

WORLD

Problems of

MARXIST

Peace and Socialism

REVIEW

October 1983, Volume 26, Number 10 \$1.00





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

October 1983, Vol. 26, No. 10

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

Features

- 1 GDR: on the highroad
G. Mittag
- 6 For the fraternal community's
common benefit
P. Damdin (Mongolia)
- 11 Brazil: the process of change
is irreversible
G. Dias
- 17 Euromissile shadow over
the globe. Not yet too late
to ward off the threat!
S. Korakas

The party

- 23 Denmark: through unity
to change
J. Jensen
- 27 France: "There were
500,000 of us but
there should be millions"
Reading L'Humanité

Exchange of views

- 30 Factories: bastions of
the working class
International symposium

Viewpoints

*National elections and
the communists*

- 41 Australia: needed —
real change
P. Symon

- 44 Portugal: in defiance
of the people's will
C. Brito
- 48 Britain: the Tories
once again. Why?
G. Pocock
- 52 Non-alignment:
trends and orientations
S. Mitra, R. Sevortyan
- 59 Finland: rejecting
false impartiality
J. Pakaslahti
- 62 Jordanian society in the
grip of contradictions
I. al-Khatib

Facts and figures

- 66 The anti-war movement
and the trade unions

Book reviews

- 71 Leninist unity of theory and practice
S. Tsukasov
- 74 Pondering the way of
the revolution
M. Delgado
- 78 There is no justification
A. Willough
- 80 In memory of Gustavo Machado



On the highroad

Gunter Mittag
SUPG CC Political Bureau member,
CC Secretary

SUPG'S ECONOMIC STRATEGY IN THE 1980s

The SUPG's activity is now determined by the goals set by its 10th congress in 1981. In fulfilling the party's program, we are carrying on with the effort to form a developed socialist society, and here it is especially important for the GDR communists that their party's stand on internal political matters and on all the problems of international relations and the class contest with imperialism is identical with that of the CPSU. This was once again reaffirmed at the talks between SUPG CC General Secretary Erich Honecker and CPSU CC General Secretary Yuri Andropov during last May's official friendly visit by a GDR party and government delegation to the USSR, a visit which marked the start of a new stage in the fraternal relations between our parties, states and peoples.

The Marxist-Leninist conception of social development worked out by the SUPG is based on a line of ensuring the unity of economic and social policy for the purpose of fulfilling the main task, which the 10th congress formulated as "raising the material and cultural standards of the people's life on the basis of high rates of development of social production, higher efficiency, scientific and technical progress, and growing labor productivity."¹ It can be fulfilled only with a further growth of the national-economic potential, and this determines the gist of our party's economic strategy in the present decade. This policy also reckons with the new demands which are being made on the national economy and which are very much greater than they were in the past, and also with the recent sharpening of the international situation.

The GDR economy has developed steadily and dynamically. In 1982, industrial commodity output went up by 4.3 per cent, while per-unit energy and material inputs went down by 7.4 per cent; in the first half of this year, the figures were, respectively, 4.5 per cent and 8 per cent. Net industrial product increased by 6.2 per cent, while labor productivity at centrally-run enterprises rose by 5.3 per cent. These data show the sources from which the SUPG's

economic strategy is being fuelled: in a broad front, our national economy is moving along the way of intensification. The necessary scope of this process could be briefly determined as follows:

- first, production has to be increased with an absolute reduction in energy and material inputs, so that the reduction in per-unit inputs should run ahead of the expansion of output;

- second, labor productivity must grow faster than output with a systematic release of labor-power;

- third, labor productivity must rise faster than the average value of fixed assets per workplace, mainly through their better use (for instance, by increasing the shift co-efficient in the use of equipment, etc.); and

- fourth, earnings from the export of new and improved products should grow faster than the outlays on the development of science and technology.

It is quite obvious that the further expansion of production almost entirely and in every respect depends on intensive — instead of extensive — growth factors. This is the most fruitful way, and it makes the most economic sense, signifying the full and effective use of the advantages of socialism and of all its inherent sources of development.

The party's elaboration of its economic strategy for the 1980s has allowed due time to prepare for work in the new conditions for advance in blending the advantages of socialism with the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution, and for realizing more fully in our national economy our own potentialities and the fruits of scientific and technical development. We fully agree with what Yuri Andropov said at the June 1983 plenary meeting of the CPSU CC: "The main road to a qualitative step forward in the productive forces is, of course, the transition to intensive development, the actual merging of the advantages of our socialist system with the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution, moreover, of its very latest stage . . ."²

The SUPG's economic strategy has tied in this fundamental process with the task of markedly boosting labor productivity and making better use of fuel and raw materials. Their every kilogram must be converted by highly efficient labor into a maximum of best products. That is why our economic policy includes a drive for high product-quality, a substantial growth in labor efficiency and a better ratio of costs and results.

In the pursuit of these fundamental goals, the party's economic strategy requires the all-round socialist rationalization of production, which also means economies in labor-time and a higher quality of labor, with a simultaneous improvement of working conditions. Our investment policy is also acquiring new features: the needs of rationalization are the first to be funded.

The end goal of our economic strategy includes a marked increase in the output of high-quality consumer goods, primarily made from our own raw materials. That is a task facing all the sectors of the national economy and the combines, regardless of whether they make such goods or the means of production. All of this implies a dynamic development of social production, and especially a growing national income and a rapid advance toward higher social productivity.

More than 8 million men and women are now employed in the GDR's national economy. Our national income is now roughly 200 billion marks, of which 70 per cent comes from socialist industry. Our economy is based on the well-tested socialist principle of planning and has all the necessary conditions for accelerated development in this decade. An important fact here is that we are advancing along the way of intensification of social production together with the USSR, and that the advantages of socialist economic integration within the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) are being brought out ever more fully. Together with the Soviet Union the GDR is working on the main lines of long-term cooperation — up to the year 2000 — in science, technology and production. This is of exceptional importance in the light of the prospects for further raising the national economy, because it makes for the constant possibility of marching in step with the requirements and achievements of modern science and technology. The party proceeds from the assumption that through socialist economic integration we can jointly make fuller use of the advantages of socialism and bring out new reserves for the progress of the economies of both states and for the benefit of our peoples.

Recent experience allows us to state with confidence that the working people of our republic have adopted the SUPG's strategy as their own, cherished endeavor. By consistently seeing to the unity of its economic and social policy over a whole decade, the party has strengthened the trust in its policy among millions of people: they are prepared to work better than ever before and to perform truly creative feats in order to consolidate socialism in the GDR. An especially great contribution to the common cause is being made by our young people. The Young Workers' Congress held this year showed that the activity of the Free German Youth League is centered on economic initiatives, that is, action aimed to attain the fundamental goals of our economic strategy.

Socialist emulation organized by the trade unions has acquired broad proportions; it is also aimed to mobilize the qualitative factors of economic growth. Party organizations believe that their main task is to secure, in the atmosphere of trust in the SUPG's policy, a greater understanding among the working people of the growing demands on economic work, boldly and resolutely to support all initiatives advancing intensification, especially those involving the systematic application of scientific and technical achievements, and also to lend an attentive ear to what our men and women want in improving working and living conditions. The purposeful pursuit of this policy has already borne fruit: more and more heightened labor obligations are being undertaken by the collectives, with special emphasis on voluntary undertakings to raise labor productivity by one per cent over and above the plan.

Lenin held that labor productivity was ultimately the most important, the principal thing for the victory of the new social system.³ It also remains the cardinal thing for the GDR's current economic development. The labor of millions — the country's most valuable asset — determines economic progress. It is better use of human knowledge and experience, and the readiness of our men and women to achieve high production results that pave the way for further improving economic management and administration.

Growing labor productivity has always been central to our economic policy, and this is borne out by the facts: in 1955, it took 72 working hours to turn out manufactured goods worth 1,000 marks⁴; in 1965, 33 hours; in 1975, 18 hours; and in 1982, only 13 hours. We expect this positive trend to continue.

Today, labor productivity is being increased above all by the consistent application of scientific and technological innovations. We have

everything that is necessary to do so: adequate scientific knowledge and the material facilities, above all in the form of microelectronics. Nowadays, one can no longer be content with the occasional successful applications of scientific and technological advances; the task is to open the floodgates for such applications, thereby markedly accelerating the pace of progress in this field. That is not just an economic but a political matter, because the state of scientific research and the application of its results tend to be crucial in the contest between the two social systems.

The purposeful use of the economy-of-time law through the intensification of production enables the socialist society to use the released labor reserves in a new way. In 1983, we intend to economize by means of scientific and technological progress 543 million hours, or the annual working-time fund of roughly 300,000 persons. This absolute reduction in the number of workplaces through the boosting of labor productivity provides us with working hands for tackling other economic tasks: starting new production sectors, operating machinery and plant in multi-shift regimes, and extracting our raw materials in more complicated conditions.

There is no doubt at all that labor is the basis for the development of the socialist society. But it is equally incontestable that the pace of progress depends on the efficient use of the potentialities of science and technology. That is why our party has set before the GDR economy the following task: to speed up the introduction of new scientific, technological and organizational schemes and to make consistent use of them in the economy, thereby propelling economic growth, obtaining high production results, reducing labor-time inputs and improving product quality.

We have the prerequisites for the application of scientific and technological achievements in a more efficient way in economic terms: experienced scientists and technologists, executives and organizers of production at industrial and construction combines, in transportation and communications; we have also shaped the forms of economic administration and management which are up to modern requirements. The GDR's scientific and technological potential, which is already a large one, will continue to grow: for these purposes we have appropriated an average of 4 per cent of the national income.

In the recent period, we have attached special importance to the development of microelectronics. It has developed into an industry in its own right, and a growing volume

of its products is being supplied to the national economy. In a short time, microelectronics in the GDR has burgeoned into a key sector that is having a crucial effect on the development of the society's productive forces. Let me add that the build-up of this industrial complex — its research and development facilities, its flow-line production of integrated circuits, the manufacture of highly pure primary materials and the fabrication of various types of new technological equipment — was started literally from scratch. The potentialities for developing our microelectronics were created through intensive expanded reproduction; success was assured by the labor effort and knowledge of more than 100,000 scientists, researchers, technologists, skilled workers and management personnel involved in microelectronics. Here, we succeeded in erecting a sort of bridge into the future. The high world rates of development in this field confront us with serious demands.

The use of robots in production is now of tremendous importance. Our party believes that if robots are to yield the maximum effect, there is a need to restructure the entire technological processes on a new basis. That will help to raise the quality of labor markedly. Just now, 26,000 industrial robots of various types are already functioning in the GDR.

It is equally important to make economical use of resources, to process raw materials to the greatest possible degree, and also painstakingly to keep stock of, process and recycle waste, or the "excrements of production," as Marx put it. That alone will make it possible to increase the net product (and consequently national income) without expanding, or even while reducing the consumption of primary raw materials. To every kilogram of these, living labor adds a new value, and the greater the degree of processing, the higher is that value. Its magnitude should not be determined by the mass of used-up materials, but by the quality of labor. That is why, if intensification is to be a success, there is a need to overcome the vestiges of the so-called gross-output ideology.

There is another essential aspect to the task of in-depth processing of raw materials: it enjoins the priority use of the country's own resources, and the turning of these resources, with the aid of the appropriate technologies, into high-quality products as substitutes for expensive imports. The deeper processing requirement is not a forced measure in any sense, for it helps markedly to improve the input-output ratio. Additional mental effort and new design and development ideas make it possible to turn available resources into a greater amount of

higher-quality goods, and to this special attention is being given in the process of intensification.

The improvement of the input-output ratio and the cutbacks in production consumption help to bring out the main reserves for further national income growth. The lowering of outlays and the economies in energy and raw and other materials (especially when there is a reduction not only in the per-unit inputs, but also a development of production with an absolutely lower consumption of energy and raw and other materials per product-unit) signify an increase in the national economy's assets and potential. To attain all this, industrial enterprises must be swiftly modernized, fixed assets used to the utmost, and product quality enhanced.

Consistent intensification enables us to use what we actually have at our disposal to turn out more products for the needs of the national economy, for export and especially for meeting the population's demand in consumer goods. Their growing output is simultaneously the result and the condition for intensive expanded reproduction, because it is directly aimed to attain the end goal of socialist production. Here, economics is most closely interwoven with social policy, because a copious supply of consumer goods has a direct impact on effective distribution according to work.

The task of increasing the output of high-quality goods, for which there is a heightened demand among the population, has been set before every sector of the GDR national economy. It can be fulfilled through the growth of labor productivity and the establishment of special consumer-goods shops at all combines manufacturing producer goods. But in this context, there are also considerable reserves in the other, above-listed aspects of intensification (deeper processing of primary materials, fuller use of the country's raw materials, including recycled materials, and better exploitation of installed equipment).

The time-factor has an ever more tangible influence on our economy. The duration of the cycle which starts with the development of a new product and ends with its marketing has a fundamental effect on the profitability of production. Throughout the world there is a steady reduction in the length of technological cycles, and we also need to accelerate not only the individual labor operations, but also the whole process as an aggregate. The economy of our republic is faced with this task: to go on to wholesale automation of production sectors and shops with the aid of microelectronics and robotics. The time it takes for products which

are vital for the national economy to move from the drawing board to assembly line must be shortened to the utmost. Besides, in the management of production organized on clear-cut lines, scientific methods should be used for substantially reducing inventories. Precise observance of technological regimes, timely performance of maintenance, reduction of idling time, and a general tightening up of labor discipline could also yield a great deal.

The modern production process requires appropriate material and technical facilities. From 1975 to 1982, fixed assets per person employed in the GDR industry went up from 74,500 to more than 106,000 marks. However, the national economic effect of capital investments does not depend on their size but primarily on their effective use. We feel the need to reduce sharply the time it takes to realize investments and to obtain faster returns within the framework of closed technological circuits.

Accordingly, much significance is attached to capital investments earmarked for rationalizing production. It is now exceptionally important to modernize the already installed machinery and plant. For that end, vigorous efforts are being made at the combines and enterprises to create the possibilities for fabricating the means of rationalization on the spot. That is just how roughly a quarter of all the capital investments in equipment is now being realized. These provide a basis for subsequently remodelling, modernizing and totally transforming the entire technological processes. The switch of operating machinery and equipment to electronic control also helps to reduce many workplaces. The combines' potentialities in this field are markedly enlarged by the effective organization of the making of the means of rationalization, above all where there are research and development units. Re-tooling on that basis is not a secondary matter, but one of the conditions for arranging efficient and profitable operations everywhere.

In the transition to intensive expanded reproduction, there is a constant quest for new ways of perfecting management and planning, so as best to meet the vital requirements of our day. In this respect the establishment of combines at which the reproduction process proceeds as an integrated and organic whole has turned out to be highly effective. It is highly important that at the combines science and technology are directly merged with production in economic terms and are working together for the end result. These combines have large-scale research and development facilities, which are being steadily built up. Their own facilities for making the means of

rationalization enable them to apply scientific and technological achievements much faster.

Not long ago, the combines' national economic responsibilities were enlarged, and practice shows that that was the right step to take. The task of further improving the administration of the combines on the basis of the principles of democratic centralism, so as to enable them to perform their functions to the fullest extent, is now coming to the fore. This implies primarily the combines' relations with the higher-standing organs. The right to issue orders to their directors-general is vested only in ministers, each of whom, as a rule, has from 8 to 15 combines in his charge. The personal responsibility of the directors-general for the coherent management of reproduction at the combines is being enlarged.

Centralized state planning is the basis of socialist economic management. That is why the starting point for the work of the combines and enterprises in the GDR is provided by mandatory state indicators, like the commodity-output dynamic, the growth of labor productivity, net product, and profit, and also the output of key goods for supply to the population, the national economy and export.

These indicators, balances, state norms and standards are the basis on which the results of the work of the combines and enterprises are assessed. They are also the basis for economic calculus, with indicators reflecting the enterprises' own efforts and their success in advancing intensification having the crucial role to play. In future, we intend to assess the activity of economic units above all on the strength of net product and profit, the volume of goods and services for the population, and also the volume of exports, that is, the contribution each enterprise makes to the national income.

Combines are economic units in industry and construction run directly by ministries. They consist of economically and juridically independent enterprises which bear full economic responsibility for their activity. That is why it is necessary to have economic calculus both at the combines and at the enterprises.

We believe that comparing the results of the work of individual combines is a fundamentally important method in the political guidance of economic processes. This helps to bring out sizable reserves for further intensification by spreading the experience of the best and markedly enlarging the circle of enterprises making use of advanced labor methods. The comparisons reckon above all with the inputs that were required to obtain a given result, and this is the key point of political economy. Such comparisons are a reflection of the urge

for enhancing the efficiency of production and show how all the factors of intensification can best be used.

The combines are large centers at which the working class of the republic is concentrated. They are headed by experienced communists, by cadre who are loyal to the workers' and peasants' power, and who have solid knowledge of management, organization and economics in modern socialist production. In addition, a special party organizer accountable directly to the SUPG Central Committee for the state of political work at the combine is appointed to each combine.

The development of socialist relations of production and the switch to intensive expanded reproduction calls for conscious and active participation in all these processes by the working people. A high state of discipline, a thrifty attitude to socialist property, solid political and professional knowledge provide the crucial propulsive power for further economic progress. That is why our party's mass political work is concentrated above all on the questions of economic strategy. Agitation and propaganda make use of all the ideological factors that help to boost labor productivity.

Socialism's most important advantage is that the workers — the largest, strongest and historically most progressive class — in alliance with the cooperative peasants and other sections of the working people wield the political power, which they are able to use for their own interests. We are doing everything to consolidate the power of the working class and its vanguard — the Marxist-Leninist party — and to strengthen their influence on the course of social development.

Because of its status under socialism, the working class is capable of so developing the economy that it should most fully satisfy the working people's vital material and spiritual requirements. In this way, it fulfils its historical mission in shaping the socialist system, which first makes it possible to blend economic and social policy. This gives a powerful impetus to the further strengthening of socialism's economic might and enhancement of its superiority over capitalism.

The SUPG's activity has always proceeded from the view that politics and economics interact directly with each other. Today, we also believe that there is a strong link between the GDR's serious political responsibility for the preservation of peace, on the one hand, and the build-up of our republic's economic potential, on the other. That is why, while implementing

our economic strategy, we shall continue in the 1980s as well to work on this two-fold task: fully to bring out all the potentialities of socialism for our people's benefit, while ensuring all the necessary external conditions for doing so.

1. Protokoll des X. Parteitages der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands, Bd. 1, Berlin, 1981, p. 64.
2. Yuri Andropov, *Selected Articles and Speeches*, Moscow, 1983, p. 287 (in Russian).
3. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 427.
4. In constant prices.

For the fraternal community's common benefit

Pavangiyn Damdin
CC Secretary,
Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST DIVISION OF LABOR: THE BASIS FOR ALIGNING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LEVELS

Lenin wrote his famous work *The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Power* 65 years ago, but far from diminishing, its importance has steadily grown with the passage of time. This is quite understandable, because that work of Lenin's is of special value for the young states taking the way of socialist construction: it sets forth a full-scale program for tackling the most complicated tasks facing the state and the party at the very beginning of the revolutionary reconstruction of the society, chiefly of its economic basis. Lenin's work was, of course, written in the light of the concrete conditions then prevailing in Russia, but the lessons in the creative application of the Marxist theory in practice which it contains are of universal significance.

Considering the main factors in building up material production on socialist lines, Lenin also stressed the importance of tackling the raw materials problem. After listing the main natural resources which Russia's liberated people took over, he drew the following conclusion: "The development of these natural resources by methods of modern technology will provide the basis for the unprecedented progress of the productive forces."¹

The problem of developing natural resources with the use of the most modern hardware and technology is a most urgent one for the countries which have opted for independent development. But while the substance of the problem is crystal clear, it does not lend itself to any easy or satisfactory solution under capitalism. While being nominally in possession of its natural resources or even making use of them, a developing country frequently receives an unjustifiably small advantage from doing so, because even after the winning of political inde-

pendence, it continues to be integrated within the system of the international capitalist division of labor.

The bonds within this system are fairly strong: after all, it has taken nearly two centuries to shape. While constantly modifying its forms, adapting to the new circumstances, and renewing the methods by means of which capital manages to take care of its own interests, the system has in substance remained unchanged. It functions only if there is unevenness of economic level and economic inequality based on that unevenness between the industrialized states conducting an imperialist policy, and countries whose progress has for various reasons been retarded. The former have less than one-third of the population of the capitalist world, but they have at their disposal the lion's share of the financial capital and the industrial product. Their national income per head is 16-20 times higher than that of the underdeveloped countries. It is not surprising, therefore, that while the subsoil of the latter abounds in various resources, they themselves are still not masters of the situation.

In the capitalist world, it is the major powers that own the investments, the hardware and the technology that it takes to develop a country's natural resources. Having been forced to abandon the methods of extra-economic coercion, by means of which they once ruled the colonies (and constantly trying to reintroduce these methods in one form or another), the leaders of imperialism are using neocolonialist methods, including "aid" to developing countries and expansion by transnational corporations. "The world has become divided into a handful of usurer states and a vast majority of debtor states," Lenin wrote.² The capitalist part of the globe is still divided along those lines. The "usurers" manage to dictate the prices of most of the raw materials they buy and to keep them

low, while constantly raising the prices for the manufactured goods the newly liberated states have to import. The result is a steadily mounting debt owed by the latter to the rich capitalist countries.

Far from diminishing, the economic gap between these two groups of countries has been widening. It is vital for the industrialized countries to keep things in this state, because they batten on the exploitation of the poorer countries, just as the capitalists flourish at the expense of the workers. As a result, the exploited countries remain raw material appendages of the major imperialist states, and are deprived of full rights and potentialities in using their own natural resources.

It is private property in the means of production that is the basis of the unjust order in the capitalist international division of labor, and of class exploitation as well. Socialism, which converts the means of production into the property of the whole people, alone makes it possible to harmonize social relations, to do away with all exploitation — whether class or national — and to attain genuine equality in the peoples' economic development levels. The socialist international division of labor gradually does away with economic unevenness within the framework of the countries it involves. Under socialism, there is no ground for any antagonistic contradictions between states which mainly supply raw materials and those which mainly engage in converting these raw materials into manufactured products. The peoples in possession of natural resources not only have these fully at their disposal and are not subjected to discrimination by their partners in the distribution of the incomes derived from the use of these resources, but also receive all-round fraternal assistance. Such is one of the key uniformities underlying socialist relations between states, which are based on the principles of internationalism and class justice. This ultimately helps to even out the economic levels of the equal new type of states.

The socialist countries inherited from the past a wide gap in economic development levels, entering the new society from different social formations and different epochs. Some, like the GDR and Czechoslovakia, had been fairly well developed in industrial terms (although their economies also bore the imprint of capitalist unevenness), while others were among the backward agrarian provinces. Mongolia ranked among the latter, and its industrial construction was started in the 1930s, literally from scratch. Until then, the only sector of the economy was nomad livestock-breeding with the use of patriarchal methods. Pre-revolution-

ary Mongolia had been the back-country of Asia because of the Buddhist religious ideology which had been implanted among the people for centuries in its most conservative, Lamaist form, the total illiteracy of the population, the undivided rule of the clerical and lay feudal lords, and the growing colonial expansion on the part of its neighbors.

Following the 1921 people's revolution, the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party led the country along the way of non-capitalist development building a bridge from feudalism to socialism. The age-old backwardness created many difficulties in tackling this task and called for great efforts. Nevertheless, the democratic stage of the revolution in our country was completed in 1940, and the foundations of the new society were laid at the end of the 1950s. In 1961, the party oriented the country toward socialist industrialization. The party's 1966 program set the task of completing the construction of the material and technical basis of socialism in Mongolia and of converting the agrarian-industrial country into an industrial-agrarian country. The party's latest, 18th congress (1981) reaffirmed this strategic line, and specifically drew attention to the need to intensify the whole of social production.

Like Vietnam and Cuba, Mongolia is a member of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and is involved in the international socialist division of labor. It is true that they joined the CMEA later than did other states. Mongolia, the first of the three, joined in 1962, when all the necessary prerequisites for doing so had been built up in the country. But even today there is a marked difference between the economic levels of the advanced industrialized and the agrarian-industrial socialist countries.

How are the countries' roles allocated within the international socialist division of labor in view of this unevenness? How are their natural resources being developed, in particular? After all, if relations between the industrialized and the agrarian-industrial countries had been arranged on the capitalist model, we would have inevitably become dependent on the stronger partners. Let us see, however, what actually happens in socialist practice.

Mongolia began to lay the mineral and raw material foundations for its industry with the USSR's help long before the formation of the CMEA. At that time, their cooperation was regulated only by bilateral agreements. These were based on the same Leninist principles of international cooperation by which the whole socialist community is guided today. Mongolian-Soviet ties provided the first op-

portunity in history to test these principles in practice. The foundation of socialist international relations is provided by the similar-type economic basis of the states (social property in the means of production) and the common character of their political power (the power of the people led by the working class). Socialist internationalism is the main, definitive principle, and it includes both general democratic elements — complete equality, mutual respect for independence and sovereignty, and purely socialist elements — cooperation among the peoples and fraternal assistance.

Soviet-Mongolian agreements relating to the development of Mongolia's mineral wealth were couched in the spirit of these principles and provided for *joint and equal participation* by both sides in all works and projects. Such was the character of the Eastern Geological Expedition, which was set up back in the 1930s, the Soviet-Mongolian joint-stock society Sovmongometall, and the enterprise Mongol-neft set up in the post-war period. These organizations helped to explore deposits of tungsten, tin, feld-spar (fluorite), oil and many other minerals. Several joint Mongolian-Soviet enterprises, including some in the mining industry, are now operating in our country. They have proved to be a form of cooperation that is highly valuable and advantageous for both countries, Mongolia in the first place. Their activity was highly assessed by Yumzhagiyn Tsendenbal, General Secretary of the MPRP CC, when he said that joint Mongolian-Soviet enterprises have had an exceptional role to play in helping to overcome Mongolia's age-old backwardness, in building up its socialist economy, in converting agrarian Mongolia into an agrarian-industrial country, and in training cadre of the working class and the intelligentsia.

The Soviet Union has helped our country not only in the exploration and use of mineral resources, but also in training a national contingent of geologists and mining specialists. Our mining industries are now assured of the necessary number of engineers, technicians and skilled workers. Our research institutions have all the research personnel they need. Our geological service has its own scientific and technical facilities.

Our country's participation in the activity of the CMEA has provided it with fresh potentialities for accelerating its economic growth, including the fuller exploration of our subsoil and the development of our natural resources. The party's 15th congress in 1966 approved the line of developing broad cooperation with the

CMEA countries. The Comprehensive Program of Socialist Economic Integration, adopted by the CMEA in 1971, marked an important stage in deepening this cooperation. It was a striking expression of the fundamental distinction between the capitalist and the socialist international division of labor. The program set the task of aligning the economic levels of all the CMEA countries, and outlines the measures of fulfilling this task. That concerned our country in the first place.

The method by means of which the Mongolian economy is being raised to the advanced fraternal countries' level was first tested in the USSR's historical experience with its once-backward national periphery. The substance of this method is that the less developed district, region or republic, and within the CMEA framework the less developed state, is assured of *priority rates of economic progress*.

In the Soviet Union, the 26th congress of the CPSU in 1981 declared, the evening out of the economic levels of the Union Republics has in the main been completed. There is no longer any gap between an industrial center and a raw-material supplying periphery. All the republics are roughly at the same stage of socio-economic development, even if, because of natural, historical and national specifics, the economy of each has its own features, its own specialization and its own unique place in the all-Union economic complex. Those are the conditions which pave the way for the fullest and most efficient use of natural resources.

Similar processes are now also under way within the CMEA framework, but on an interstate scale, a fact which gives them a new quality.

In order to assure Mongolia of a faster rate of development, it was provided with privileged conditions in the international socialist cooperation (easy credits, preferential commercial prices for export products, assistance in developing science and accelerating scientific and technological progress, in training national personnel, etc.). Special attention was given to helping our country explore its deposits of mineral raw materials and expand their development.

Subsequently, when Cuba and Vietnam joined the CMEA, similar measures were also extended to them, and this was an effective means of overcoming the backwardness they had inherited from the past, and accelerating growth to attain economic equality with the other socialist community countries. Mongolia has a priority rate of development even today. Thus, in 1982, the CMEA countries' national

income went up by an average of 2.2 per cent, and Mongolia's — by 8.4. per cent.

The strategy of aligning economic levels within the CMEA framework, as mapped out by the Comprehensive Program, has had an exceptionally beneficial effect on Mongolia's economic development, especially in the exploration of its subsoil and in the advance of its mining industry. In accordance with the program, long-term goal-oriented programs of cooperation were drawn up for five different areas of the national economy, including those which have a direct bearing on the raw material problem. With the goal-oriented program targets were tied in the national-economic plans of the last two five-year periods of the CMEA countries, and agreed plans for integration measures were also adopted. In the process, every possible account was taken of the need to accelerate the development of Mongolia's natural resources. The mere fact that the CMEA's Standing Commission on cooperation in the sphere of geology, the chief coordinator of this activity, has its headquarters in Ulan Bator, our capital, testifies to the CMEA's great attention to Mongolia's part in building up the mineral and raw material basis of the socialist community.

It is quite natural that the greatest assistance to Mongolia in developing its natural resources still comes from the Soviet Union, with which we have now had the closest fraternal relations for more than 60 years. In accordance with the Comprehensive Program, Mongolia and the USSR concluded an agreement in 1973 on developing the large-scale Erdenetiyn-Obo copper and molybdenum deposits and building a joint enterprise on that basis. The mining and concentration combine known as Erdenet was started in 1981, and now ranks among the 10 biggest enterprises of this type in the world. The start of its operation laid the basis for the formation of a new economic region with a multisectoral industrial structure. A town with all modern amenities and a population of many thousands has now emerged near the combine.

A complex approach is characteristic of the most important joint Mongolian-Soviet projects of the recent period involving the development of our mineral wealth. This means that the minerals are not only mined but also processed on the spot. Such a complex requires the creation of a ramified infrastructure: communications, the services, and housing. All of this provides an impetus for boosting the other sectors of the economy: energy, fuel, building, the light and food industry, etc. Economic progress in the relatively underdeveloped regions frequently starts with a mining

enterprise. Consequently, the country owning the natural resources obtains the maximum advantage, its economy is shaped harmoniously and without any of the ugly twists that frequently result from the unequal division of labor between countries under capitalism.

Here is yet another example in the build-up of a new industrial complex with coal-mining as its core. The Baga-Nur deposit was discovered by Soviet and Mongolian geologists in 1974 and 1975. The proved deposits and the favorable mining and geological conditions made it possible to open a large open-cast colliery in the area. The working out of the project involved, on the Soviet side, 16 research and design institutes and organizations. Another modern town, with a population of 10,000, has already arisen in the steppe; a high-voltage power transmission line and a railway have been built. The first section of the colliery, with a capacity of 1 million tons of coal a year, was started last year, well ahead of schedule. By 1988, its capacity is to go up to 6 million tons. The question now being considered is to set up at Baga-Nur an industrial city as a satellite of our capital, to increase the capacity of the colliery to 12-15 million tons of coal a year, and to erect an installation for the in-depth processing of the coal into liquid fuel and into other valuable materials which now have to be imported.

In coal output per head, Mongolia has already surpassed the average world and average EEC levels. The party's 18th congress outlined a large-scale program for further increasing coal output, which in the current five-year period (1981-1985) is to go up by 60 per cent.

The ore-extracting industry has also been developing at a fast pace: its capacity has grown so much that it now turns out in less than a month as much as it turned out in the whole of 1970. Since then, its output has multiplied 49-fold and this accounts for 40 per cent of Mongolia's exports. By the end of the five-year period, its gross output should be more than 100 per cent up on the first year of the period.

In the light of Soviet-Mongolian cooperation, other fraternal countries have also been extending their participation in setting up joint mining enterprises. The association called Mongolczechoslovakometall, which was set up in 1979, is operating a tin mine and a mine for the extraction of fluorite. An association called Mongolbolgarmetall is also laying the foundations for new mining enterprises.

Alongside the bilateral cooperation, multilateral cooperation, especially in prospecting for minerals, is also being extended. In 1976, the CMEA's International Geological Expedition began to work on the territory of our coun-

try, and its activity is being financed by all the fraternal countries involved, without any cost to us. It has already discovered several deposits of tungsten and other rare metals, and fluorite. Altogether, more than 4,500 deposits and promising extrusions of more than 40 minerals have been discovered. Among the riches Mongolia has in its subsoil are copper, molybdenum, tin, tungsten, tantalum, bismuth, mercury, gold and silver. Fluorite is an important raw material for the chemical, metallurgical and optical industries. Extraction of it in our country was started in the 1950s. By 1985, it is to reach 1 million tons a year, and this will make our republic a world front-ranker in exporting fluorite. Coal-mining has great prospects before it. One of Asia's largest deposits of coking coals, at Tavan Tolgoy, with commercial and prognosticated reserves of several dozen billion tons, is now being studied. Geologists predict that we have many similar discoveries still ahead of us.

The use of some minerals will start within the next few years. This applies primarily to phosphorite and zinc ores. The Comprehensive Program of Socialist Economic Integration envisages cooperation among interested CMEA countries in organizing the production of yellow phosphorous and other highly concentrated phosphate-bearing products on the basis of the Hubsugul deposit, which is estimated to contain 3 billion tons of phosphorite. Large deposits of nepheline sienites, the raw material for making aluminum, have also been discovered in the area. A rich deposit of zinc ore has been prepared for commercial working, and the estimation of deposits of high-grade iron ore, which could be used for the direct reduction of metal, is nearing completion.

Consequently, our country has a solid raw material basis. This creates good potentialities for developing its own industry and for fruitful participation in building up the mineral and raw material basis of the whole socialist community. These natural resources are being developed for Mongolia's benefit and for the common benefit of the fraternal countries. In such relations, no one stands to lose, and all the participants stand to gain.

The scientific and technological revolution has not reduced demand for natural raw materials, despite the fact that substitutes for them are being turned out in the world at a rapid rate. Indeed, the consumption of minerals is being accelerated and the spectrum of those involved in production has been widening. That is why the raw material problem continues to have priority in determining the strategy of economic development, and the CMEA is quite

right to give it close attention in its integration program.

In addition to the existing methods of solving this problem, new and more effective ones need to be found. At the party's 18th congress, Yumzhagiyn Tsedenbal emphasized the need "to develop inter-state property in the means of production, to shape and develop, together with other interested countries, international economic complexes underpinned by the use of the country's natural resources."³

Such complexes are yet another stage in the development of socialist economic integration. They help effectively to even out the economic levels of the countries involved in the international socialist division of labor.

The Mongolian communists fully appreciate the propositions put forward by CPSU CC General Secretary Yuri Andropov at the June 1983 plenary meeting of the Central Committee aimed to attain a qualitatively higher level of economic integration. We feel that this will be promoted not only by deepening specialization and closer cooperation of the national economies, but also by the use of new forms of inter-state property. Our experience shows that this is a highly promising line.

The perfection of socialist economic integration is bound to have an effect on the solution of the raw material problem within the CMEA framework. There should be an effect both in increasing the extraction of natural resources and in their more rational and complex use, while resolving the contradiction between human activity and protection of the environment.

Let us note that the raw material problem is not only a problem of resource availability. It is a blend of ecological, economic and political factors. Thus, the question of economizing on resources is inseparable, for instance, from the key task facing the whole of humankind, which is to limit the arms race, because the manufacture of weapons is one of the most "voluminous" consumers of minerals.

Let us also note this specific aspect of the raw material problem: no country can cope with it single-handed. Only through extensive international cooperation, only in a complex approach, only together can the use of minerals be made reasonable and rational. As the experience of the CMEA countries shows, this needs to be done on a planned basis, in the light of long-term forecasts. The latest such forecast is now being carried out, and it will provide the basis for all our further activity in the joint use of natural resources.

What has been said, we think, warrants the following conclusion: the new economic rela-

tions which have taken shape within the socialist community could serve as a prototype for such international relations on a world scale in the future. They determine the new character of the international division of labor and help to even out the economic development levels of the countries included in the system, and to attain complete and full-fledged economic equality, which accords with the highest,

socialist stage in the development of human civilization.

1. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 257.
2. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 277.
3. Yumzhagiyn Tsendenbal, *Report of the Central Committee to the 18th Congress of the MPRP and the Tasks for the Next Few Years*, Ulan Bator, 1981, p. 47 (in Mongolian).

The process of change is irreversible

Giocondo Dias
CC General Secretary,
Brazilian CP

Brazil is Latin America's biggest country in whose political life the army — usually "defensive" and reactionary-minded — has had a very noticeable role to play throughout the whole of this century. No wonder then that it was the top military who undertook to act as the strangulator of democracy and defender of the interests of the latifundists and the big bourgeoisie, when the working class, peasant and mass anti-imperialist movement was intensified under the bourgeois governments of J. Quadros and J. Goulart in the early 1960s, with marked democratic changes posing a threat to the Brazilian oligarchy through the establishment of the Popular Front. In the spring of 1964, a coup was engineered in Brazil with the support of the U.S. monopolies, and power was taken by a military grouping, which effectively abolished the constitution and "suspended" the citizens' democratic guarantees and political rights. Since then, for nearly two decades, the Brazilian people have been carrying on a struggle with mounting success for the re-establishment of their trampled civil liberties, and against the regime's line of maintaining a curtailed, "guided" democracy.¹

This military-imposed system operated in the country until 1979, allowing for the existence of only two parties: the governmental National Union for Renewal (ARENA) and the opposition Brazilian Democratic Movement (BDM). Being closely tied with the military, the ruling ARENA relied heavily on extraordinary laws, while the government it formed had virtually unlimited powers, following the re-allocation in its favor of some functions of the legislature and the judiciary.

By the end of the 1970s, following the collapse of the Brazilian "economic miracle," which had been artificially created by the un-

limited influx of foreign capital, the stimulation of private enterprise and the promotion of state-monopoly trends in the economy, most Brazilians decided that the military regime, with its economic model, had outlived itself. Economically, the much vaunted "miracle" had been the result of the super-exploitation of the working class, and politically, of fascist methods of government. There was a rapid growth of the legal opposition in the country, grouped mainly around the BDM, and forces calling for the liberalization of political life even appeared within the ARENA party of the ruling bloc. The processes on the inter-party and inner-party levels sprang from a massive popular movement against the authoritarian forms of government and the sway of the monopolies. This movement involved not only the working strata of town and country, but also a section of the national bourgeoisie, the clergy, and even some of the officers in the army that was the dictatorship's mainstay. The popular discontent, despite the repression and electoral fraud, was clearly manifested in the course of the elections in 1974, 1976 and, especially, 1979, when the opposition demonstrated its growing influence by winning an ever larger number of votes.

The fresh winds of social renewal, which had a marked influence on Brazil's political climate over the past few decades, were caused by the substantial changes in the country's overall economic structure: once a mainly agricultural country, it has developed into an industrial-agrarian country, with its productive forces on a medium level of development. Industrial growth has turned the bourgeoisie and the working class into the two main social forces, with all the consequences that this entails for the destinies of democracy. During the 1967-

1981 period of military rule, the Brazilian proletariat grew from 8 million to 23 million, including 6 million industrial workers (most of them under the age of 30 years), of whom 37 per cent worked at enterprises employing over 500 persons.² There has been a marked rise in the ideological, skill, and cultural stature of the working class, which constitutes the bulk of the economically active population and which has advanced to the frontline in the struggle for the country's renewal. There was also a change in the character of the national bourgeoisie, with the entry of Brazilian capitalism upon the monopoly stage and the formation of a financial oligarchy.

Today, urban dwellers make up the majority of the Brazilian population, whose changing structure is characterized by the proletarianization of wage-labor, both in the industrial centers (where it also involves the middle strata) and in the countryside (where the agricultural proletariat is prevalent). Hence, the growing participation in political life by millions of dispossessed Brazilians. Their will for a change in the existing order of things, which has produced super-exploitation, unemployment, the impoverishment of the toiling strata, and plunged the education and public health systems into a state of crisis, is becoming the crucial factor in answering this question: which way is Brazil to advance after the inglorious end of the regime?

In the atmosphere of universal discontent, General Figueiredo's government, which was installed in March 1979, began to conduct the new political line proclaimed by his predecessor, General E. Geisel (1974-1978), a line designated by the press as "controlled liberalization." The scheme of the most far-sighted leaders of the ruling stratum was a simple one: without changing the existing system, gradual and well-considered reforms "from the top" should help to let off steam from the boiler of popular discontent, smooth over the sharpened economic and political contradictions and improve their party's positions by expanding its social base. In this connection, the restrictions on the main bourgeois freedoms were lifted, a part of the repressive legislation repealed, an amnesty for political prisoners declared, a number of concessions made to the trade unions, and direct elections of governors re-established (in 1983).

The "party reform" announced at the end of 1979 was an important step in democratizing internal political life, a step that was, however, a forced one on the part of a government keeping an eye on the situation. Its purpose was, on the one hand, to revive the multi-party system

in Brazil and, on the other, to weaken the strong opposition party, the BDM, by inducing a number of small party groupings to leave it. As a result, the ruling party ARENA began to call itself the Social Democratic Party (SDP),³ while the BDM split up into a number of new and smaller parties: the Brazilian Democratic Movement Party (BDMP), the Brazilian Trabalhista Party (BTP), the Party of Democratic Trabalhism (PDT), the People's Party (PP), and the Working People's Party (WPP). On the eve of the elections, the PP merged with the BDMP in order to fight the governmental SDP more successfully. However, the Brazilian Communist Party (BCP) was not legalized.

Reaction expected the elections to weaken the opposition, but the expectations of the moribund dictatorship were not realized. Despite the authorities' show of optimism, the election returns of November 15, 1982, testified to a further deepening of the regime's crisis, and were yet another milestone on the way to final liberation from the authoritarian forms of government.

A scrutiny of the election returns will show that it was not victory but a defeat that the generals got. The lists of voters included a total of 58.5 million, of whom 90 per cent went to the polls. The level of the population's electoral activity is itself a sign that Brazil, the "tropical giant," has awakened from its relative political lethargy. The Brazilians were to re-elect a third of the Senate, the whole Chamber of Deputies of the National Congress, all the governors, and members of the legislative assemblies of the states, municipal councillors and judges. Altogether, more than 43,000 persons out of a total of close to a quarter-million contenders were to be elected to the various posts. Despite unfavorable legislation (notably, the prohibition to form electoral blocs), the opposition won nearly 60 per cent of the poll, of which the overwhelming majority went to the BDMP, the largest opposition party. In absolute figures, that party alone got almost 1.5 million votes more than the ruling SDP (18,901,000 against 17,524,000). Accordingly, the number of SDP seats in the Chamber of Deputies dropped from 53.8 per cent to 48.8 per cent, with a proportional growth in the ranks of the opposition, which got 245 seats (out of 479) in the highest legislative body, including 201 deputies representing the BDMP. The opposition scored an equal success on the local authority level: the BDMP now has its own mayors in 1,800 of the nearly 4,000 municipalities, whereas before the November elections it had only a few hundred.

The winning by the opposition of 10 guber-

natorial posts out of the 22 up for re-election (the governor of one state had been earlier appointed by the government) was perhaps one of the most important political results in the 1982 electoral campaign. The fact that the states now administered by the opposition — and the most developed of them are Sao Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, and Minas-Jerais — turn out nearly 80 per cent of the gross national product, handle more than 70 per cent of all the export and import operations, and have more than one-half of the population, should be especially underlined. Indicative also are the results of the polling in 100 major cities (with a population of over 128,000 each): the BDMP won in 75, the SDP, in only 17, the PDT in 4, the BTP, in 2, and the WPP in 1. These eloquent figures show that the nation's most dynamic and politically mature forces voted for change, while the regime, personifying the dictatorship and mainly representing the big latifundists, has kept its positions in the rural areas and the less developed states controlled by the SDP.

The opposition's advance to the seats of power has had important socio-psychological consequences for Brazilian society: to some extent the popular masses have become confident in their strength, and the possibility of defeating the government has been demonstrated in practice. The extension of democratic freedoms has had the most visual effect on the mass media: the newspapers, radio and television express the aspirations of the deprived strata of the population with more boldness, criticize and expose the corruption, fraud and forgeries which flourished under the dictatorship, and spotlight administrative shortcomings. Many of these facts, brought out in the course of the electoral campaign, tend to deepen the contradictions within the government.

The changing psychological climate in the country has led to the weakening of the positions of the two main forces on which the military dictatorship relied: the army and the National Information Service (NIS). The electoral reverses suffered by the ruling party, which has close ties with the senior officers, induced within the armed forces a mood of returning to barracks and leaving the political posts to civilians. This frame of mind did exist among some army circles in the past as well, but now it is much more pronounced. The military were almost sure that a majority would vote for the SDP, which is allied with them, but having suffered a political defeat, they now have to display their role in running the country to a lesser extent. They do not, of course, want to let go of the real power, and the situation impels them to maneuver. That is why in the forth-

coming presidential elections, the top military will evidently nominate as their candidate some civilian enjoying their trust and capable of retaining the authoritarian methods of government behind a front of traditional bourgeois democracy. The SDP and the military do have a chance of getting their man into the top post: according to the present constitution, the chief of state is not elected by direct suffrage, but by an electoral college. According to some estimates made since the November 1982 elections, the government will have a slight majority in the college (360 out of 680) and therefore could get its man in, so keeping its grip on the key executive post.

The democratization of Brazilian society has made the problem of interference in social life by the security organs even more glaring. The almighty NIS, which combines the functions of an intelligence service and a political secret police, had up until recently been an actual state within the state. It conducted the oligarchy's repressive policy and had a far-flung network of agents in every social sphere, including the government agencies and the army. Things came to such a pass that a bugging device was recently discovered in the office of the incumbent President Figueiredo, although he himself had been chief of NIS a few years ago. The senior army officers resent this kind of behavior on the part of their "colleagues" in actually running the country, because the acts of the NIS tend to undermine the existing hierarchy.

In view of the sharpening contradictions between the NIS and the armed forces, a highly delicate situation has now taken shape in the government circles. In the past, the in-fighting within the regime was kept under wraps, but now it has come out into the open. The results of the elections, which have already divided the government, were an especially painful blow at the NIS's dubious prestige, and put on the agenda the public demand for a reorganization of the "service" and a curb on its functions. Brazilians have just as resolutely rejected the notorious "State Security Act," which curbed the freedom of the press and was used by the dictatorship to manipulate public opinion. Reflecting the disagreements within the government, Minister of Justice Abi-Ackel declared that the Act had been "designed to cover up abuses," and branded it as "draconian."⁴

But for all the successes of the anti-dictatorship and left-wing forces in Brazil, the communists do not overestimate the achievements. Positive development will naturally have an influence on the political conditions and measures to be taken by the ruling élite, in the light

of the will expressed by the people. The main change is that the present regime, while still retaining power, will no longer be able to impose on the people its solutions of the country's key political problems and will have to sit down to the conference table with the opposition. The results of the negotiations will largely depend on the mass struggle, the mobilization of the democratic forces, and the level of their cohesion and unity. If the opposition fails to achieve success along this way, there is a danger of sliding down to conciliation, to an outcome of the dialogue with the government that would effectively harm the interests of the people and democracy.

What then has the present legal opposition in the country at its disposal? The Brazilian Democratic Movement Party (BDMP), the most numerous opposition party, is the most important political force: it has an impressive number of votes in the Chamber of Deputies of the National Congress, the Senate, the local legislative assemblies, and thousands of municipalities. It is represented by about one-half of the mayors and state governors, including those from the economically most developed states. Some of the BDMP's slogans meet the interests of broad masses of people. It wants the convocation of a National Constituent Assembly, direct elections for the Presidency, and improvement of the working people's living conditions; it supports an agrarian reform (even if it does not have a clearcut stand on this matter), comes out in defense of peace and so on.

The BDMP says that its most general task is Brazil's political reconstruction with the free activity of all trends and parties. Let us note that it is not merely the most important but also the most checkered party grouping, and leads an opposition which includes the broadest forces, ranging from the communists to discontented former leaders of the ruling regime.

The successes of the PDT are largely due to the personal qualities and prestige of its founder, L. Brizola. Once a socialist, he was one of the first victims of the 1964 military coup, was subjected to persecution and deported from the country, and spent many years in exile. In the November elections, he was elected Governor of Rio de Janeiro, one of Brazil's most important states, running well ahead of the candidates of the two main and most numerous parties, the SDP and the BDMP. His relatively small party succeeded in seating 23 deputies in the country's legislature. In view of the ethnic make-up of the Brazilian population and the mass discontent with the present economic model, Brizola has declared that he advocates a "dusky

socialism"; but when the news came of his assumption of the gubernatorial post, it turned out that he was supported by the right-wing groupings of international social democracy. He is closely allied with the German social democrats, the Portuguese socialists, and the North American liberals. Brizola is undoubtedly a man with a political perspective extending all the way to a possible nomination for the Presidency.

The BTP is now a small grouping with 13 deputies in the federal parliament. I. Vargas, representing the relatively young generation and one of the few women on the Brazilian political scene, is party chairman, while its most popular leader is J. Quadros, a former President of the Republic. The BTP and its leadership mainly represent the interests of right-wing social democracy (in the context of the changing realities and Brazilian specifics, which differ from Europe's). Of all the opposition forces, this party is most inclined to compromise with the ruling regime.⁵

In contrast to the BTP, the WPP has a left social democratic orientation. It was set up in the course of the mass strike movement in 1979 and 1980 by Lula da Silva, its present leader and until recently head of the biggest steelworkers' union of Sao Paulo. Apart from skilled workers, the WPP includes members of the radical circles of the Catholic Church, Trotskyites, etc. Lula's emergence in "big-time politics" weakened his ties with the trade union masses. This capable newcomer from the midst of the working class is under considerable influence of the intellectuals surrounding him. We, communists, believe that the WPP represents a political trend which could very well develop further in Brazil: eight of the party's candidates were elected to the federal parliament, while its leader won more than 1 million votes when running for the post of Sao Paulo Governor.

The "minor" parties of the legal opposition — PDT, BTP and WPP — are on the whole oriented toward the social democratic ideology and seek mutual contacts which do not rule out unification. The fact is that, according to the electoral law imposed by the regime, parties seeking nominations for gubernatorial posts in the forthcoming 1986 elections need to have 3 per cent of the poll nation-wide, or 5 per cent in 9 states. The recent elections showed that none of these parties is as yet capable of gathering that many votes on its own.

For all that, the opposition in Brazil should not be reduced to the above-listed political parties. We also have groupings of left-wing forces, which have yet to attain party status organizationally. But even more important are the non-

party mass organizations and movements variously opposing the authoritarian forms of government.

These are above all the trade unions, a school for the political maturity of the working class, and the initiators of the powerful strikes in the leading industries which have rocked Brazil since the late 1970s. Millions of working people are involved in these strikes.⁶ With the regime in a state of general crisis, the strike struggle brings pressure to bear on its most painful spot, the economy.

The Catholic Church, with an important role in the struggle for democratic freedoms, defense of human rights and some of the urgent demands of the masses, has an important influence on the country's political life. Let us note that the Catholic Church is not united. Within it there is a right-wing, conservative trend, which is in a minority; the "reconciliators"; and a left-wing, progressive trend. The religious communities are engaged in important work helping the underprivileged and other working people in coping with many everyday problems. As far as possible, we seek to take part in this work.

There are also urban neighborhood associations (in which members of the middle classes have a leading part), and similar organizations of those who live in the *favelas*.⁷ A drive is now under way to unite on a national scale these organizations, which have emerged on the working people's initiative in the atmosphere of social tension. There is a mobilization of the masses which is bound to grow as the economic crisis in Brazil becomes more acute and extremely grave.⁸

The mass movements which have been gathering momentum over the past few years, like the movement in defense of peace, in defense of the environment, for the equality of women, movements which are ever more resolutely involved in social life, exerting a growing influence on political decision-making, have a noteworthy role in the struggle to democratize Brazilian society. Many in Brazil are coming to realize that successes in the revolutionary process will ultimately also depend on the struggle for peace.

Other democratic institutions, including those connected with the traditional Brazilian establishment, are also having an influence on the process of political liberalization. Among them are the Brazilian Press Association, the Brazilian Bar Association and its branches in Rio-de-Janeiro, Sao Paulo and other states, the Engineering Club, the Brazilian Defense of Science Association, student organizations and many others.

In the light of the situation taking shape in the country, tremendous importance is attached to the legalization of the Brazilian Communist Party, an organic element of the democratic opposition. For more than 60 years now, the communists have acted as an important factor in Brazilian reality; the BCP has deep roots in the country's political, social and cultural life, despite the fact that the number of years the party has enjoyed legal status could be counted on the fingers of one hand. "No ideological campaigns or police repression can remove the communists from Brazilian life. This makes the question of the communists the core of the democratic alternative for Brazil; a truly democratic order in Brazil is inconceivable without legislative recognition of their right to political and party organization, without legal and social guarantees of their right to form a political party on the basis of equality and equal responsibility with all the other parties,"⁹ says one of the latest BCP documents analyzing the country's economic, political and social problems. We are convinced that Brazilians cannot feel themselves to be full-fledged citizens without a recognition of full civil rights for the communists.

Our struggle to make our party legal does not spring from short-lived considerations and has a number of specific features. The communists will not be satisfied with a mere entry of the BCP on the electoral rolls by an order of the court. We want the authorities to take a decision that would meet the aspirations and demands of, at least, a sizable part of public opinion. Nor do we want a piece of legalization resulting from negotiations with the President of the Republic and other representatives of the authorities. Everything is being done to make the open emergence in the national arena of the Communist Party, an important political force in the country, one of the victories in the general struggle for democracy, which we regard as our strategic goal. In seeking the BCP's recognition in law, the communists do not pin too many hopes on the ruling regime's "good will," and try, as far as possible, to turn the struggle for legalizing the party into a nation-wide struggle for abolishing the "State Security Act," the convocation of a National Constituent Assembly freely elected by the people, and the framing of a democratic constitution reflecting the interests of the popular masses and of the nation as a whole. In short, the problem of the legality of the communists' party organization is inseparable from the question of democracy as a whole.

The national campaign for the BCP's registration was started in Brasilia, the capital, last

May, and has already yielded tangible results. Within just over two months, the leaders of nearly all the opposition parties and even some of the governmental SDP, to say nothing of the numerous federal deputies and senators, have announced their support for our legalization. We have received similarly active support from the governors of several states. Let us note that even representatives of the social forces which are ideologically alien to socialism, for instance, some hierarchs of the Catholic Church have come out in favor of legalizing the Communist Party.

But the main thing is that millions of working people, whose interests the BCP has always defended and will continue to defend, want to see it as a legal political force. Voicing the Brazilian people's will, our party advocates the establishment of the broadest democracy — a necessary condition for successful struggle against imperialism and internal reaction — which creates, alongside the other important aspects of our activity, the possibility of transition to revolutionary transformations without the use of armed force (although quite naturally "the choice of the means to liberate the country and transform the Brazilian society does not only depend on the proletariat and its allies, and . . . this makes it imperative for them to master all the forms of struggle"¹⁰).

Together with Brazil's other democratic forces, the BCP has proposed the elaboration of a common program aimed to develop democracy and improve living conditions. This is all the more necessary in view of the aggravating economic crisis, which calls for urgent decisions. Such a program should reflect the political, economic and social demands already formulated in the course of the nation-wide struggle for democratizing Brazilian society. It should be written with the broad participation of representatives of the Brazilian people's every stratum and movement, taking into account the issues which have already become a matter of national consensus.

Among these main problems are: *in the administrative and political sphere* — direct elections at every level and re-establishment of the prerogatives of the legislature and judiciary; recognition of freedom of organization for all the trends of thought and action, including the communists; abolition of all the undemocratic laws and provisions, and an end to the policy of persecuting democrats, together with the liquidation of the institutions of repression. *In the sphere of labor relations* — democratization of labor legislation and guarantees for an autonomous and independent trade union organization free from state tutelage and fully

exercising its right to strike; the pursuit of an employment policy favoring the working people and guaranteeing the preservation of jobs, with a fair distribution of incomes and wages. *In the sphere of finance* — measures to combat inflation, a complete review of the country's foreign debt commitments, and the pursuit of a financial and economic policy aimed to eliminate the privileges of the monopolies, the banks, the transnational corporations and the latifundia in order to strengthen the internal market. *In agriculture* — implementation of the positive articles of the existing land legislation and the realization of an agrarian reform giving land to those who want to work it, at the expense of the latifundia with idle farmlands or extensively-farmed lands. *In local self-administration* — the re-establishment of the autonomy of the municipalities, coupled with a tax reform guaranteeing the states and the municipalities the performance of their duties; an immediate end to interference by the federal authorities in the affairs of municipalities designated as "national security areas."¹¹ *In the sphere of foreign relations* — a policy of non-alignment and defense of the national interest, support for the cause of peace and a new international economic order, a policy of respect for the right of nations to self-determination, and the extension of all-round ties with all the countries of the world.

The realization of the proposed program will help our society to advance in a direction favorable for socialism, to root out the traditions of authoritarianism, élitism and exclusiveness which are characteristic of the ruling regime, and to involve millions of working people in the revolutionary process. The struggle for a democratic state is the assurance of leadership of the working class and its close alliance with the other exploited classes and strata. The main obstacle now standing in this way is jointly made up of imperialism (U.S. imperialism in the first place), the monopolies and the latifundia, which are organically linked with the moribund dictatorship. "The destruction of the reactionary alliance," says our party, "requires that the Brazilian people gain political power and carry out radical transformations in the country's economic, social and political system, transformations of an anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly and anti-latifundist character capable of removing the historical obstacles to the country's transition to socialism, social progress and real democracy."¹² Working people's Brazil is taking important steps to meet the future. This process is irreversible!

1. For details see "The Time has Come for Democra-

tization" by G. Dias in WMR, No. 11, 1981. — Ed.

2. 1967 data: see PCB Vinte anos de politica 1958-1979 (documentos), Sao Paulo, 1980; 1981 data: see Teses para um Debate Nacional de Comunistas pela Legalidade do Partido Comunista Brasileiro, *Voz da unidade*, May 8, 1981, Suplemento especial, p. 13.

3. The SDP should not be confused with the parties of the social-democratic orientation affiliated with the Socialist International. The SDP is a party of the Brazilian landed oligarchy and big capital. — Ed.

4. *Voz da unidade*, June 23-29, 1983.

5. On June 12, 1983, the BTP approved an agreement with the SDP in an effort to wring a number of concessions from the government, including one ministerial post. In

return, the government got a stable majority in the Chamber of Deputies. This deal was deplored by the other opposition parties. — Ed.

6. For details see "Brazilian Trade Unions on the Rise" by A.V. do Nascimento in WMR No. 8, 1983. — Ed.

7. Slums in large Brazilian cities. — Ed.

8. A.V. do Nascimento, op. cit.

9. *Voz da unidade (especial)*, March 30, 1983.

10. Ibid.

11. Municipalities and some other parts of the country where growing action against the repressive forms of government gives the central government the pretext to apply "emergency" measures. — Ed.

12. *Voz da unidade (especial)*, March 30, 1983.

Euromissile shadow over the globe. Not yet too late to ward off the threat!

Stratis Korakas

CP Greece representative on WMR

Editorial Council

COMMENTARY

Pondering the possible impact of technological progress on humankind's destinies, Lenin warned that the use of scientific achievements for military purposes would "involve a complete rupture with the latest achievements of civilization ..." War in such conditions, he wrote, "might ... in fact, it inevitably would, undermine the very foundations of human society."¹

Lenin's warning has an especially meaningful ring in these troubled days. The hands of the imaginary clock ticking away the time before a possible thermonuclear catastrophe threaten to move even a few points closer to the fatal hour of twelve. In a fit of black humor, the owner of a New York travel agency has already urged his customers: "Tour Europe — While It's Still There!"

Where does one look for the causes of the present dangers? Replying to this question, the 11th congress of the Communist Party of Greece stressed that because of the "policy of imperialism, world peace is now facing a greater danger than ever before since the end of the Second World War and humankind is threatened with thermonuclear annihilation."²

The limitations of the capitalist system in the final third of the 20th century, and the dwindling effectiveness of the old, classical methods by means of which it is trying to retain its positions in the world impel the most reckless imperialist leaders to take the adventurist policy-or-strength way, and even to go to extremes in conducting it. From the proclamation of

their line of attaining military superiority designed to prepare a "first strike," they have now gone on to an accelerated build-up of the material basis for realizing this strategy.

The events of the past several months show that statement to be well justified — and it is shared by the other fraternal parties, by the progressive forces, and realistically-minded leaders over a wide political spectrum. There is the gravest concern over the ever-increasing number of imperialist acts in the Middle East, in Central America, in the South of Africa, in Asia, and in other regions of the world, acts designed to bring about the most dangerous destabilization of the system of relations between states and prepare another world war. The main threat to international security is now posed by the Reagan administration's stubborn strivings to upset the existing military-strategic parity between the United States and the USSR by deploying medium-range missiles in Europe.

Although the Soviet-American talks at Geneva are still under way, work on the construction of missile launching ramps has already been started and is being feverishly carried on in Britain, the FRG, Italy, Belgium and Holland. The advocates of the strength policy and the *fait accompli* tactics would like to create a situation in which they would merely have to report to the NATO Council's forthcoming session in December on the fulfillment of the order issued by Washington four years ago.

While in no sense being adherents of "Eurocentrism," which tends to underestimate

developments in the rest of the world, we cannot but realize that the destinies of the world are now largely being determined precisely by developments on our continent. CPG CC General Secretary Charilaos Florakis says: "Europe undoubtedly remains the most critical place where the forces in confrontation are positioned in the modern world, and the crucial field of battle for peace. With the deployment of Cruise and Pershing-2 missiles in Europe it will, according to U.S. strategic plans, become the most likely theater of military operations."³

Much has already been written on the pages of this journal about the purposes of the deployment of new U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe and about the dangers it will pose.⁴ However, let us summarize most briefly the main aspects of the problem.

First, Euromissiles, along with other U.S. first-strike weapons, are designed to upset in favor of the United States and NATO the rough military-strategic parity which has on the whole taken shape. Regardless of how they are designated — tactical, intermediate, or medium-range — they are designed, according to the Pentagon, to ensure realization of the U.S. strategy formulated in 1982 of "decapitating" the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

Consequently, Euromissiles would pose a mortal threat to the member-states of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, and this would force the Soviet Union to respond to it. To respond in such a way, the Soviet leaders declare, that a sense of self-preservation would prevail over the potential aggressor's intention of starting the aggression against the USSR. Having emphasized that success at the Geneva talks on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe is still possible, if the United States displays an interest in reaching an honest understanding on an equitable basis, CPSU CC General Secretary, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Yuri Andropov warned in a conversation with a group of U.S. Senators that a refusal to do so would have far-reaching consequences that would inevitably affect the United States as well. Americans, he said, will also feel the difference between the situation which existed before the development of Euromissiles, and after it.⁵

Objectively-minded people will understand that such a resolute attitude on the Soviet Union's part is not predetermined by considerations of some "great-power prestige." The USSR does not at all refuse to have a mutually acceptable compromise, but in the conditions that have taken shape, the Soviet government, concerned with the defense of the

vital interests of the Soviet people, of the peoples of the other socialist community countries, and of all the peoples of the world is simply left no other choice. So, the military equilibrium upset through NATO's fault will be re-established, but — most regrettably — at a much higher level.

Second, Euromissiles would also pose a threat to states outside the socialist system. The prominent Egyptian political leader Haled Mohy el-Din has drawn attention to the fact that the missiles which are to be deployed in Sicily are capable of striking at North Africa and the Middle East. The Austrian newspaper *Volksstimme* has made public a secret plan called "Northag Defence Plan 69," from which it follows that U.S. nuclear missiles and planes with nuclear bombs on board are targeted not only on the territory of the Warsaw Treaty countries, but also on West Germany and a number of "friendly and neutral states," including Austria.⁶

Third, despite the assurances that medium-range missiles make it possible to "limit" a nuclear war, once launched, they would, in actual fact, inevitably trigger off a wholesale explosion. That is the view held by well-informed persons, the former senior officers from several NATO countries who have joined in the Generals for Peace group. The International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War say with bitter irony that such a clash would be the last epidemic in the history of humankind. Hiroshima's tragic fate would become the lot of the whole globe.

Fourth, Western Europe's over-saturation with missile weapons will sharply increase the possibility of an outbreak of war through miscalculation or technical fault. Nor is that a hypothetical situation at all: such errors have repeatedly occurred in U.S. systems over the past few years. Their probability is now bound to increase because, as Deputy U.S. Secretary of the Army James R. Ambrose has admitted, Pershing-2 missiles will be put into service even if 20 per cent of their launchings went out of control.⁷

Fifth, the development of Euromissiles is bound to have a negative effect on the whole international political situation. In this context, Chairman of the SDPG group in the Bundestag Hans-Jochen Vogel voiced the very reasonable view that it would be an illusion to expect the deployment of missiles on the territory of the FRG to make no difference to its relations with the USSR and the GDR.

Economic and cultural ties, which have a beneficial effect on the overall political climate would be the first to suffer. Such a turn of

events would have a painful effect on employment in the leading West European states, which have major contracts with the socialist countries, and would harm the interests of the working people.

By intensifying pressure on the socialist community in Europe, the imperialist circles also expect to reduce its potentialities in supporting the struggle for national liberation and social emancipation. They would like to have a free hand in the local conflicts they have been starting in various parts of the world.

Sixth, by agreeing to the deployment of Euromissiles, the governments concerned have struck yet another blow at the state sovereignty of their own countries. After all, these weapons will not be controlled by the national authorities, but by the U.S. command. This will turn the said states into hostages of Washington's imperial policy.

It is undoubtedly an illusion to assume that the deployment of U.S. missiles will "soften up" the Soviet Union at the Geneva talks and help to reach an earlier agreement on medium-range nuclear weapons. Such acts can merely undermine the basis of the negotiations.

However, it would be fundamentally wrong to assume that the extremely dangerous situation, which has now taken shape, and which has, in addition, a tendency to be further sharpened, has become irreversible, and a nuclear conflict — fatally inevitable. "The forces of peace are mightier than the forces of war. Everything depends on their cohesion and purposefulness of action,"⁸ said the Warsaw Treaty states at a conference of their Political Consultative Committee last January.⁹

The steady growth of the economic might and defense capability of the Soviet Union and of the socialist community as a whole is the key prerequisite for averting a thermonuclear conflict. This process is having a multifaceted influence on the international situation. The military-strategic equilibrium which has emerged as a result of that process helps to stabilize the situation, compelling the potential aggressor to ponder the prospect of a lamentable outcome of his military gambles. This lays the basis for the start of a vigorous diplomatic offensive aimed to halt the arms race and bring about a settlement of disputed issues by peaceful means. Finally, potentialities are created for rendering active political and material support to national liberation movements, whose activity is objectively anti-imperialist, and is, for that reason, directed against war.

In their foreign-policy activity, the socialist countries take a dialectical approach to the

solution of urgent problems. As any fair-minded person will see, this is a blend of firmness on matters of principle, and a readiness to seek mutually acceptable solutions.

This has been amply demonstrated by the Soviet stand at the talks on medium-range missiles in Europe. Back in October 1979, the USSR expressed its readiness to reduce the number of medium-range weapons, if the West renounced the deployment of new nuclear missiles in Europe. Two years later, it adopted a unilateral moratorium on the further deployment of Soviet medium-range nuclear weapons in the European part of the country. In a similarly unilateral manner, it announced its intention to reduce a part of these weapons, and got down to doing so. The USSR put forward a proposal envisaging the establishment of a vast European zone, stretching from the Arctic Ocean to Africa, and from the mid-Atlantic to the Urals, a zone in which nuclear weapons would be reduced and limited. With the realization of such an agreement, the USSR and NATO would have no more than 300 units of medium-range weapons each with an equal number of warheads on these. All such weapons — both missiles and aircraft — would, of course, be subject to reduction. Similar missiles and aircraft belonging to Great Britain and France should naturally be counted in the above-mentioned total level.¹⁰

At the end of August, the USSR declared its readiness to take yet another major step facilitating agreement. In the event a mutually acceptable agreement were reached, including U.S. renunciation of new missile deployment in Europe, the Soviet Union, when reducing its medium-range missiles in the European part of the country down to the level equal to the number of missiles belonging to Great Britain and France, would liquidate all the missiles being reduced. That leaves no ground for the NATO assertions that the USSR is not seeking a reduction but merely a relocation of its SS-20 missiles from Europe to the East.

Socialist diplomacy is marked by an urge to secure success on a broad front in the struggle for peace by considering all the international problems in their interdependence. Such an approach is also displayed when it comes to averting an arms race in new spheres. That is precisely the concern permeating the new Soviet proposal to enter on the agenda of the 38th session of the UN General Assembly the question "On Concluding a Treaty on the Prohibition of the Use of Force in Outer Space and from Outer Space with Respect to the Earth." Here the Soviet Union is guided by a desire to erect a reliable barrier to the plans of

the militaristic forces threatening to turn outer space into a source of mortal danger for the whole of humankind.

Important steps taken unilaterally with the aim of facilitating the reaching of relevant agreements are yet another characteristic feature of socialist foreign policy. The peace-loving public highly appreciate the Soviet Union's unilateral repudiation (1982) of the first use of nuclear weapons. There was also a similar response to Yuri Andropov's announcement (August 1983) that the USSR has declared a unilateral moratorium on putting into outer space any types of anti-satellite weapons for the duration of the whole period in which other states, including the United States, refrain from such launchings.

The national liberation movements and the developing countries are making an ever greater contribution to the defense of peace. Evidence of the growing anti-war, anti-imperialist trend in their positions in the international arena was provided by the recent non-aligned summit in Delhi.¹¹

The anti-war movement, which is gaining strength and breadth, and which has now spread across the globe, is of tremendous importance for the defense of peace. Most of it has now concentrated efforts precisely on the struggle against the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Europe and wants a positive completion of the Geneva talks.

Unprecedented massiveness and involvement of various class and social strata are a specific feature of the contemporary peace movement. The peoples of the socialist countries unconditionally support their governments' peaceable policy. The peace movement has become a movement of the majority in a number of capitalist states (thus, in the summer of this year, according to a public opinion poll, 92 per cent of the Greeks wanted a policy of peace, while 75 per cent of the FRG population is opposing the deployment of Pershing-2s).

The working class has ever more explicitly tied in the goals of its struggle with the defense of peace. The interconnection between the policy of détente, the development of many-sided mutually advantageous cooperation between states with different social systems, on the one hand, and improvement of the working people's condition in the capitalist countries and the successes of the national liberation struggle, on the other, is being ever more clearly comprehended.

The ruling circles of the imperialist powers are finding it ever harder to ignore the peoples' urge for peace. That is precisely why they have made fresh efforts to disorganize and split the

anti-war movement, and to provide U.S. missiles with "doves of peace" make-up. When such tricks fail, the militaristic forces stoop to the use of economic, political and direct physical pressure against the people involved.

In preparation for this "hot autumn," the Bonn government had produced, on Washington's insistence, a draft law under which any demonstrator may be put on trial in the event of any outburst of "violence," which is usually provoked by the authorities themselves. But, as even the *International Herald Tribune* has noted, this conflicts with the fundamental legal principle of the presumption of innocence.¹² Drugs have already been stocked in West German prisons to exert a psychological influence on arrested peace fighters. In Britain, not only additional police units, but army units have also been moved up to the approaches to military bases where U.S. missiles are to be sited. In the United States, those who want peace face the threat of imprisonment.

Ideological weapons are widely used against the anti-war movement. One of the most poisonous ideas that is being persistently injected into the minds of those taking part in peace action is the theory of "equal responsibility," according to which NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization are allegedly equally responsible for the tense international situation and, for that reason, the peace movement should "direct fire against both."

Furthermore, militaristic propaganda seeks to implant in the mass consciousness the idea that nuclear war is "acceptable" and argues that such a conflict can be won. It has tried to justify the need to deploy U.S. missiles on the plea of a "Soviet threat." The Warsaw Treaty Organization's proposals aimed to halt the arms race, to reduce armaments and to eliminate the danger of war are either being ignored or distorted.

While this psychological influence does now and again work, it has failed to attain the desired goal. Thus, in our country some political forces which allowed themselves to be duped by the conceptions of the "superpowers' equal responsibility," "equidistance," etc., left the united movement in defense of peace in 1981 and began to take separate action. But their slogans have not attracted the masses. On the contrary, there are more and more people rejecting the anti-Soviet and anti-communist slanders, joining in the struggle against the imperialists' plans in Europe, and demanding the removal of U.S.-NATO bases and nuclear weapons from Greece, and the country's withdrawal from NATO.

When considering the immediate and more

distant prospects for the development of the international situation, one cannot discount the *disagreements within the ruling circles of the imperialist powers*. Prominent bourgeois politicians and, now and again, even the governments of some countries, both within and without NATO, have demanded efforts to reach an agreement at the Geneva talks or, at least, a postponement of the U.S. missile deployment in Europe. They still look to continued détente and cooperation with the socialist states.

In May of this year, the Danish Parliament passed a resolution proposing that implementation of NATO's missile decision should be postponed. In August, Prime Minister of Greece Andreas Papandreou demanded that the deployment of U.S. missiles should be deferred for six months to enable the Geneva talks to be continued with the aim of reaching an agreement. In the Bundestag, the Greens have issued warnings of the disastrous consequences of deploying Pershing-2 missiles on the territory of the FRG. An anti-missile mood has crystallized within the ranks of the West German Social Democrats, including the leadership. Great Britain's Labour Party has taken a negative attitude to U.S. Cruise missiles.

It is indicative that doubts about the acceptability of the Reagan administration's present line have also seeped into the upper ruling strata of the United States itself. They have been expressed by prominent spokesmen for the country's economic, political and military circles. In the U.S. Congress, there is a growing number of those who advocate a freeze on nuclear weapons and reduction of military appropriations.

Consequently, in the capitalist world realistic attitudes reckoning with the state of affairs in the international arena are in the making. One confirmation of this is the understanding reached on the constructive completion of the Madrid meeting of the states parties to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The further steps that have been agreed (above all, the decision to hold a conference in early 1984) on measures to strengthen confidence and security and on disarmament in Europe, show that the processes predetermined by the necessity of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems are ever more pronounced.

On our continent, a material basis for détente, which has already withstood many an assault from across the ocean, has been created by the invigoration of inter-state ties, and by the long-term treaties and agreements, including eco-

nomic programs stretching into the next century. No matter how acute the present situation may be, Europe now has a political atmosphere in which the "cold war" winds have not fully prevailed.

So, our analysis suggests that in the early 1980s, something like a unique situation for the nuclear age has taken shape in the world. It is unique in the intensity of the imperialist circles' urge to try to change the course of the historical process by means of force, and even to risk war for the attainment of their main goal: to push back world socialism, and to regain their lost positions. It is also unique in the light of the extent of unity of the forces acting against the imperialist plans, in the scope of the anti-war movement, and in the consistency and purposefulness with which it has resisted the imperialist plans.

Being aware of the extreme gravity of the situation, the communists are more than ever before induced to analyze even more thoroughly the very substance of their activity both on the domestic front and in the international arena. It is the conviction of the Communist Party of Greece that in our day the prevention of a nuclear war that could wipe out life on the Earth is the prerequisite for solving any social, economic and other problems. But while setting the cohesion of the broadest social forces in the struggle for peace over and above class, political, philosophical and other distinctions, and calling for their unification on that basis, we do not at all abandon our historical goal of ending the system of oppression. We believe, moreover, that every success along this road helps to strengthen the front of peace.

The insistence on a just and democratic international policy has always been a "part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes."¹³ But in the present conditions, the role of external factors for revolutionary, class action has been sharply enhanced by the internationalization of social life. Hence the special attention being given by the communists to the development of the anti-war movement.

As the communist parties of a number of NATO countries said in their statement, the communists of countries whose governments adopted the 1979 nuclear decision have a special responsibility in the struggle for peace. Their document, signed by our party together with the communist parties of Denmark, Luxembourg, the FRG, Norway, Turkey, Canada and the United States, calls for even more vigorous action against the deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe, a freeze on nuclear weapons, the establishment of nuclear-free

zones, and further measures on disarmament. We believe that the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries pave the way for just solutions of these problems.

Concerning the stand of the CP Greece, CC General Secretary Charilaos Florakis emphasized in the report to the party's 11th congress: "The CPG believes that in the present international conditions, which are critical for a peaceful future, it is especially useful to display a common will and strive for joint action by communist and workers' parties in the struggle to solve the great problems facing humankind: disarmament, peace, a new international economic order, and solidarity with the peoples fighting for democracy and national liberation. The CPG holds that this can be achieved by means of well-considered bilateral and multilateral measures taken at the right moment, including the convocation of an international meeting of communist and workers' parties."¹⁴

On the main questions of the movement for peace and its anti-imperialist substance, the stands of the fraternal parties are identical or similar. But the main thing is that the urge for the cohesion of the international communist movement in rebuffing imperialism in order to save our civilization is becoming the prevalent line in their policy. All of this suggests that the communists' role in the on-going struggle of the peace forces can and must grow.

The closing months of 1983 are a responsible period. It is still not too late to force the initiators of Europe's nuclear re-armament to heed the peoples' will as expressed in the motto of the Prague World Assembly "For Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War" and to halt the slide to the fatal brink. The crucial step in doing so in the present conditions would be frustration of NATO's missile plans and the creation of political conditions in which the governments allied with Washington would be unable to implement them.

The struggle against turning Europe into a U.S. nuclear testing ground is gaining in depth and breadth. It is assuming new forms to meet the specific conditions taking shape in each country.

In the FRG, wide-ranging extra-parliamentary and democratic action is gathering momentum: anti-missile strikes, and action in front of military installations where Pershing-2 missiles are to be sited. Initiatives are multiplying to turn streets, cities, schools and enterprises into nuclear-free zones.

Tens of thousands of Greeks held hands to form a "ring of peace" around the ancient

Acropolis. They declared: "What has been preserved for two and a half millenia must not be destroyed in a second of madness."

People all over the world have now heard about the events around the "peace camps" at Greenham Common, in Great Britain, and at Comiso, in Italy. The fearless resistance which their inhabitants have put up to the authorities just where the U.S. missiles are to be sited is a catalyst of action by the peace forces in other countries as well.

In the Netherlands, a decision has been taken to set up a Peace Monument at the Wunsdrecht air base, which the government has chosen as the site for Cruise missiles. Mass rallies and demonstrations are to be staged at the spot.

Peace March-83 was held on the initiative of the Belgian, Dutch and West German Women for Peace groups. It was one of the numerous marches against the threat of war being held on the territory of many countries in every continent.

Almost 400,000 Americans from nearly 400 cities throughout the country, representing more than 700 mass organizations, staged a march on Washington. On behalf of millions of their fellow-citizens, they demanded of the administration peace, jobs and freedom.

"Talks, Not Missiles!" is a demand that is gathering momentum throughout the world with the approach of the deadline set by Washington to start the deployment of the new missiles. This demand is being supported not only by public bodies but, as has been said, also by the official circles of some countries. The goal is to prevent the NATO bosses from squeezing such a complicated and responsible discussion into a rigid time-frame which they themselves have laid down in order to torpedo it. The ever more vigorous action by anti-war movements, explaining the peaceable nature of the proposals made by the USSR and its allies, is doing much to promote the efforts aimed to ensure the success of the Geneva negotiations.

The wide use of every form of anti-war struggle, the further enlargement of the framework of the peace movement and its consolidation can create an insurmountable barrier in the way of new U.S. nuclear weapons. Whatever the imperialist forces may do, we, communists, are sure that the powerful action against the danger of war will grow. Humankind has no other reasonable alternative!

1. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 422.

2. 11th Congress of the CPG, Athens, 1983, p. 129 (in Greek).

3. 11th Congress of the CPG, p. 16.

4. See, for instance, "A Crucial Year for Europe,"

WMR, No. 9, 1983.

5. *Pravda*, August 19, 1983.

6. *Volksstimme*, July 31, 1983.

7. See *International Herald Tribune*, August 6-7, 1983.

8. *Pravda*, January 7, 1983.

9. For details see "Socialism in the Drive for Peace," WMR, No. 3, 1983.

10. The last condition has met with the greatest resistance in the imperialist camp, or to be more precise, it has been used to the utmost in thwarting any possible solutions at the talks. But every sober-minded person will agree that the British and French medium-range weapons

are capable of delivering a strike at the strategic centers of the European socialist countries. Besides, neither Great Britain nor France have denied that their nuclear missiles constitute a part of the common Western "system of deterrence." Finally, both powers have repeatedly declared their support for NATO's "two-track" decision.

11. For details see "Non-Alignment: Trends and Orientations" by Sarada Mitra and Rustem Sevortyan in this issue.

12. See *International Herald Tribune*, July 26, 1983.

13. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 18.

14. 11th Congress of the CPG, p. 16.



Through unity to change

Jorgen Jensen

Chairman, Communist Party of Denmark

The 27th congress of the Communist Party of Denmark, which met last spring marked a new stage in the activity of Denmark's communists. It consolidated party unity. The unanimous approval of the report, manifesto, action program and working resolution strengthened the pillars of the party on the basis of the ideas and experience of Marxism-Leninism. This was largely a result of the pre-congress discussion in party branches, district organizations and the party press and at extraordinary conferences.

The congress was attended by 453 voting delegates, including 126 women. Women's share in the party membership is bigger and stands at 40.1 per cent. As for the social composition of the party, workers add up to 35 per cent and teachers (the second largest group), to 19 per cent. The members' average age is 42 years and that of the congress delegates was 37.

Present at the congress were 150 guests and 27 delegations from the parties of other countries.

The items on the agenda were discussed very frankly and critically. Many speakers stressed the need to increase communist influence on parliament and put an end to passivity among the working class. The debate was also indicative of the problems posed by the activity of an anti-party group which throughout the last year preceding the congress had been trying to foment discord in the party. But despite the allegations of the bourgeois press and our political opponents, who misrepresented our party

life and inner-party democracy with reference to criticism on the part of the group, the debate was fruitful and led to the adoption of a clear, explicit position in the spirit of unity.

However, it was pointed out that delegates' speeches and the congress decisions alone cannot bring about unity and political clarity. They certainly create a dependable basis for work but we need everyday political and organizing effort and meaningful leadership if the party is to develop.

The debate revealed that the following problems require our immediate attention:

— Trends toward political instability, personal struggles or minimizing the role of the party leadership.

— Underestimation of the activity and possibilities of the party as well as of the results achieved by it or unwillingness to assume responsibility. Some say they agree with the party program but when no major gains are made they refuse to take any share of the responsibility, affirming that it is the leadership's fault.

— Inadequate appreciation of the importance of trade union work and the decisive role of the working class in political struggle.

— Manifestations of anti-socialism. There are those who do not realize that the development of socialism in countries where the people are in power is a revolutionary process in which some tasks result from others and failures are not necessarily a consequence of mistakes that could have been foreseen and

avoided. The pressure of the class enemy must not be underestimated.

The main political issues put on the agenda and reflected in the congress decisions were the defense of peace, trade union activity, the struggle for unity, and the situation and role of the party.

Assessing the international situation, the congress described it as dangerous and stressed that the threat of war is real. Imperialism, primarily U.S. imperialism as the Reagan administration's policy indicates, is out to gain absolute military superiority so as to use it afterwards. It is precisely imperialism — a system based on the exploitation of peoples — that is responsible for the frantic arms race. And it is imperialism's leading centers that engineer provocations against world peace. Using the stick and the carrot, the imperialists are trying to make peoples accept the burden of armaments and are undermining détente in violation of the spirit and letter of the Helsinki agreements.

The world is divided into two camps. This division is a result of social changes and the peoples' liberation struggle. It is due to class factors, not to geographical, racial or ethnic ones. This is why the ideological struggle is so bitter, so uncompromising and comprehensive. It centers on the issue of war and peace, social system, human rights, freedom and democracy. The bosses of capitalist society, including those in Denmark, use the media and other information and propaganda channels to indoctrinate the masses, to misinterpret past and current history in a way likely to help justify the exploiting system.

They present the fundamental principle of social relations as the "right" of the strongest, richest and most cynical to supremacy. As for the exploited, those living in the worst social and economic conditions, particularly the unemployed, they are blamed for their own hardships. The crisis is described as an inevitable phenomenon of external origin. Anti-socialism and anti-communism are made a permanent attribute of politics and propaganda. Socialism as a system is alleged to be "aggressive," "oppressive" and "undemocratic."

In these circumstances, the congress stressed, the role of the Communist Party and its contribution to the ideological and political contest and the struggle against war are particularly great.

What has been done in this respect? Communists took part in the formation of peace committees. The groundwork was laid for vigorous action against the deployment of new

U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe. We defeated attempts to form a peace movement without communists. The main thing for us is not to win recognition or influence in the movement but to help it attain the proportions and strength needed to gain the upper hand over the forces of war.

The congress noted, however, that our contribution to the public debate on the causes of the arms race and the mounting war menace is still inadequate. We did not expose imperialism sufficiently as the force responsible for international tensions, the escalation of war preparations and numerous encroachments on peace.

The overwhelming majority of Danes dread war and emphatically condemn the arms race. But among the peace supporters there are both people who realize imperialism's responsibility for growing international tensions and people who put the blame on the socialist countries or consider that the Soviet Union and the United States are equally responsible. The defense of peace necessitates unity among all its supporters to resist the war forces and this, in turn, calls for the exposure of the schemes of those who are really responsible for the worsening of the international situation.

Obviously, to equate the policy of the socialist countries and that of the imperialist powers by blaming both groups for the growing war menace is to clash with incontrovertible facts and take a stand imperilling peace. What is deteriorating the international climate and endangering the very existence of humanity is not the "struggle for influence" between the two "superpowers" or blocs but the activity of imperialism, which wants to achieve military superiority and turn back the wheel of history.

Imperialism is using its whole propaganda machinery to mislead the peace movement and breed uncertainty in its ranks. Lately it has resorted to so-called alternative conferences of peace "supporters," which it stages as part of its ideological struggle against the socialist countries. To this end it has been making false allegations about the "Soviet threat," the "military superiority" of the socialist world, the "undemocratic" goals of liberation movements, and so on.

To bring about unity of action against the war menace, there is certainly no need to wait until all wrong notions are overcome among peace supporters. The war danger is real, here and now and must be combated in common. But we cannot make any concessions on points of principle in the hope of achieving unanimity at the price of renouncing our class approach; we can neither stop laying bare the aggressive na-

ture and policy of imperialism, nor refuse to show socialism as a peace force. We will abide by a class line while at the same time working to bring about unity among the democratic and peace-loving forces and vigorous effort on their part.

The CPD joins in actions of solidarity with victims of imperialist policy, and often takes the initiative of forming solidarity committees and sponsoring actions in support of the freedom and independence of peoples. In carrying on our fight against imperialism, we declare for the rights of the people of Palestine and protest emphatically against U.S. attempts to strangle the Nicaraguan revolution.

Problems of trade union activity and the framing of an alternative economic policy for the working class are prominent in the congress decisions.

The party's economists have established through research that in this crisis period big capital has shored up its power and increased the exploitation of labor. As far as the working people are concerned, the crisis means loss of social and democratic gains and increasing unemployment, which in the case of Denmark hits one in every three wage workers. Many of the young people who have finished school in the past two years can neither find a job, nor continue their education. It is a sad reality that economic power and the real right to make decisions are in the hands of the owners of a few companies. At the same time the influence of multinationals is growing; 1,300 Danish enterprises are directly controlled by foreign capital.

The dimensions of exploitation are exemplified by the activity of IBM, which employs 1,700 people in our country. In 1982 the company made a profit totalling 304 million kroner, or 178,824 kroner per employee. Over the past years the company, having invested in Denmark and increased its earnings, has remitted 150 million kroner to its shareholders in the United States.

When all economic activity — industrial production, construction, trade — is determined by the drive for profit and investment policy is controlled by big capital, which imposes its will regarding the management of society, the Folketing and the government are virtually reduced to the role of big capital's stewards. And when the big capitalists demand — as they often do — subsidies, depreciation allowances, a slackening of regulations on environmental protection, and so forth, this means that they are directly using the state in the interest of monopoly.

Cuts in appropriations for social and cultural

purposes, "austerity" at the expense of the state and municipal budgets and stealing from the working people by raising prices and limiting wages (which collective agreements do not allow to be put up by more than four per cent) mean a direct transfer of funds to big capital. As a consequence of the reduction of social spending effected by the Schluter government,¹ a wage worker's family loses 14,000 kroner a year, which subsequently go directly or indirectly to the employers.

Private companies pay society much less in tax than they get from it in direct or indirect subsidies. In 1982 the A.P. Moller company, for one, received 748 million kroner in profits and hundreds of millions of kroner in government subsidies, yet the taxes paid by it did not exceed 80 million kroner.

When the social democrats were in power they promised that in 1983 taxes on profits from North Sea oil and gas would bring one billion kroner. But due to various subterfuges used by the companies concerned, Denmark does not get a penny from them.

On examining the domestic economic situation, the congress set important tasks before the party. One of these is to rouse the jobless to the defense of their interests and to steadfastly support those hit by the crisis, including people whom despair has reduced to passivity. It is important to win the working class and its organizations for the alternative policy proposed by the communists.

The congress drafted and unanimously approved a timely action program that constitutes a substantial contribution to the struggle of the working class. But while it is a balanced and realistic program, it will not acquire political force until large population groups, primarily the workers, make its content their own and show readiness to fight for its implementation. We will therefore have to submit the program for discussion at workplaces, in trade unions, in workers' residential neighborhoods and among youth.

At a time when the bourgeoisie is carrying on a powerful ideological offensive against the Danish working class, when a mood of hopelessness is gaining ground among the workers due to the reformists' servility to capital, and when the younger generation is showing impatience, demanding that decisive changes be effected without delay, an important task facing us is to build up the Communist Party and strengthen its correct class positions.

"As a party of the working class," the report presented to the congress says, "the CPD must formulate the demands of the class and ensure that the labor movement adheres to a class posi-

tion. We see it as a success when other parties take up and uphold our political demands under pressure from active population groups, workers and trade unions even when the parties concerned do not remember who formulated the right proposals, nor see our theory and our position determined by class interests as a prerequisite of carrying on this policy."

Numerous speakers at the congress and the relevant congress decisions stressed the need to fight for the working people's unity.

The Social Democratic Party is Denmark's biggest. Its leadership uses reformist methods and gives in to the demands of big capital, in particular by reducing social expenditures and curbing the activity of the working class. It feels constantly linked with NATO and the EEC. But discussion at the grass roots and in the trade unions brings out signs of a growing demand for change. The Social Democrats have revised their stance on the issue of the new U.S. missiles in Europe. They are against new expenditures for preparing the deployment of the missiles and have made the Folketing adopt a decision aimed at putting it off.²

Controversies are also going on in the Socialist People's Party (SPP), the second largest left party in parliament, whose branches are small and weak, however. The SPP holds 21 seats in the Folketing but has no influence on it. The party lacks a following in the working-class movement and is evidently bound to continue evolving in a reformist direction and become an appendage to the Social Democrats.

In today's conditions it is important for the communists to show initiative making it possible to unite the more active working people on class principles. Unity can only be achieved in the struggle for peace and for the interests of the masses. This process must unfold from below, on the basis of joint action, as the congress stated in its manifesto. "Radical social changes," the manifesto says, "never come of themselves. They can only be brought about through struggle."

The class domination of big capital, its power is supported by financial power, a machinery for the suppression of the masses, police and other coercive agencies, and profits by the passivity of the oppressed. Many ask: Where is the force that can cope with the power of capital? This strength lies in the people, in their craving for a better life, in their desire to remove the threat to their present and future. However, these aspirations will alter nothing as long as there is no unity. It is not enough to be dissatisfied with the existing state of affairs and to want change. There is a need for joint action on the basis of a class alliance of all whose common

interests are contrary to the interests of big capital and the warmongers.

Speaking of the conditions for achieving unity on crucial problems, we wish to stress again that the cause of unity will make no progress if the removal of differences over other issues is put forward as a precondition. It will gain, however, if differing points of view are stated clearly and outright as a basis for frank discussion in a spirit of mutual respect.

The communists disagree with the SDP, the SPP and other political parties and currents on certain fundamental issues. We reject the opinion that the task is to manage the affairs of capitalism more efficiently instead of undermining monopoly power. We do not believe that lobbying in Parliament can help solve the country's problems, nor do we think mass movements outside Christiansborg³ should be curbed. We are against minimizing the role of the working class as the most important force in the renewal of society. We recognize the decisive role of the socialist countries in the struggle for peace and social progress. Nor do we make any secret of our views.

At the same time we communists are doing our utmost to bring about unity among the working people and unity of action. Our party supports any action likely to help remove the Schluter government, combat unemployment and promote peace. This is why we call on diverse political organizations and the trade unions to discuss together joint measures to achieve these aims. The Communist Party gives primacy to what unites it with other progressive forces. The growing peace movement and joint action against the government's policies show that the desire for unity is strong in the trade unions, among youth and various sections and groups of working people. This offers new opportunities for joint action in defense of the interests of the masses.

In carrying on its activity in various public spheres, Denmark's communists are aware of their responsibility to the working class and the people as a whole. They are doing their best to link together the struggle for the working people's everyday demands and the fight for a socialist Denmark. The action program adopted by the congress and the political manifesto "The Denmark That We Want to Build" provide a sound basis on which to go on strengthening the party, build up its influence and accomplish our other tasks.

1. Government of the Conservative People's Party, Venstre Party, Center Democrats and Christian People's Party; formed in September 1982. — Ed.

2. On May 26 the Folketing passed a resolution demanding that the new U.S. intermediate nuclear missiles not be deployed in Western Europe and that preparations not be made for their deployment while the Geneva talks on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe are on.

The resolution says that in assessing the overall balance, account should be taken of the nuclear arsenals of Britain and France, and that all the arsenals of both tactical and strategic nuclear weapons should be frozen. — Ed.

3. Palace housing the Folketing. — Ed.

“There were 500,000 of us but there should be millions”

READING “L’HUMANITE”

The world will mark Disarmament Action Week — announced by the UN — from October 24 to 31. In France the event will also be a response to the appeal which 500,000 people from all over the country adopted at a big peace festival at Vincennes, the Paris forest park, last June 19. The French peace supporters made their voice heard at the World Assembly for Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War, in Prague. Late in October their voice will be heard by those who arrive at the railway stations of 10 major French cities to meet a peace train to be given the green light by the initiative of 100 noted politicians and other public figures of the country. It was they who in the summer of 1982 organized a 250,000-strong march against war from Montparnasse Station to La Place de la Bastille and who this year brought together twice as many people at Vincennes.

The background of the event is as follows:

On May 5 the French communist daily, *l’Humanité*, carried the text of the “Appeal of 100.” “There were 100 of us peace supporters to begin with,” the Appeal says. “The time has come when there should be millions. Our action is evidence of our concern but also of our hope. For peace and freedom cannot be dissociated and no conflict is inevitable... We say to young people as well: ‘Peace is your cause, it is your future.’” The Appeal gave the place and time of a national peace festival destined to become one of the greatest actions against war ever seen in France in recent years.

The Appeal brought a ready response from every part of the country and the most diverse sections of French society. Among the first to support it were the Communist Party and the General Confederation of Labor (CGT). Small wonder that the communists responded to the call, wrote Claude Lecomte editorially in *l’Humanité Dimanche* on May 6. They have never regarded war as an effective means of class struggle. Indeed, a peace climate is favorable to freedom and democracy. This is particularly true of the peoples, who would benefit

from a reduction of military expenditures by meeting their own development needs. France enjoys international prestige and many nations see people like Jean Jaures, Romain Rolland or Frederic Joliot-Curie as personifications of France. It could become a motive force in the struggle for lasting peace, as the joint communiqué adopted by the Socialist and Communist parties in May 1981 pointed out.

Meanwhile the situation in the world and Europe and on the French political scene was deteriorating. “The year 1983 will be decisive for peace,” the FCP Political Bureau declared on May 31. The statement spoke of the need to do everything to bring about agreement on a balanced reduction of armaments meeting the aspirations of all nations. After noting that France has its own “nuclear deterrent,” the Political Bureau stated that by signing the Williamsburg declaration, France has put itself in a situation in which the outcome of the Geneva talks concerns it too. The soundness of this conclusion came out all the more after the June meeting of the NATO Council in Paris, the first to be held since the withdrawal of France from the military arm of the Atlantic bloc. The final document of the meeting, which endorses Reagan’s plan for the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe, was also signed by the French representative.

The pro-Atlantic tilt of official Paris and the Socialist Party leadership added fuel to an already intense propaganda campaign which the French rightists have long been carrying on against the French peace movement.

The monstrous brainwashing campaign, wrote Jacques Denis in the May issue of *Les Cahiers du communisme*, political and theoretical journal of the CC FCP, is based on two propositions disproved by facts and figures and yet maintained, namely, about the Soviet Union’s alleged military superiority and its having “threatened” the West with imminent aggression almost ever since 1945. The reactionary press has gone as far as to describe peace supporters as “Munichites,” and *Le Figaro* has even attacked Charles de Gaulle for his

policy of cooperation with the Soviet Union and anathematized the peace movement.

It is not only the blackest reaction that is involved in this campaign, Denis noted. The media, including national radio and television, have been largely harnessed to the campaign. All this makes the role of the communist press, primarily *l'Humanité*, still more important and adds to the communists' responsibility for this sector of the ideological struggle, which the 24th FCP congress has urged the party membership to carry on actively.

It is fair to say that the French communists and their militant paper, *l'Humanité*, made a good job of the organization, conduct and popularization of the Vincennes peace festival. Backing the Appeal of 100 at the level of the leadership, the FCP uses its possibilities of mobilization at the local level, among the working people, youth and intellectuals, to ensure that the Vincennes event draws still more participants than the Montparnasse action the year before.

During the several weeks preceding the festival, *l'Humanité* daily published material in a section reproducing the poster of the anti-war action: the word peace and a symbolic drawing of the heart. It told readers that anybody was free to contribute to the section no matter how remote his views and convictions were from the communists. All that was needed, it added, was that he should have the idea of peace at heart. It would be hard to so much as list the interviews, letters, reports, documents and feature stories that appeared in *l'Humanité* during that period. Therefore we will only give a selection of extracts from some of the items showing the diversity of the contributors' political views.

"I have joined the signatories to the Appeal of 100 because their platform is directed to the majority. It is not a vehicle of any ideology. It expresses the sentiments of people who want to free themselves from anxiety, for nothing could be less logical than war. Peace, like songs, brings people together" (Georges Moustaki, singer and composer).

"We teachers and scholars differing in convictions and beliefs ... demand multilateral, negotiated and gradual disarmament ... It will depend on our common commitment whether the year 1983 sees a new escalation of the arms race or, on the contrary, a step toward peace" (signed by dozens of scholars and teachers).

"The arms race is very costly for all countries, including France. It is a waste of resources engendering inflation and unemployment ... This is a major reason why action for peace

concerns primarily the working people of our country" (Bernard Lacombe, CGT Secretary).

"The nearer June 19 draws, the more every party member is faced with the simple question of what he is going to do ... to help bring to Vincennes all people of good will who are ready to work for peace" (Henri Malberg, First Secretary, Paris Federation of the FCP).

"The French government is a left government. It refers to Jaures. But it cannot merely refer to Jaures, who was a man of peace — it should proceed as a real champion of peace" (TV interview with Georges Marchais).

"Some reject all war, others are prompted by their resolve to preserve nature, and still others cannot bear any waste of resources or knowledge. Though motivated by different reasons, they hold out their hand to one another to achieve one and the same goal, peace ..." (article by Jean Le Lagadec "Preparations for an Immense Festival").

"I consider it my duty to step in the face of the infernal process that has begun in the sphere of the arms race. Homo sapiens has been here for 20,000 years — he is still young. An atomic war would end all human life. It would be very foolish to die of an infantile disorder, to commit suicide, when everything is only just beginning" (Professor Albert Jacquard, biologist and demographer).

"There are more and more bishops, priests, Christians who are determined to fight for peace, to reject the folly of the arms race and search for paths leading to a world of brotherhood. During the Resistance, the rose and the mignonetter were already put together in one and the same bouquet; Christian, socialist and communist workers often march together in the struggle for social progress" (Georges Montaron, Director of the newspaper *Temoignage chrétien*).

Two weeks before the peace festival, the FCP Political Bureau expressed satisfaction with the contribution of communists and the party press to preparations for it and urged the party membership to work still harder for the success of the planned anti-war action.

And succeed it did. Here is how André Stil, member of the Goncourt Academy, one of the signatories to the Appeal of 100, described June 19 in *l'Humanité*.

"The first thing I came up against was the uncertainty which often attends the beginning of a big undertaking, of any demonstration. I saw some 20 people come out of a subway station, hesitate a little and then unfurl a streamer; another 30 stepped down from a bus and a further 10 came over on foot. Would there be enough to fill the huge Reuilly forest

meadow at Vincennes? This time an unusual demonstration began; the 20 from the subway station made one another's acquaintance. The 30 from the bus were on a familiar footing already because they had been singing together on the way, all through the night.

"One's feet are the best indicator of the size of a moving crowd. I was made to walk by the simple fact that I had come late to Porte Dorée, the assembly point of Writers and Artists for Peace. I had to catch up with them on la Place de la Nation, some five kilometers away. Groups of demonstrators were forming everywhere. Was that a sign of clever organization or of inspiration felt by everybody? The number of small, calm, trustful demonstrations!

"La Place de la Nation was teeming with people. The head of the column had started already amid that rare contest of sounds and colors. The writers could only be at the head. I walked my five kilometers through side streets, overtaking some two hundred streamers held up by what seemed to be the intertwining hands of young and elderly marchers. Some day somebody was bound to wonder why peace fighters of the late 20th century were so fond of marches. The very first answer that occurred to me was that the idea of peace was marching across the planet, drawing in nation after nation.

"Everybody felt he had to tell his neighbors that he stood for peace and that they must keep together. And it was certainly not a great distance — the stretch from la Place de la Nation to Charenton — for those who had come from Copenhagen or Amsterdam, Australia or South Africa. What mattered much more was that they all should gather together, that so many people differing among themselves as never before, with many of them far removed from one another, should march together. Many steps can and must be taken to this end.

"The writers were lost somewhere in the crowd. There have always been writers dedicated to peace. Great names of the past are evidence of this. Today their torch was being carried on by the frail Suzanne Prou. She accounted for her stand very simply: she had a family and children and they must have a chance to live. She had borne on her shoulders the whole burden of the initiative of the 100, who include many other writers."

It is a perfectly obvious matter, Stil goes on. Life or death. Much could be said to complicate this choice. But then simple things are the easiest to grasp. Already there are enough bombs to blow up the whole planet. No more bombs are needed, there is enough of that. This was the conviction with which the 100 began

and which by now has won such backing.

It will be seen that neither slander campaigns, nor overt and covert pressure on French peace supporters succeeded. The Vincennes action against war was backed by 121 mass organizations whereas during last year's march in Paris there were only 85. Along with the country's major trade union center — the CGT was among the sponsors — there were the French Communist Youth Movement and Christian Working Youth, National Federation of Gaullists for Progress, Union of French Women and National Federation of Exiles and Internees, Resistance Fighters and Patriots. Many socialists, including well-known leaders, were present. Among the marchers there were left radicals and noted religious leaders. Twenty-three foreign delegations from various parts of the globe and adhering to the most diverse orientations — from the Soviet Peace Committee to West Germany's Greens — arrived at the festival. Differing points of view were expressed but all speakers were agreed that the arms build-up must be ended if we do not want the planet to become a lifeless desert.

The festival culminated in the adoption of an appeal to all French people, all the nations and governments of the world and the UN to stop the deadly arms race, reach agreement on disarmament and defend peace. Spokesmen of the Appeal of 100 said that the fight must go on. They proposed that an international forum of people of culture and intellectuals of France, Europe and the world for disarmament be held in Paris in 1984.

The initiators of the Appeal of 100 met to sum up the results of the festival and draw conclusions from it. They noted the significance and impact of the unusual anti-war action. In a letter sent to *l'Humanité* the group said that it unanimously approved of the contribution of the French communists' paper to the success of the event. This contribution was all the more important, they wrote, that *l'Humanité* had shown respect for the distinctive character of the Appeal of 100, for the desire of its initiators to lend the movement from the outset as broad and unitary a character as possible, which had found expression in the Vincennes Appeal.

The growing scope of the anti-war movement in France and the communists' active role in it alarmed reaction. The bourgeois media vied with one another in representing the Vincennes festival as a "tactical ploy of the French Communist Party" and in looking for the mythical "hand of Moscow" in it. Reactionary propaganda gave free rein to its imagination. But it was unable either to foil the action, or to minimize its significance. Rene Andrieu,

who analyzed these attacks in *l'Humanité*, wrote with good reason that had those who met at Vincennes really been communists, which many bourgeois commentators imprudently assert to have been the case, it would have meant that the Communist Party was doing well in spite of those commentators' allegations. After all, it is not every party that can bring out half a million people into the streets.

The fact of the matter, Andrieu goes on, is that the communists united with people of all political convictions by joining fully in this battle for peace, as they had done earlier, at the time of the Stockholm Appeal and during the struggle against colonial wars. For we are again living through a turning point where people of good will, irrespective of whether or not they are communists, of whether they believe in God

or not, are understandably alarmed at the stepped-up arms race. The powerful movement against war involves the whole world. Some claimed until recently that France was sleeping. The Vincennes festival gave them the lie.

But the struggle is not over. Should Washington deploy new nuclear missiles in Europe, this would pose a threat primarily to West European countries, including France, as *l'Humanité* wrote on August 24. This is why dozens of French mass organizations are continuing their fight against the dangerous plans of the United States and its NATO partners. It also explains why the French communist daily insists on building up the peace movement, on effort to build it up without delay.

W. Sheppard



Factories: bastions of the working class

INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON THE COMMUNISTS' ACTIVITY AT CAPITALIST ENTERPRISES

In the various concrete conditions of the contest with capital, the communists' activity has always been wholly focused on the enterprise, where the working class is mainly concentrated. In this context, Lenin said that "the main strength of the movement lies in the organization of the workers at the large factories, for the large factories (and mills) contain not only the predominant part of the working class, as regards numbers, but even more as regards influence, development and fighting capacity. Every factory must be our fortress."¹

How is this task being tackled in the present conditions? Which forms of work are being used by the communists to develop the working class movement at the enterprises? How do they counter capital's offensive against the working people under the sharpening general crisis of capitalism? That was the broad range of question discussed by the participants in an international symposium, "Communists at the Enterprises," which was sponsored by *WMR*

and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Austria. It was held on the premises of the CPA's party school at Mauerbach, near Vienna, in May 1983, and was attended by fraternal party representatives from Austria, Denmark, the FRG, Finland, Great Britain, Greece, Spain and the United States.

Here is a summary of what was said at the symposium.

Crucial front in party work

For our party, political work at the enterprises and the activity of factory party organizations are of paramount importance, Franz Muhri, Chairman of the CP Austria, said in his opening speech at the symposium. The enterprises are the points at which the interests of labor and capital clash in the first place. That is most keenly felt just now. The employers are stepping up the working people's exploitation on the pretext of rationalizing production, seeking to get them to bear the brunt of the crisis, and activating diverse forms of pressure on the workers' leaders. This provides fresh opportunities for the arrangement of joint action by left-wing and progressive forces in defense of the working people's vital interests. Another

key task springs from the growing threat of war, which is posed, above all, by the reactionary, imperialist circles of the United States. The present situation calls for the utmost efforts to get the organized working class movement, which draws its strength from the enterprises, to join in the struggle for peace with greater vigor.

In saying that work in the collectives of working people is the main line of party activity, I have no intention of concealing the fact that we have many "bottlenecks" in this area. We have not yet succeeded in adequately concentrating our practical efforts at the enterprises proper. I think that our exchange of experience and discussion of difficult problems at the symposium will help further to invigorate the struggle for our common goals and ideals.

The German Communist Party, Karl Stiffel, its representative, said, is now carrying on a struggle for anti-monopoly democracy, which should pave the way for socialism in the FRG. We seek to get a majority of the working people, primarily the industrial core of the working class, to back this goal. We believe that successful advance depends above all on the number and strength of party groups at the enterprises, on their influence and ties with the masses, and on their militancy and activity.

The communists' multi-faceted activity at the enterprises, especially the large ones, is of the utmost importance for the further development of the class struggle and the strengthening of the working class movement, its revolutionary wing in the first place. Here are some data: in the FRG, there are roughly 1,200 enterprises in material production each employing over 1,000 people. While constituting only 1.7 per cent of the industrial enterprises, these big plants employ the labor of 3.4 million workers and employees (40 per cent of the work force in industry). That is precisely where the impulses for all the important action by the working people have come from over the past several years.

Last year's sixth plenary meeting of our party Board analyzed the role of the working class in the present-day conditions and formulated the tasks of the GCP's factory groups, adding: "The class adversary is aware: the issue being decided at the large enterprises is whether the ideology and practice of social partnership can go on camouflaging the contradictions in the period ahead; whether it can prevent invigoration of the working class struggle or whether workers and employees, having become aware of their class condition, can successfully organize the defense of their own interests."

Facing the sharpening crisis

Party work at the enterprises requires thorough consideration of the conditions in which the parties operate. In emphasizing this, the participants in the discussion closely analyzed the present state of the capitalist economy, and the impact of its structural changes and crisis trends on the activity of the working class.

The sharp leap in unemployment is one of the serious obstacles in arranging effective work by the communists, said Ramon Mendezona (CP Spain). The mass layoffs, the closure of enterprises and the growing number of those who work less than a full working day make the labor force fluid and lead to a frequent change of trades and jobs. As a result, faced with the fearful prospect of losing their jobs, many working people become socially less active, and there is a spread of individualistic and corporativist trends, and sectarian and narrow local-interest attitudes.

All these factors need to be reckoned with now and in the future, because the prescriptions capitalism intends to use for "curing" the crisis provide for the maintenance of a high level of unemployment, and further curbs on trade union activity. How can the communists counter this? We believe that they must formulate their own economic alternatives in the light of the working people's interests, provide answers to the convoluted contradictions of present-day capitalist production, and staunchly stand up for these interests.

Here is another factor which we believe to be important. Since the application of new technology tends to whittle down the traditional working class, steps must be taken to enlarge the social base of the mass movement by drawing on the sections which want to see the society transformed on socialist lines and which increasingly have to suffer from capitalist exploitation. The party's task is to shape the political consciousness of these sections, working to advance the development of the organized working class movement.

Britain already has more than 5 million unemployed — such is the outcome of the economic strategy of its Conservative government, Kevin Halpin (CP Great Britain) emphasized. Engineering, the sector in which we had the strongest party organizations, has suffered most from the closure of enterprises. Indeed, as the employers lay off their workers, they can see to it that the dismissed comrades will find the doors of other enterprises closed to them.

At one time, the Labour Party tried, in its own way, to do something for those who had lost

their jobs from the introduction of new technology. Thus, dock-workers willing to leave of their own accord are paid a cash compensation. We have been carrying on a struggle under this slogan: "Don't sell jobs, they're not yours, they belong to the working class!"

It is fairly hard to carry on active work among the unemployed. Before the war, they had their own movement, concentrated mainly at the labor exchanges, where the unemployment benefits were paid. Today, even those points of contact have been eliminated: the unemployment benefits are sent through the mail. Nevertheless, we try to do what we can. A number of measures have been taken to assure the unemployed of trade union membership. Several unemployment centers have been set up with the help of the British Trades Union Congress (TUC). The Communist Party and its youth organization are trying to involve them in their activity. But the problems and difficulties here are many.

It has often been asserted that in the atmosphere of crisis, the revolutionary activity of the working class tends to grow. However, we often find the opposite happening as well: unemployment causes disappointment, political scepticism and other negative phenomena. That is why, it was said in the discussion, the communists at the enterprises have the duty to explain to the working people the meaning of capitalist exploitation in all its forms, to help them to develop a class consciousness and to convince the workers that the class struggle is the way to improve their living and working conditions. Where this is done, Karl Stiffel said, mass action acquires a new quality, as will be seen, for instance, from the save-jobs movement in the FRG's steel industry, the shipbuilders' demand that the state should take over, under democratic control, the shipyards in the north of the country, and so on. It is highly noteworthy that in the course of the struggle for jobs some contingents of working people raise the question of changing the nature of property in the monopoly sector of the economy. That is a new element which has originated — not least importantly — under the influence of the explanatory work carried on by our party groups at the factories.

The "mints" and their defense

Capitalist enterprises could be called "mints" coining profits from the workers' blood and sweat; they are the foundation underpinning the whole superstructure of the exploitive power, said James West (CPUSA). The capitalists naturally do everything to safeguard their interests at the enterprises. Whatever the

democratic gains of the working class, in our country they cease to be valid within the factory walls. Armed guards, company spies, electronic "eyes and ears," a system of penalties and fines, and threats of layoffs — all these are used to intimidate the workers and neutralize their attempts to unite to resist the employers. This anti-labor policy is spearheaded against those who take a more consistent stand for the working people's class interests — the communists.

Our country still has no legislative acts protecting the working people's right to have their own organizations at the enterprises, said Demetres Karagules (CP Greece). Following the defeat of the right-wing forces in the 1981 election,² there appeared some possibilities for quickening the trade union movement. However, capital continues to make extensive use of firings, blackmail and other forms of repressive pressure. So while trade union and party activity at the enterprises is officially recognized, their owners — not without the help of reformist propaganda — have been obstructing our work, and the advance of the struggle for peace, independence and democracy in every way they can. In other words, the idea is to keep politics out of the industrial shop, where the mass of working people is constantly concentrated.

Kevin Halpin's remark: In Britain, applicants for jobs are frequently required to produce a trade union card, and if you have one, your chances of getting the job are slimmer. Such discrimination is prohibited by law, but in practice . . .

How is one to fight against the discriminatory policy of the bourgeois state and the employers? Above all by organizing actions of solidarity, the participants in the symposium declared. Risto Koskinen (CP Finland) told in this connection of what happened at one of the largest Finnish concerns. Its board had started legal proceedings against the chairman and the secretary (both members of the CP Finland) of the shop-stewards committee. On what charges? On the charge of having called for a "day of action" to put pressure on the employers in the course of collective bargaining. During the trial, strikes were staged at the plants of the concern. The CPF CC Political Bureau issued a statement condemning the arbitrary acts. The authorities were forced to release our comrades from detention. Such active solidarity in the party and its factory organizations is a natural matter, and today it is especially necessary.

Strength in unity of action

"Let us remember that we can improve our conditions only by our common and concerted efforts."³ That is what Lenin told the workers, and this best expresses the communists' attitude to the problem of ensuring unity of action by the working people at the enterprises. For that reason it was a central point of discussion at the symposium.

Anton Hofer (CP Austria) said that for several decades now political life in the country has borne the mark of the policy of class collaboration, which is conducted by the right-wing social democrats. Within the framework of that policy, the conciliators among the trade union leadership have the duty to damp down the energy and suppress the activity of the working class, above all by splitting the working people and injecting anti-communism. During the boom in the Austrian economy, high profits could go hand in hand with some growth of real wages, and this helped to spread illusions of class harmony among the workers.

As the crisis sharpened, there was a change in the situation. The right-wing social democrats are still trying hard to frustrate joint action with the communists at the enterprises, but in the recent period — for the first time in many years — it has been possible for communists, socialists and Christians to join in the demand for a 35-hour working week without any cut in wages.

It is, of course, not easy to achieve unity in the fight against capital. Now and again we fail to take due account of the fact that the first thing that needs to be done is to find a common "starting point" for joint action. The quest for it is complicated by political and ideological differences. This calls for patience and perseverance. Now and again our comrades seek unity with their fellow-workers on ideological matters, forgetting all that you need to organize acts of solidarity is a common approach to this or that concrete demand.

In Greece, the employers and the right-wing forces are aware of the threat posed to them by a united working class and so seek to split it up, to establish control of the trade unions or to set up parallel splinter organizations, Demetres Karagules went on. Regrettably, PASOK has also been acting along these lines. All of this tends to hinder our efforts to arrange cooperation. The communists seek a common approach with the socialists, with those of them who truly want real change, and are prepared to form a broad popular bloc, a people's alliance. That is why at the enterprises we do not lose sight of workers with conservative political

views, and try to make them alive to the fact that we have a common enemy — the monopolies, and that, as working people, we have common interests.

Although the decision of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SDPG) concerning the "incompatibility" of socialists and communists has been in force for many years, it has never been fully practised at the enterprises, said Hans Vossen (German CP). Members of the GCP and the SDPG find opportunities for joint action in trade unions, public associations, initiative groups and movements. Experience shows that without such cooperation it is impossible to take a successful stand for the interests of the working people at the enterprises.

Here is one example. Last year, our party's leadership arranged a conference with factory groups of communists in the steel industry. Having analyzed the situation in the industry, the conferees reached the conclusion that there was a need to keep insisting that it should be transferred to the state under democratic control. Within a few weeks, that slogan had gone round all the steel works and had been taken up by the workers. The metal-workers trade union of Dortmund and Duisburg, both major centers of the industry, adopted a document in support of the nationalization idea. In this way, an understanding was reached at the trade union level. That was made possible because we were able to discuss the matter in detail at the enterprises with the social democrats. We are now acting together to back up realization of that demand.

To this I should like to add, James West said, that we in the United States, while emphasizing the need for joint action in tackling concrete issues, are guided by this formula: a united front only at the "top" is impossible; a united front at the "top" and at the "grass roots" is both possible and impossible; a united front at the "grass roots" is always possible. What is the gist of this idea? It is that joint action at the grass roots must become a constant goal in our comrades' work, because it serves as the basis for unity at the higher levels as well.

In this connection, Ramon Mendezona recalled the following episode. When he was chairman of the Popular Front in Madrid, he once spoke about the difficulties in relations with the Socialist Party leadership, and called for stronger unity only at the grass roots. Palmiro Togliatti, who was present at that meeting, later said: "Both at the grass roots, and at the top!" Unity of action at the grass roots should undoubtedly serve as a means of pres-

sure for also achieving agreements at other levels.

And another thing: since we are discussing the influence of various political forces at the enterprises, it is worthwhile to consider the problem of the "ultras," both "leftist" and rightist, he went on. In Spain, there have been a great many parties which wanted to look more "revolutionary" than the communists, and which believed that they were such in fact. The fiasco of such leftist groupings, which have, as a rule, disappeared from the national political arena, is due to their inability to win over any sizable strata of the working class. This also applies to the anarchists and the anarcho-syndicalists. On the other hand, the most reactionary organization in Spain — "The New Force" — also wanted to set up its own trade union. It made cheap promises to win over the lumpen proletariat, the déclassé elements and the unemployed. Provocateurs and professional killers were recruited, and ultra-rightist terrorism was cultivated. None of this has yielded any dividends for right-wing reaction. But attempts may well again be made to recruit those who have lost their jobs and do not have any material aid, as it was done in Germany during the crisis of the 1930s, when this fueled the emergence of Hitlerism on the political stage. That is a danger we should also reckon with.

Work in the trade unions

The trade unions are one of the important spheres in which unity at the enterprises is manifested and in which its potentialities are now especially ample. It was stressed at the symposium that the set of demands which they put forward in connection with the workers' working and living conditions has been markedly extended over the past several years. Trade union activity itself — not least importantly under the influence of the communists' efforts — is acquiring an ever more clearcut orientation against the socio-economic policy of capitalism.

The Communist Party of Denmark, said Karl Møller, has always devoted prime attention to work in trade union organizations. We believe that, alongside the struggle for peace, détente and disarmament, this work is now most important. Accordingly, we try to carry on — openly, flexibly but also resolutely — a policy of unity of action at the enterprises, and to show the working class an optimistic perspective.

The Danish trade unions are united in one body, although their structure is somewhat outdated: there is still a division by craft unions, and separate trade unions for men and women will still be found in many industries.

Changes in structure are, of course, necessary, but we believe that the main thing is to bring about a change in the political line and to overcome the reformist attitudes in the trade union movement.

The communists are the propulsive power behind the urgently needed changes. Whereas the social democrats prevail at the top of the trade union structure, our comrades hold 3,000 posts at the middle level. They are on the leadership of sectoral organizations and local trade unions, and work as elected and paid functionaries and shop-stewards at the enterprises. These positions are being strengthened, but the problem is how to convert our trade union strength into political strength.

Over the past few years, communists working in the trade unions have set up initiative groups of shop-stewards for the purpose of countering reformism with examples of vigorous activity at the enterprises. These groups convene conferences, make proposals on joint action by the working people, and coordinate measures to help fighting workers. Major conferences are held to consider nation-wide initiatives, like the demand for the 35-hour working week or the formulation of a common platform of the working class movement against the bourgeois government. Thus, the Danish Workers' Conference, held in the town of Aalborg in March of this year, was attended by 750 delegates from local trade union organizations and work collectives. Speakers in the debate represented also the leadership of three parties: the Social Democratic, the Socialist Popular, and the Communist. For the first time, there was a discussion of the question of a working class alternative to the policy of the monopolies. The conference decisions are being widely discussed at the enterprises.

In this way, the communists' efforts aimed to have the active line prevail in the trade union movement promote unity of action at various levels.

In Finland, as in other Scandinavian countries, said Risto Koskinen, the trade union movement is a considerable force: it unites from 80 to 95 per cent of the workers and employees. The communists have very strong positions in the Central Organization of the Trade Unions in Finland, the country's largest trade union center, in which important changes have taken place over the past 10-15 years. Its 1971 congress wrote some changes into its program reflecting the goal of that organization: to create a society free from exploitation.

The communists' emphasis on work in the trade unions is quite understandable, and we have achieved some good results. Over the past

several decades, the CP Finland has markedly stepped up its activity at the enterprises, and many of our comrades have been elected shop-stewards and heads of local trade unions. These men and women have also frequently been at the head of party organizations, so that some of our factory groups have become like shadow committees. While concentrating on trade union activity, they have relaxed their ideological and political work, concern for enlarging the party ranks, circulating the communist press, etc. These failings are now being righted.

We are also worried about problems arising from a "job combination" when one and the same person heads the trade union and the party organization, Anton Hofer remarked. In such cases, let us say frankly, purely trade union problems tend to come to the fore. But the important thing for the party is to orient the comrades toward ideological and political work among the masses. A closer look at the substance of socio-economic problems will show that many of them could serve as an instrument for the communists in conducting our political line.

Now and again, James West said, a party organization may have more "trade unionists" than party members in the trade union. The result is that in some clubs, meetings, unless duly prepared, develop into discussions of trade union matters alone. We think that there is a need to overcome resolutely the tendency toward economism, the tendency to reduce our work to the level of trade union reformism. The main thing in party activity at enterprises is to combine action for particular demands with the broadest struggle for radical anti-monopoly, democratic transformations, and to help the workers to understand the need for such transformations.

The discussion showed that in the present conditions the importance of the communists' work in the trade unions has been growing. Speakers emphasized that it is important to have a clearer view of the demarcation of roles and of the tasks of party and trade union organizations at the enterprises, because each, as Lenin said, has its own sphere, determined by its nature, and within which it must act quite independently.⁴

Concern for increasing the ranks

It is impossible to tackle the problems which life sets before the communists, speakers at the symposium said, without a constant growth of the party ranks, without an ever more massive involvement of the working people at the enterprises in the political work carried on by

the communists.

We in Greece give special attention to setting up party structures at the factories and plants where the CPG's positions are not yet strong enough, Demetres Karagules said. The party's authority, and so also the potentialities for its growth, largely depend on the level of our political and ideological work, on the communists' role in the trade union struggles. But the results of this work are not of themselves always automatically materialized in a growth of party ranks. This can be the result only of planned, concrete organizational activity, something that should not be neglected.

At the industrial enterprises, said Ramon Mendezona, we concentrate on recruiting the most authoritative workers into the communist ranks. While welcoming everyone who joins the party, we are especially interested in seeing in the party the front-ranking members of the working class. At the same time, some new aspects need to be reckoned with. Thus, a sizable part of the Spanish proletariat is now employed in the sphere of the services, and in some production sectors there is a growth in the percentage of engineers and other technical personnel. If we want to create a bloc of forces backing the transformation of the society on socialist lines and to formulate and carry out a realistic alternative to capitalism, we must gain influence among these strata as well. We must do this not only to wean them away from the bourgeoisie, which has traditionally found support in their midst, but also to turn them into allies of the working class in the struggle against capitalist exploitation.

I should also like to consider the question of drawing young people into the party. Here we have some objective difficulties. The vast majority of the young who have come on the labor market over the past five years at once became unemployed, and that is a serious obstacle for our work with young people, because for most of them the way to the enterprises is closed. How are we to involve hundreds of thousands of such unemployed young men and women in active political life? Let me say frankly: up to now, we have not found any effective forms for winning them over to communist ideas.

Hans Vossen also spoke of the problems in filling the party ranks. In the light of a study made by the Institute of Marxist Studies, the German CP has reached this conclusion: efforts should above all be concentrated on recruiting young workers up to the age of 35 years, before they come under the strong influence of right-wing opportunism. In the FRG, there is the Socialist German Working Youth, an organi-

zation closely cooperating with the Communist Party. For some time now, it has been setting up its own branches at the major enterprises. We must say that at first this had some negative consequences for the activity of party groups, because the young communists whom we assigned to help the youth cells had to leave the work of the factory party organizations for some time. But we believe that this method has justified itself: it has helped to awaken interest in the party among sizable sections of the working young. Not long ago, I attended an accounting and election meeting of the party group at a shipyard in Kiel. Of the 25 communists present, only one had not been a member of the Socialist German Working Youth, and he was an elderly man.

Here is another aspect to this question. In order to draw closer to the working people and strengthen contacts with them, it is important to be active not only at the enterprise itself, but also in the working class neighborhoods, to have a knowledge of their everyday life and leisure pursuits, and to share their joys and sorrows. For this we need well-organized mass cultural work.

Ramon Mendezona's remark. In this connection, I should like to draw attention to what could appear to be a particular point, but it is an essential one: the use of party premises which many CPS factory organizations have. These are usually situated close to the enterprises, and at one time they were merely used as places for the workers to get together after working hours, to chat in a friendly atmosphere or to watch television. We do not object to such forms of intercourse, but it is not right when no political work is carried on in such party clubs. That is, after all, the main thing. Just now we are working to provide such places with a ready stock of propaganda material, to arrange for lectures and other cultural and educational functions. It is also important that anyone entering such a place should at once feel that he is among communists, in a special atmosphere of revolutionary, Marxist culture.

The discussion of experience in enlarging the party ranks was continued by Karl Stiffel. Practice shows that before a person joins the party, he maintains personal friendly contacts with a communist for a year or two and takes part in social and political action. Most factory groups and district organizations of the GCP consider the question of new members once in three months, take note of potential party members, and analyze the obstacles still in the way. As a result, every member of the factory party organization knows with whom of his fellow-workers he is to discuss most actively

problems of the enterprise and broader political matters in the immediate period ahead. He acquaints his colleague with the factory party newspaper and invites him to attend party meetings. This helps to establish relations of mutual trust. We attach special importance to work in building up the party ranks in the course of strikes and other militant action by the working people.

Kevin Halpin's question. I was impressed by the experience of individual work described by the GCP comrades, and I want to ask them this question: what is being done at the enterprises to recruit women into the party?

Hans Vossen's answer. One cannot say that in this area everything is all right, although practice testifies that where women are involved in the activity of factory party groups, it becomes more effective. For instance, five women joined a party organization at Grundig, and they gradually got their husbands also to join the party. Now, life in that group is vigorous, and many new forms of work are being used. The party is constantly working to involve ever more women in political and trade union activity at the enterprises. Altogether, 42 per cent of the GCP's members are women. But we think that there are still not enough women in leading party posts.

Loyalty to principle, creative quest

Daily life and the difficult tasks of the class struggle induce the communists to take a more flexible approach to the structure of party organizations at the enterprises. It is necessary, as Lenin said, for "all comrades to devise new forms of organization by their independent, creative joint efforts".⁵ The fraternal parties have much experience in setting up grass roots units that most fully take account of the national and local conditions and help to influence the masses more effectively.

In the German CP, Karl Stiffel said, there are three types of party groups: factory, territorial and higher school. It has already been emphasized that we attach the main significance to our activity among working people in the sphere of material production. It is not always possible to set up a branch at every enterprise right away. That is why joint party groups are first set up to include all the communists working at factories in a given industry and situated on the territory of the same district party organization. Joint party groups may be formed on the understanding that they set themselves the goal of forming independent groups in the near future.

For several months now, the party has been setting up groups of activists at the enterprises.

GCP Chairman Herbert Mies has defined this idea as follows: "After agreement with the neighborhood groups and the higher school groups, several party members are temporarily assigned to the enterprise group of activists. These party members are given the task of rendering every possible assistance and support to the communists, to discuss with them the development of contacts and ties, to coordinate their activity with party groups in the working class neighborhoods, to organize the sale of the GCP newspaper, *Unsere Zeit*, at the factory gates, and also to ensure the preparation and regular publication of a factory newspaper. The assignment of comrades to the enterprise group of activists for some time understandably weakens the neighborhood groups, but this is a breach that can be closed. If we educate thousands of party members oriented toward factory work, if we are represented through such activists at hundreds of enterprises, the party as a whole will become stronger and its influence in the working class will be markedly enhanced."

The enterprise group of activists is not a primary organization, and the communists within it continue to be registered at their territorial or higher school party cell. These are small groups of comrades united for a limited period for the purpose of shaping a cell at the enterprise.

The party must have an outpost wherever there is a communist present, even if one only. That is the principle followed by the CP Austria, said Anton Hofer. In accordance with our requirements, the factory party group must meet these three basic criteria: it must have at least three members, it must collect party dues directly at the enterprise, and it must carry on party activity. By a minimum of such activity we mean the publication of a factory newspaper, the work of one of the communists on the enterprise council, the circulation of political printed matter, including the newspaper *Volksstimme* in the collective, and the arrangement of party studies. These tasks are mandatory for each CPA factory group. But if there is only one or two communists at the enterprise? In that case an outpost is set up to fulfill some functions of the party cell, or a factory contact group to maintain ties with workers and progressive-minded socialists. So long as we are unable to set up a factory party group at each enterprise, such transitional forms of organization are necessary.

In the CPUSA, said James West, we also have such temporary forms of organization, namely, the industrial clubs. But I should like to deal with another important question: the inter-

action of territorial and plant cells. As others here have said, there is a need to be active not only inside the factories, or outside the factories, at the factory gates, but also in the working class communities where the workers of the given plant live. After all, it is in the communities that the independent political action of the working class for participation on a class basis in elections takes place. On a community basis, unemployed organizations, committees on housing and rent problems, etc., are established. It is here, too, that workers' families are drawn into the struggles for the interests of their class.

Our party has drawn up a special plan to concentrate efforts around work at the enterprises. It is designed not only for plant groups but also for territorial clubs. The members of these clubs seek to establish contacts with the families of industrial workers and, through them, with the other working people as well. This is especially important in the big cities, where the workers live in different districts, sometimes fairly far away from their enterprise. In addition, territorial clubs are engaged in the distribution of our newspaper at the factory gate, help plant groups by organizing meetings in their communities. It would be interesting, I think, to hear about the experience of comrades from other parties in this sphere of work.

Let me emphasize, first of all, Karl Stiffel continued, that the GCP is based on the production-and-territorial principle. Now and again, new party members who join from the ranks of the mass movement, suggest a review of the established organizational principles. We cannot agree to this, because we regard ourselves as a militant working class party, and so we concentrate our main efforts on work among the working people precisely in production. Of course, the GCP does not at all want to abandon vigorous activity in the neighborhoods as well. On the contrary, we urge the above-mentioned enterprise groups of activists to concert their efforts with the territorial party groups, especially in working class communities, and suggest to the territorial groups that they should consolidate their positions in the neighborhoods.

Re-establishment of the CP Spain's influence as a Marxist, revolutionary class organization, said Ramon Mendezona, means above all the re-establishment of its influence in the working class movement. We must admit, in a spirit of self-criticism, that over the past few years we have noticeably relaxed our activity among the working people. The number of CPS organizations at the enterprises has dropped, while the remaining ones — with rare exceptions —

can hardly cope with the political tasks set before them. A short historical retrospect will help to explain what I mean.

It is generally recognized that under the fascist dictatorship, the CP Spain was the most organized and powerful force of the opposition. In the years of the underground, the party had a large number of factory organizations engaged in active work. The communists played an important part in establishing, developing and strengthening the Workers' Commissions, which up to now are the strongest trade unions at enterprises employing more than 250 working people.

As the downfall of Francoism drew near, our party carried out a number of organizational measures in preparing for work in the new situation. The cells which had operated on the production principle and which were isolated from each other in the clandestine conditions gave way to organizations set up on the territorial principle. However, serious mistakes were not avoided either. The forms in which communists were united at their workplaces were automatically all eliminated. The introduction of the territorial principle was not combined with a retention of flexible forms of ties between party members at enterprises. As a result, many communists devoted themselves almost entirely to trade union work, while others had a sense of disappointment and pessimism. The emphasis on "policy from the top" to the detriment of "policy from below" increasingly estranged the CPS from the vital problems of the working class movement. There was a growth of political friction within the trade unions and among the communists. The party was in a state of crisis.

Consequently, our immediate main task is to re-establish and increase the number of party cells at the enterprises, to enhance the communists' organizational influence in the work collectives, and to increase their role at the workplaces. That is to be discussed at the forthcoming 11th congress of the CP Spain.

To make the communists' voice heard

Despite the numerous obstacles for work at the enterprises, **Demetres Karagules** said, the CP Greece is pressing for the free spread of its ideas. The party's positions and conclusions are conveyed to the working people and the public at large along various channels: through our newspaper *Rizospastis*, through posters and other printed matter, and through the CPG deputies in parliament. But it is not enough for people merely to hear the communists' views. These ideas should be clear to the masses and should call them to struggle. Consequently,

every party member has to become a propagandist.

We have already said that in the face of the crisis there is a growing interconnection between economic and the political struggles. This is also expressed in the fact that more vigorous action by the working class for higher wages enabled the communists to convince the working people that our economic alternative, that the whole of our policy is correct and that our ideas are viable and potent. The party's grass-roots organizations are engaged in variously spreading and explaining the ideas of Marxism-Leninism at the factories. Extensive measures have been arranged to mark Karl Marx Year. In the course of these, we demonstrated the abiding importance of revolutionary theory, and showed that radical social transformations, including those at the enterprises, were necessary and realistic.

Party workplace branches provide effective answers to complex problems only where there is a Marxist understanding, said **Kevin Halpin**. In order to get this basic knowledge, the Communist Party is constantly pushing for workplace branches to discuss theory and arrange constant studies (the best example being the Scottish miners, who hold week schools). Although in general we have to be critical of our lack of theoretical discussion in many branches.

The CP Great Britain attaches much importance to the *Morning Star*, not only to counter the reactionary mass media, but also to give the country's working class confidence in its strength. Our publications have an essential role to play in developing the strike movement and help to extend contacts in the trade unions. The selling of the *Morning Star* is the communists' key job at the workplaces.

Anton Hofer continued the discussion of this topic by emphasizing that the party is solidly established in the midst of the factory workers only to the extent to which it has equipped its members with political and ideological means of struggle. The various forms of study used in the CP Austria are backed up with publications in the party press: apart from *Volksstimme*, there are factory newspapers, special printed publications for oil workers, railway men, postal workers, and also for women.

The idea of the German CP, **Hans Vossen** said, is that a system of political education needs to be set up and improved in each factory party group and in each enterprise group of activists, in the light of local conditions. A single program has been drawn up for this system, and in accordance with it the party groups

arrange their studies once in two months. Information on the content of the studies, attendance and the character of the discussions which arise is reported in the higher-standing party organs. We strive to involve non-party workers in these studies as well. What kind of topics are included in the plan? For instance, this study-year (it begins in September) we are to discuss the following basic questions: the communists and the defense of peace; the historical mission of the working class; the communists and the unemployed; unity of action and the policy of alliances; the communists and the social democrats; the communists and the Greens, and a number of others. We attach much importance to explaining the achievements of existing socialism. In addition to the party group studies, the system of Marxist education includes one-year courses for factory workers at night schools which enable them to study without leaving their jobs, which means two nights a week, in acquiring knowledge on the fundamentals of the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Our party gives special attention to these evening factory workers' schools.

While perseveringly looking for new effective forms and methods of ideological work, it was said at the symposium, party organizations at the enterprises have the daily duty to carry to the masses the truth about the communists' policy with all the means at their disposal, to give the workers a class understanding of the uniformities and specifics of contemporary social development, to expose the policy of monopoly capital, bourgeois propaganda inventions, and the lies of anti-communism.

Peace: working class ideal

The preservation of peace is the most burning issue of our day. The threat of a devastating nuclear war looming over the globe induces a fresh look at the communists' activity, including that at the enterprises. Millions of working people are involved in the anti-war movements, in which the working class has to play a growing role. No enterprise is a closed little world; every enterprise is an outpost of the great world in which a struggle for the preservation of human civilization, and for the right to life is under way, a fact which makes the communists' work especially meaningful. That was most explicitly stated at the symposium.

The arms race, said James West, is itself a factor contributing to the economic crisis in our countries, to the worsening of living conditions, through the inflation which it stimulates, through the high taxes imposed on the working class, and through the loss of jobs, as a result of: (a) the export of jobs by the transnationals; (b) the

shift of capital to the arms industries, which provide fewer jobs than the industries producing peace-time goods, and (c) the embargo on trade with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Thus, the fight for peace today merges with the fight for jobs, for job security, making it possible to transform the enterprises into bastions of peace, providing the most substantial base for the peace forces. "Jobs, Not Bombs!" is now one of the most popular slogans in the United States. It is a reflection not only of the working people's aspirations, but also of the official stand of such major working class organizations as the million-strong machinists' union.

A similar slogan has been put forward in the FRG, said Karl Stiffel. It is "Jobs, Not Missiles!" and it has met with a ready response at the enterprises. We seek to express it in concrete terms in the light of the interests of this or that contingent of working people. The main slogan has been logically continued in slogans like "Steel Mills Instead of Missiles!", "Pipes Instead of Missiles!" etc. The German CP is helping to set up factory initiative groups in defense of peace. An impetus to their formation and to anti-war action is provided by the demands to switch production from war-time to peace-time goods, and to increase the number of jobs by cutting back the military budget.

The activity of the factory groups has had broad support in work collectives where a start was made from concrete deeds, and where the initiative has come from the communists and social democrats, from the workers themselves. There has been a marked increase in the number of statements at district trade union conferences calling on the trade unions to take all possible measures in order to prevent the deployment of new U.S. missiles on German soil. Even the union of workers in the arts has called on the Federation of German Trade Unions to stage a general strike in protest against the missile-deployment plans.

Over the past year, Karl Moller said, the attitude of the Danish working class movement to the problems of peace has undergone a great change. This has occurred since the social democratic government was succeeded by a right-bourgeois government. The changes which have taken place in the ranks of the social democrats because of their loss of power also affected the trade unions, whose leadership issued a pamphlet containing demands which are fully backed by the communists: to prevent the deployment of Euromissiles, to declare Nordic Europe a nuclear-free zone, and to resist Denmark's conversion into a military

base. The thing now is to have all these correct resolutions and demands translated into concrete action, especially at the enterprises. The basis for doing so is there.

It is, of course, not at all enough to spread our views on the issues of war and peace, *Demetres Karagules* reaffirmed. It is important to find effective forms of anti-war struggle, including action at the enterprises. Thus, on the communists' initiative, the trade unions have held referenda at the factories to find out what the workers think about foreign military bases in Greece. More than 95 per cent of those who took part firmly said "No!" to the bases. This was naturally of serious significance for the further development of the mass working class movement for peace and for enhancing its militancy.

In Great Britain, *Kevin Halpin* said, more and more people support the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), and the campaign "For a Britain Without Nuclear Weapons," which was started on the initiative of the British TUC. There has been nation-wide support for the Greenham Common Peace Camp, which is widely known in many other countries. While working for the broadest peace activity, the communists believe that it is their duty to show the masses that the drive to war comes from U.S. imperialism, from the Reagan administration, which has the backing of Thatcher's Tories. We seek to show, consequently, that the defense of peace is inseparable from action against the whole Tory policy, the policy of monopoly capital, and that it merges with the working people's action for their rights, for democracy and social progress.

In winding up the discussion, *Sergei Tsukasov*, WMR Managing Editor and a member of the Editorial Board, said: the communists' work at the enterprises, the symposium has shown, is a question of great political importance and a pressing one for all the parties represented here. For our journal, which strives to shed a fuller light on the fraternal parties' experience, it is most valuable that the discussion here has been carried on in concrete historical terms, with an eye to the trends, conditions and potentialities of the 1980s, and with a comprehensive analysis of the general uniformities and specifics of the national forms of the communists' activity.

The representatives of all the participating parties are agreed that the frank exchange of views has made it possible to consider some of the urgent problems of theoretical and practical importance, among them: the interconnection between the struggle for political, economic and social tasks in the present conditions; the dialectics of the changing condition of the

working class under the fresh aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism; and ways of uniting the left forces. Our symposium has helped to deepen the comprehension of the need for further transferring the thrust of the communists' political activity to the factory collectives. Speakers at the symposium stressed that, in working at the enterprises, it is important to tie in more closely the immediate and the long-term goals, that is to link up every specific question with the proletariat's general tasks, to transform every act of organization into one of class cohesion, and to win, through vigorous action and ideological influence, the vanguard role among the working people.⁶ In this context, it was shown most convincingly once again that the fraternal parties attach tremendous importance to organically merging the struggle of the communists and the working class in defense of peace with the anti-monopoly struggle for the rights and better conditions for the working people, and for social progress.

Everyone who took part in the discussion supported the idea that it was necessary to invigorate work in the trade unions, to overcome the reformist trends in them and to convert them into a force for class action. The discussion also led to the following straightforward conclusion: there is a need to combine skilfully party activity at the enterprises with work in the communities and among the various categories of working people which are now drawing ever closer to the working class.

There was also much interest in the organizational problems discussed by the parties at the symposium. The importance of more flexible forms of party structures, in the light of present-day requirements, is an idea that has been fully supported. Matters relating to the ways of strengthening the party groups at the enterprises, directing these grass roots units and increasing the party ranks were considered in the light of the diverse experience.

It is the common view that all of this provides a fresh impetus for reflection, decision and improvement of the various aspects of the communists' activity at capitalist enterprises. Responding to the wishes of the fraternal parties, *World Marxist Review* will continue to give broad coverage to new experience in this highly important endeavor.

1. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 243.

2. The parliamentary election of October 1981 gave power to a government of the Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK). — Ed.

3. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 81.

4. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 463.

5. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 34.

6. See, V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 354.



National elections and the communists

This year general elections took place in several industrial capitalist countries. They were held in an atmosphere of widespread popular dissatisfaction with the policies of the ruling classes — an arms race endangering peace, encroachments on the vital rights of labor, growing unemployment. The elections brought the Right to power in some countries and led to its defeat in others. Why did this happen? What conclusions do the communists draw from the outcome of the elections? These questions are answered in the following contributions from Australia, Portugal and Britain.

NEEDED: REAL CHANGE

Peter Symon
General Secretary,
Socialist Party of Australia

In February of this year the ruling Liberal-National Party coalition government of Australia led by Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser decided to call an early election, anticipating that the political and economic circumstances for his government would deteriorate as the year progressed. The Prime Minister miscalculated badly. The Australian Labour Party (ALP) won the elections and established a new government, with R.J. Hawke as Prime Minister.¹

The ALP has a big majority in the House of Representatives but does not have a majority in the Senate (the Upper House). The balance of power in the Senate is held by the Australian Democrats (a middle-class liberal party) and one independent.

Australia is in the grip of the capitalist worldwide economic crisis. There are almost 750,000 officially registered unemployed, that is, 10.7 per cent of the workforce. In addition there are the "hidden" unemployed, those who do not register or are not entitled to register for unemployment relief payments. The real unemployment is, therefore, more like one million. Living standards are going down. Social welfare organizations estimate that over two million people (out of a total population of 15

million) are living below the poverty line.

Furthermore, unfavorable structural changes are taking place in the economy. Data released by the Bank of Australia and New Zealand show that from June to October 1982 production in the manufacturing industry fell off by 12 per cent and by as much as 25 per cent in such of its branches as mechanical engineering, metal-working and instrument-making. The building industry registered its lowest output in 20 years. The manufacturing section of industry is declining relative to primary production and mineral and energy resource development. In 1970 the industrial production of GDP was 30 per cent, in 1976, 25 per cent and in 1982, 22.4 per cent. Many key industries are controlled outright by or have a high percentage of foreign capital.² Principal sources of foreign capital are Britain, USA and Japan.

As if to demonstrate where the real power lay, foreign investors transferred out of Australia about 3 billion dollars in the weeks immediately preceding the elections. To stop this outflow, the new government devalued the Australian dollar by 10 per cent immediately on assuming office, whereupon the foreign investors brought their money back in, making thereby very lucrative speculative profits.

In response to the economic crisis the Liberal-National Party coalition campaigned during the elections under the slogan of "We're not waiting for the world." Given the influence of foreign capital and the fact that Australia is a large trading nation, this slogan was, to say the least, demagogic.

The ALP's campaign slogan was "Getting Australians together." For this purpose they proposed, immediately following the elections, an "economic summit" with representatives of the employers, the trade unions, the Federal and State governments.

The new Prime Minister, Hawke, was formerly the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU)³ from 1970 to 1980 and even in that capacity had put forward the idea that if only everyone could "get together" and put their "cards on the table" and "cooperate"

the country's economic problems could be solved.

Shortly before polling day the ALP and the ACTU adopted a "Statement of Accord" which was an agreement covering a number of issues — wages, prices, taxation, health care, welfare benefits, and so on. But in essence it was a prices and incomes policy and class collaborationist. The wording of the Accord was vague except when it dealt with wages. In this respect the wording effectively tied the trade union movement to limit its demands.

Following the elections the economic summit was held, with an array of leading capitalist representatives, the ACTU Executive and Federal and State government Ministers. The communiqué from the economic summit, adopted almost unanimously, further weakened the position of the trade unions, which accepted the need for the restoration of the profitability of industry as the necessary basis for economic recovery. The trade union leaders abandoned all reference to the objective of public ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange and did not even place the blame for the economic crisis on the capitalist system. There was tacit acceptance by them that wages were too high. Since the last general wage rise in 1982 and the imposition of the wage freeze toward the end of 1982, prices have gone up by over 10 per cent, which constitutes a cut in real wages.

The Hawke ALP government has moved to introduce a promised universal health care system and has allocated money for job creation schemes but in other respects is already abandoning its election promises, blaming an unexpectedly high budget deficit.⁴ Instead of promised tax cuts, tax increases have already been imposed. At this stage they have hit the middle classes mainly. There is little indication that taxes on the big companies and the wealthy will be increased given the government's acceptance of the need to restore the profitability of the capitalists. During the election the ALP promised to introduce a "wealth tax."

Because of the general attitude of the leadership of the trade union movement there is, as yet, little struggle to achieve wage increases justified by the price rises. Some workers have accepted a reduction to a four-day week with a commensurate reduction in pay. Layoffs are continuing.

During the great depression of the 1930s the trade union movement vehemently condemned the capitalist system for the crisis and resisted the wage cuts which were imposed at

that time. The ACTU called for a policy of nationalization.

The boom conditions existing in Australia in the 1950s, 60s and much of the 70s created many illusions. Furthermore, the propaganda offensive of the ruling class is now much more sophisticated.

The 1981 congress of the ACTU elected a center-right leadership. A general shift to the right in the community over the last few years was also reflected in the trade union movement and among workers generally.

Over many years the ACTU campaigned for centralized wage demands on behalf of all workers. This was expressed in the demand for not only a unified wage claim but also indexation of wages, that is, regular periodical wage increases based on the increase in prices of a selection of consumer goods, services, health costs, rents, travel, and so on.

But in 1981 this approach was abandoned. Trade unions were urged to campaign individually for whatever they could get from their various employers. Some strong and well-organized trade unions were able to make gains but weaker unions lagged behind. Overall, this decision weakened the trade union movement. It caused divisions and made it relatively easy for the Arbitration Commission (the wage fixing authority) to abandon the system of wage indexation altogether.

However, there are pockets of resistance and the struggle of the class generally will grow as the effects of the crisis on living standards are brought home to working class families and the falsity of capitalist mass media propaganda is exposed.

In foreign policy questions the ALP National Conference held in 1982 adopted many progressive policies. The ALP declared its support for détente and disarmament, called for a restoration of Australian government aid to Vietnam and a negotiated settlement of South-east Asian problems. The National Conference rejected Indonesia's incorporation of East Timor⁵ and pledged the withdrawal of the Australian contingent in the U.S.-sponsored Sinai force.

One of the government's first foreign policy acts was to remove restrictions on exchanges and the visa ban placed on Soviet citizens wishing to visit Australia, which had been imposed in 1980 by the former Liberal government.

The Australian government has offered its services to help negotiations between the Indochina socialist states and the ASEAN⁶ powers. But the demands placed on Vietnam as the basis of a settlement do not hold out much hope

of real progress at this stage. Furthermore, the restoration of the promised aid to Vietnam has been made conditional on the approval of the USA, ASEAN and the People's Republic of China. Shortly after the elections the Premier of the PRC visited Australia and strongly pressed the government against restoring the reconstruction aid. The USA is certain to take the same attitude.

The ALP government has also repudiated its own National Conference policy decision toward East Timor, preferring instead to cultivate its relations with Indonesia. Similarly, the firm commitment to withdraw the Australian contingent in the Sinai is being postponed and is not expected to be fulfilled. Mr. Hawke's rabid pro-Zionist stand over many years is likely to prevail on this issue.

The ALP's 1982 policy decisions were in favor of a nuclear-free South Pacific but this has now been interpreted to exempt U.S. naval craft, some of which carry nuclear weapons.

The most serious foreign policy question for Australia is the existence of important U.S. military bases on our territory.⁷ They are part of the worldwide network of U.S. bases and turn Australia into an important strategic center in the Pacific and Indian Oceans in particular, but with world significance as well. B-52 bombers are using Australian bases and U.S. nuclear-armed ships are regularly and more and more frequently using Australian ports. It is the U.S. bases and the use of our air and port facilities by U.S. forces which are the real danger to Australia. They may well become retaliatory targets in the event of a nuclear war. In addition they seriously qualify Australia's national independence and sovereignty. On the major questions of war and peace, the U.S. bases can effectively determine Australia's foreign policy without the government ever being consulted, let alone the people.

The ALP accepts commitment to the ANZUS Treaty (Australia, New Zealand and the USA) as the cornerstone of foreign policy. The new government is seeking an updating of this Treaty which was formulated shortly after World War II in entirely different circumstances. Given the present attitude of government leaders, an updating of the Treaty can only result in greater Australian commitments and an even tighter knot being tied by the USA around Australia.

There is considerable disquiet in the ranks of the ALP about the course being followed by the government on some foreign policy issues, particularly the question of aid to Vietnam.

In many respects, both in national and international affairs, the change of government has

brought only small changes in policy. Social democracy has much less room to offer and implement reforms in the current period of economic crisis and an intensification of the general crisis of capitalism. It bows before the stubborn resistance of the ruling class to the needs and demands of the working class and promotes concepts of class peace.

As in other countries, so in Australia, the broad peace movement has grown considerably in recent times. Last March 150,000 people demonstrated, rivalling in size the massive anti-Vietnam war marches of the early 1970s. Slogans for peace and against nuclear war and for the removal of U.S. bases predominated in all major cities. Many new peace organizations have sprung up. Doctors, artists, writers, teachers, the churches, trade unions, municipal councils, political parties, youth organizations are all contributing to the broad movement. There is as yet considerable organizational diversity and a rather widespread propagation of the "two super-powers" concept. However, there is unanimity on the need to stop the drive to nuclear war.

The Socialist Party of Australia entered the Federal elections, nominating candidates for the Senate in three States and a small number of candidates for the House of Representatives. The party put forward, in the first place, the over-riding need for peace and the adoption by government of a policy in support of peace and disarmament. It was the only political party to do so. The party has carried out a great deal of activity advancing its own policies and works also within the various peace organizations.

We have publicized and supported every proposal for relaxation of tension, for negotiations and not confrontation, for real disarmament measures. The party publicizes the many peace proposals of the Soviet Union, its pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and its offer to make an agreement binding all nuclear powers not to use nuclear weapons against countries lacking them and having none on their territories.

The SPA demands that U.S. bases in Australia be dismantled. These bases, the domination of the economy by foreign capital and the imperialist cultural penetration make the struggle for national independence an urgent and pressing one.

The struggle for peace and national independence have become closely linked. There is also a direct link between economic problems and the escalating military expenditure.

On specific economic issues, the SPA put forward proposals for job creation, for regular and indexed wage increases, for price and

profit control, for control over the inflow and outflow of foreign capital, improved social welfare benefits, a universal health care scheme, taxation changes to relieve the tax burden on working-class families, land and mineral rights for Aborigines, equal pay and an end to discrimination against women.

In addition, the party pointed out the deep and fundamental nature of the economic problems and the responsibility of the capitalist system. To meet this, real change is necessary, including the extension of public ownership of production, mineral and power resources, finance, communications and housing and a new political orientation with the formation of a government representative of the working people, professionals and intellectuals, small working farmers and small businessmen — all who are exploited by and opposed to monopoly domination. The SPA called for the defeat of the Liberal-National Party government. While recognizing that the ALP provided the only possible alternative government at the time, the SPA was critical of the class collaborationist line being put forward by Bob Hawke. Developments since the elections confirm the correctness of this criticism.

The party is now raising more sharply the necessity for anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly struggle for peace, national independence and real change. It calls for the development of all the progressive social forces whose policies and activities can prevent a return of the open parties of reaction and implement the progressive and democratic changes which are expected and needed. These policies point the direction that must be taken if a start is to be made to overcome the serious and growing problems facing the Australian people.

1. In the Federal elections held last March 5, the ALP polled over half of the votes. It won 74 of the 125 seats in the House of Representatives. The conservative parties collected slightly more than 43 per cent of the votes, which won them 48 seats against the earlier 74. In the Senate the ALP now holds 30 of the 64 seats. — Ed.

2. As late as 1977, foreigners owned 59 per cent of Australian companies, according to official statistics. Under the rule of the coalition of conservative parties, the inflow of foreign investments went up from 1.5 billion dollars in the 1977/78 fiscal year to 9.3 billion dollars by early 1983. — Ed.

3. The Australian trade unions have a membership of about 3 million, that is, over 62 per cent of the labor force. At the last congress of the ACTU in September 1981 a single national trade union center was created by the amalgamation with the ACTU of the formerly independent associations. — Ed.

4. The Australian Ministry of Finance predicts for the 1983/84 fiscal year a budget deficit of 9.6 billion Australian dollars against 6 billion in the previous year. The same source indicates that the government intends to go on increasing military expenditures, which are to grow by 9.1 per cent in the 1983/84 fiscal year, a further 17 per cent

in 1984/85 and 13.4 in 1985/86, when appropriations for the purpose will total 6,841 million Australian dollars. — Ed.

5. The former Portuguese colony of East Timor in the Malay archipelago was annexed by Indonesia in 1976. — Ed.

6. ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) was founded in 1967; it comprises Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines. — Ed.

7. There are 40 U.S. military installations in Australia, including the Pine Gap base, the largest spying station outside the USA monitoring outer space and collecting information through satellites. — Ed.

IN DEFIANCE OF THE PEOPLE'S WILL

Carlos Brito

CC Political Commission Member,
Portuguese CP;
Chairman, PCP's Parliamentary Group

The Mario Soares government, set up on the basis of a government and parliamentary accord between the Socialist Party (SP) and the Social Democratic Party (SDP), the leading rightist political force, has been shamelessly flouting the will of the electors, including those who voted for the socialists at the unscheduled parliamentary elections on April 25, 1983.

An overwhelming majority of the electorate voted against the rightists and their policy, and for the expulsion of the reactionary parties from the government. But Mario Soares and other socialist leaders once again introduced into the executive the SDP, the main party of the reactionary Democratic Alliance,¹ whose crushing defeat in the elections reflected the people's discontent with the pernicious consequences of its three-year rule.

It so happened that the Socialist Party itself conducted its electoral campaign under the slogan of struggle against the reactionary coalition. That enabled it to win over a sizable section of those who resented the DA's policy.

As the PCP Central Committee's Political Commission has declared, the Soares government, which not only includes the leading DA party, but once again adopted and, in some respects, even aggravated the policy and goals of the rightists, is a monumental political fraud.

Crushing defeat of reactionary forces

Such is the most impressive and important outcome of the early elections to the Republic's Assembly, held on the anniversary of the Portuguese Revolution. Indeed, the rightist parties that had been in power and had had a majority in parliament now found themselves in a minority, so forfeiting the right to form a government.

The failure of the reactionary parties at the general elections followed upon another major

political defeat which they suffered at the hands of the popular and democratic forces. The resolute action of the working class after the major democratic victory in the elections to the local organs of power in December 1982² in effect predetermined the government's resignation and frustrated all the attempts to form a new DA cabinet, which led to the break-up of the reactionary coalition, the dissolution of parliament and early elections.

The electoral campaign of the PCP and its associates from the Alliance for Popular Unity (APU), was very important in determining the stand of the electorate toward the reactionary parties. In the course of that campaign, they not only exposed the disastrous consequences of DA rule and emphasized the outstanding role of the working people and the mass struggle in the collapse of the reactionary coalition, but also pointed out that its defeat was a perfectly realistic task.

Life confirmed the PCP's conclusions and forecasts. Over the past two and a half years (from 1980 to 1983), the absolute number of votes cast for the rightists has declined from 2,791,000 to 2,244,000, a loss of 547,000 votes. Percentage-wise, the votes cast for them have gone down from 47.2 per cent to 39.9 per cent. As for parliamentary representation, the figure has dropped by 29 seats, from 134 to 105. The rightists have lost considerable ground across the whole country (in the autonomous regions — the Azores and Madeira — the losses were, perhaps, somewhat smaller). Thus, in 11 of the 20 electoral districts they lost more than 20 per cent of the votes, and in Porto, Portugal's second largest city, 36.5 per cent. That was an unequivocal demand by the electorate for a change of government and policy.

The new composition of the Republic's Assembly is very different from the old one, as will be seen from the following figures:

	1980 elections	1983 elections
Alliance for Popular Unity, total	41	44
Portuguese CP	39	41
Portuguese Democratic Movement (PDM)	2	3
SP Rolls ³ , total	74	101
Socialist Party	66	94
Left Union for Socialist Democracy (LUSD)	4	4
Independent Social Democratic Action (ISDA)	4	3
Democratic Alliance, ⁴ total	134	105
Social Democratic Party	82	75
Social Democratic Center (SDC)	46	30
People's Monarchist Party	6	-
People's Democratic Alliance ⁵	1	-
	250	250

So, the April 25 elections, in which the democratic forces (socialists and communists) won a sizable majority in parliament, created the institutional conditions for a democratic alternative. But by entering into an alliance with the rightists, Mario Soares and the SP leadership immediately gave up the opportunity provided by the people's vote: that of forming a democratic government and elaborating a new political line to solve the country's grave problems.

The communists and their allies strengthen positions

In the early elections to the legislative organs of power, the Portuguese CP campaigned, as in previous such campaigns, as a part of the electoral bloc, Alliance for Popular Unity, comprising the PCP, the Portuguese Democratic Movement and independent democrats. But there was also a new element: the APU's list also included independent candidates from the Portuguese Ecological Movement, the party of the Greens. One of them, nominated under the PCP list, is now a deputy of the Republic's Assembly as an independent.

At the April 25 elections, the APU scored an important political victory. First, its electoral campaign played the crucial role in defeating the reactionary parties. Second, in the most complicated conditions of a fierce anti-communist campaign and calls for a so-called "useful vote"⁶ for the Socialist Party, the APU convincingly strengthened its positions, improving its stand both in absolute and relative terms, and winning more seats in parliament.

As compared with the 1980 parliamentary elections, the number of electors who cast their votes for the APU went up from 1,001,133 to 1,024,162, that is, by 23,000, and their share in the electorate from 16.9 to 18.2 per cent. The number of APU seats in the Republic's Assembly increased from 41 to 44. One of the three new seats is held by the PDM, and the other two, by the PCP.

In absolute and relative terms, the APU won the greatest number of votes in six electoral districts, which include the country's major cities: Lisbon (+15,000 votes), Porto (+11,000), Setubal (+14,000), Faro (+2,000), Braga (+1,000) and Coimbra. In eight other districts, the APU increased its percentage, in one maintained it on the previous level, and in five suffered marginal losses.

As a result of the changes in the composition of the Republic's Assembly, the PCP has now become the country's third largest party in terms of parliamentary seats, and the PDM (since the LUSD and the ISDA did not run

independently), the fifth largest. In view of the concrete background to the elections, these results are of great political importance. They show that broad sections of the electorate — more than a million Portuguese — have realized the justice of the APU positions and have come to understand the role of the communists and their allies in the political process of the past few years. They realized that a vote for the APU is the only useful vote from the standpoint of defending the transformations inaugurated by the Portuguese revolution, the gains of the working people and the democratic regime itself.

Meanwhile, it was the socialists who picked up most of the votes of those who had turned away from the reactionary parties. As compared with the 1980 elections, the number of votes cast for the Socialist Party increased from 1,659,541 to 2,045,986, or from 28 to 36.4 per cent. That success was largely due to the favorable atmosphere created for that party in the state-owned and private mass media, which presented it (in contrast to the PCP and the APU, which were a target of discrimination) as an "opposition" force capable of winning through a "useful vote." The anti-communist campaign and preconceptions in some strata of society, and the absence of truly democratic conditions in various parts of the country, also contributed to the socialists' victory.

Although it managed to strengthen its positions, the SP fell far short of its proclaimed goal: an absolute majority. It used that as a pretext for refusing to correct its alliances policy after the elections. The SP leaders seek to persuade public opinion that since the socialists did not win an absolute majority their only lot now is to form alliances for the sake of power. That is why, they say, they have signed an accord with the leading rightist party. The truth, however, is that by casting, as expected, far less than half of their votes for the Socialist Party, the electorate expressed its will quite unequivocally.

The fact that the SDP, SDC and PMP, which constituted the earlier parliamentary and government majority, now polled only 39.9 per cent of the votes (as compared with more than 47 per cent in 1980), while the APU and SP, which had been in opposition, had increased their support from 45 to 55 per cent, is significant in itself. It means that the electors are demanding democratic changes in national policy, changes which are possible only with the participation of the communists and other political and social forces whose struggle led to the defeat of the reactionary coalition.

Objective: to intensify the rightist policy

Having signed an agreement with the SDP, Mario Soares and other socialist leaders naturally want to disguise their betrayal of the electors, including members of their own party. Hence their efforts to give the anti-popular coalition a euphonious name. "Center-left" government — such was the name chosen by its progenitors.

Even before the accord was fully prepared, Alvaro Cunhal, the PCP General Secretary, made a statement for the press exposing their trick. "The SP-SDP government," he said, "will neither be a center-left, nor even a centrist one. It will be a government formed on the basis of an accord between the leadership of a democratic and a reactionary party in order to pursue a rightist policy in the present conditions."⁷ The subsequently published text of the "accord," signed by both parties, an "additional protocol," and also a speech by Mario Soares when taking office as Prime Minister fully confirmed Cunhal's analysis.

Like the governments of the disintegrated coalition of reactionary parties, the SP/SDP cabinet is openly seeking to restore the economic and political power of the monopolies and latifundists closely connected with imperialism. The text of the accord makes it perfectly clear that the new coalition intends to continue and, in some respects, to step up the offensive against nationalization and the agrarian reform in order to undermine these, curb the working people's rights and obstruct their struggle against the exploitive policy of the employers, and use administrative, authoritarian and anti-democratic methods of running the country.

Declaring its intention to give big capital access to banking and insurance, to the cement and fertilizer industries — the key nationalized sectors from which private enterprise is banned under the country's constitution and legislation — the government simultaneously prohibited strike picketing and announced other draconian measures against the working people. Steps are also to be taken to make it much easier for employers to lay off working people for a time or even to dismiss them altogether, to reduce wages or suspend their payment for a long time, and to reduce working hours and, accordingly, the remuneration for work.

The new authorities keep blaming the deep economic and financial crisis in the country, but it is becoming ever more obvious that the government is incapable of elaborating any serious proposals to rectify the situation. The

crisis is being used for propaganda purposes to justify the measures that worsen the working people's living conditions, and also the legislative and administrative measures being taken in the interests of big capital. All of this is particularly evident in the Soares government's campaign over the much-vaunted "social pact."

The Communist Party immediately saw through and exposed that operation: it boils down to an attempt by the authorities, under the pretense of negotiations between the government and the so-called social partners,⁸ to induce the working people, whose working and living conditions have already worsened, to pay the full cost of the crisis. This will enable the big capitalists to make more profit, accelerate the accumulation and centralization of capital, and pave the way for a restoration of the monopolies.

The crisis is also being used to justify Portugal's growing dependence on imperialism by the need to obtain external loans from the IMF and other foreign agencies. It is not only a matter of financial and economic dependence, but also of allowing NATO and the USA to have their bases and other military facilities on Portuguese territory.

The new government's line leaves no doubt about the reactionary nature of its policy's goals. Its composition is equally disturbing. A most indicative fact here is that one of the main posts, that of National Defense Minister, has gone to Mota Pinto, who in 1980 was the campaign manager of the fascist General Soares Carneiro, when the latter was running for the Presidency. Pinto has a distinct propensity to repression, as it became evident during his term as Prime Minister in 1979 and in the recent electoral campaign, when he extolled "law and authority."

The danger which threatened the democratic regime during the three-year rule of the reactionary coalition is once again looming on the Portuguese horizon. The blame for that lies on the SP/SDP government's political line and composition.

The struggle continues

Echoing the Democratic Alliance governments, the present Soares cabinet has also proclaimed itself to be the most stable ever, saying that the broad parliamentary majority will enable it to remain in power throughout the constitutional four-year term.

In actual fact, in spite of all the assertions by responsible spokesmen, the government was formed and began its work in an atmosphere of general mistrust. The ups and downs preceding its formation showed very well that wide circles in each of the parties that signed the accord were dissatisfied with the deal. The Soares cabinet is like a bridge propped up by two rotten pillars. But the most important thing is that the country has no confidence in the government, which has so openly disregarded the electorate's will.

Can one trust a cabinet which intends to continue a policy which is exactly similar to the one pursued during the past three years by the DA coalition which brought Portugal to the brink of national disaster?

Can one trust a government which regards the working people and their organized movement as its chief enemy, while it is common knowledge that the crisis can be ended and the country's problems resolved only with the working people and with their assistance?

If the SP/SDP government follows its political line at the expense of the masses' living conditions, it will meet with the same response and with the same lot as the DA governments: firm resistance on the part of the working people. Such a government will be overthrown by the people's struggle.

The outcome of the elections and the developments since then show that the country is not at all doomed to protracted rule of the right-oriented authorities. Institutional conditions for the formation of a democratic government and pursuit of a democratic policy still exist, and it is a powerful incentive for struggle against the rightist SP/SDP cabinet and for an effective democratic alternative.

1. The Democratic Alliance (DA) was set up in 1979 by the Social Democratic Party, the Social Democratic Center and the People's Monarchist Party. — Ed.

2. See "Portuguese Democrats Score Success" by Luis Sa in WMR No. 4, 1983.

3. In 1980, the SP, LUSD and ISDA constituted the Republican Socialist Front coalition. This time, the SP campaigned independently, entering LUSD and ISDA candidates on its lists as independents.

4. In 1983, the DA coalition as such did not take part in the elections and its formerly constituent right-wing parties went to the polls separately.

5. A leftist party now not represented in parliament.

6. "Useful vote" — a propaganda trick used by the socialists to persuade electors that only a vote for the Socialist Party had any meaning and could have a real effect. — Ed.

7. *Avante!*, May 12, 1983.

8. Trade unions and employers' associations. — Ed.

THE TORIES ONCE AGAIN. WHY?

Gerry Pocock

EC Political Committee member,
CP Great Britain

The June 9 general election in Great Britain was a momentous one that will have far-reaching consequences both in Britain and abroad. In Britain, it means the return to office of the most reactionary government of modern times, committed to policies that cancel most of the post-war gains of the British people in the field of welfare provision, public ownership, and local authority democracy. The trade unions are a particular and prime target. In addition to the legislation adopted in its first term of office that limits trade union ability to conduct effective industrial action, the Thatcher government has already announced measures that interfere in an unprecedented way in the internal democracy and functioning of the trade unions, and seeks to weaken the links between the trade unions and the Labour Party.

In foreign affairs, the election result signals a continuation of the Reagan-Thatcher partnership in continuation of the U.S.-led arms race, virulent anti-Sovietism, opposition to the demands of the developing countries, backing for South Africa and other reactionary regimes.

Thatcher's first act after the election was to fire Foreign Secretary Francis Pym, a man regarded as an old-style Tory and opposed to Thatcher's aggressive style and policies. In his place is a confirmed Thatcherite. The first act of the Minister of Defense was to announce a 10 per cent increase in spending by his department to a record £16 billion. The very next day, the new Chancellor of the Exchequer, Nigel Lawson, was obliged to announce a £500-million spending cut, mainly in health and education.

In its statement on the election result, the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain underlined the seriousness of the attacks being made on living standards, on democratic rights and the trade unions. But, said the statement, resistance to Tory policies can develop over the coming months. Already the fightback is under way and the party "will do all in its power in unity with others on the left to mobilize for this fightback." The great task of the labor movement is to draw in millions of people from all sections of the electorate. Particular attention was drawn to the campaign against the siting of Cruise missiles in Britain, with the aim of the biggest mobilization ever for the national demonstration planned by the peace movement for October 22. The statement said: "Communists will work for this

and for a bigger than ever involvement by the trade unions."

But how is it that the Tories were able to win the election and with such an overwhelming majority of seats (347 out of 650) in spite of all that has happened in the four years since their victory in 1979? Unemployment has risen massively to over 3 million officially, and nearer 5 million in reality, though the Tory 1979 election campaign was based on ending unemployment, and all opinion polls show that unemployment was the main concern of a majority of the electorate. Before going on to deal with this question, which is at the heart of the discussion going on in the labor movement, it is necessary to say something about the actual statistics of the election.

While all the polls predicted a massive Tory majority of seats, and while the Tories themselves talk of a landslide victory, the actual voting figures tell a different story. The total Tory vote actually went down by 700,000, compared with 1979. They were supported by less than half of those voting compared with 43.9 per cent in 1979.

Such is the nature of the first-past-the-post electoral system designed for a situation that existed in the 19th century where there were two parties of MPs in agreement on fundamental questions and competing for office. This system lost its validity once the labor movement sought independent representation and formed the Labour Party in the first years of this century. This majority system means in practice that in any constituency where there are more than two candidates — and that is now the case in the overwhelming number — the winning candidate is likely to have less than half of the votes cast.

In this recent election, the Labour Party totalled 8,461,616 votes, 3,053,020 less than in 1979. The Social Democrat/Liberal Alliance got 7,776,061. But in the distribution of seats the Tories, with 42.4 per cent of the vote, got 61 per cent of the seats, Labour with 27.6 per cent of the vote got 32 per cent of the seats, and the SDP/Liberal Alliance got 24.6 per cent of the vote, but only 4 per cent of the seats.

While an overwhelmingly strong case has been made — once again — for electoral reform, this is unlikely to be achieved without a major campaign. The Tories are opposed to such a campaign, and so is the Labour Party, including most of the left. The SDP/Liberals support reform, and the Communist Party itself has long stood for reform to introduce proportional representation.

While it can be shown therefore that the Tory landslide is more apparent than real and is the

product of a grossly distorting voting system, the question still arises: why was Thatcher able to hold most of the Tory vote and why did the Labour vote go down? These questions have an added importance for the left in the labor movement because the Labour manifesto was by far the most advanced policy document in post-war politics.

Following the defeat of the Callaghan Labour government in 1979, there was greater understanding that election of a Labour government was not, in itself, enough. Somehow the government had to be more responsible to the demands of the labor movement. This at the time was a great advance in understanding and its immediate effect was to make Michael Foot leader of the Labour Party in an election that, for the first time, was not confined just to Labour MPs — traditionally a more right-wing group than the party membership. The electoral college consisted of three parts: the MPs, the local party organizations, and the trade unions. In the election for deputy leader the outstanding representative of the left, Tony Benn, was defeated by the narrowest of margins by Denis Healey from the right of the party. Other changes gave local parties greater opportunities to change their candidates for parliament (as a result of which a number of right-wing MPs were not reselected; it also led to some joining the Social Democratic Party).

The other development in that period was in the field of policy. On vital issues, the Labour Party conference took clear and overwhelming decisions on what a Labour government would do, and these were incorporated in the election manifesto. On all these key issues, the Labour conference was following the lead given by the Trades Union Congress (TUC). These decisive issues were three. First, on disarmament: clear opposition to the Cruise; for cancellation of Britain's independent deterrent, Polaris and the Trident replacement. In total, unilateral nuclear disarmament by Britain to give impetus to multilateral disarmament negotiations; while the policy included the removal of U.S. nuclear bases from Britain, there was specific rejection of a demand for withdrawal from NATO. Secondly, the demand was made for withdrawal from the EEC because of the damaging effect of EEC policies on the economy, the excessive cost of EEC membership, and because the EEC not only undermined British sovereignty but also would be a barrier to Labour's policies for the economy. Thirdly, a range of policy proposals for tackling mass unemployment and the rundown of the economy.

They constituted a series of economic poli-

cies closely interlocked and mutually supportive which together and as an integrated entity was projected as an alternative economic and political strategy. Its central theme was to rapidly achieve an expanding economy through the twin means of increased demand by increasing real wages and social benefits, as well as increases in investment in the public sector by the government itself, and in the private sector via compulsory, or mandatory planning agreements. To ensure that this would not lead to either a resurgence of inflation or insupportable balance of trade deficits, the policy also called for selected import controls, prices regulation as well as strict control of the export of capital and exchange controls.

All these points were in the Labour manifesto. But as the Communist Party pointed out there was a failure on the part of the Labour leadership to fight for the policies. Especially little was done to explain this highly complex alternative economic strategy in a way so that the people could see it as a real alternative, to make them believe in its credibility, and above all practicality in achieving a fairly early drastic reduction in unemployment. Not only that. During the election campaign itself there were deliberate attempts to play down the distinctive points of policy, to re-write policy and to create confusion.

Former Prime Minister James Callaghan was particularly damaging in his attack on disarmament policy. It should be noted that Labour's National Executive has a right-wing majority hostile to these policy demands. While on the question of unemployment, which every opinion poll indicated was the single most important issue worrying the people, the Labour leadership contented itself with a few slogans about reducing unemployment, but totally failed to explain and make its alternative policies credible.

The CPGB Executive Committee statement went on to point out that not only had there been "failure on the part of the Labour leadership fully to support the manifesto policies during the election. These policies had not been presented and campaigned for among the people in the previous four years in the wholehearted way necessary to win conviction in the movement and wider support."

Also on many issues policy was unclear. Firstly, there was confusion on the question of wages restraint, or incomes policy. While a form of words had been found to cover this — national economic assessment — it was not clear what this meant. What was clear was that there was no understanding that wages and

benefits needed to rise.

On defense policy, the Tories and media were able to focus on weaknesses, particularly in claiming that Labour's policy would leave Britain "defenseless." Here it should be noted that while polls have consistently shown a majority against Cruise and against Trident, this is not the case on unilateralism generally.

The election campaign had been marked by a vicious media campaign against Labour. The Labour Party has no newspaper of its own. One of the "popular" monopoly-owned daily papers supports Labour, "but not its policies." The *Morning Star*, the daily newspaper independent of the press lords, which editorially expresses the policy of the Communist Party, is the outstanding exception.

Serious attention has to be paid to the emergence of the Social Democratic Party and Liberal Alliance. The Social Democrats were formed by leading Labour MPs who broke away from the Labour Party in opposition to the left policies mentioned above. They were led by Roy Jenkins, former chairman of the EEC Commission. During the course of the last parliament over 20 MPs, elected as Labour candidates, joined the SDP. The Labour attitude toward this development has been rather dismissive, refusing to take them seriously and believing that the support expressed for them in by-elections and in local council elections would disappear in the heat of a general election. The Communist Party had warned of the danger of this attitude, and emphasized that the SDP was more than a media phenomenon.

The SDP/Liberals based their appeal on the classic argument of being "above class struggle," the middle way between the divisiveness of Labour and Tory. In the election itself, while most of the SDP MPs were defeated, three of the leaders were not and the Alliance as a whole took nearly 8 million votes. During the campaign its leaders made exaggerated claims of what they would win — at one stage saying they would form the government. They won nearly the same number of votes as Labour, and in 300 seats they came second to the Tories. This means a real prospect that in future elections they could win more votes than Labour, and the total of votes they attract could ensure the repeated election of Tory governments.

For all these reasons, the lessons of this election campaign need careful study. An immediate result was the resignation of Michael Foot as leader of the Labour Party, and the process of electing a new leader is already well under way, to be completed at the Labour Party conference in October. There is a clear desire to "jump a generation," a most unusual step for

the Labour Party, and it is most likely that the left candidate will be successful. Established Labour figures such as Denis Healey and Peter Shore have been brushed aside, the most likely victor is Neil Kinnock, 41 years old. This development itself indicates widespread recognition that Labour has a serious and deep-seated problem. What is not yet clearly established is recognition of what the problems are and how they are to be overcome.

Labour lost votes among many of its traditional supporters. Its share of the poll was the lowest since 1918. While this decline did not happen overnight, scarcely any attention has been paid to the reasons for the decline and ways to overcome it. This is partly because till now Labour could reasonably regard itself as likely to win elections, given the nature of the electoral system, even with less than 40 per cent of the vote. This has happened. The 1979 election and Tory policies since have been a rude awakening. Firstly it has been shown that Labour inadequately responded to important changes in the outlook and social situation of millions of workers. On many issues — such as municipal housing, nationalization, law and order — the Tories and SDP were able to exploit real shortcomings and grievances.

There is evidence that the Tories and SDP won considerable numbers of votes even among trade unionists. The Tory demagoguery about trade union bureaucracy or lack of democracy found a response. There was also of course the "Falklands Factor." The atmosphere of fake patriotism, and above all of "firm government" during the Falklands war was successfully used to present Mrs. Thatcher as a courageous and dedicated defender of the rights of the British people. It was that episode that more than any other established the ascendancy of the Prime Minister. In contrast, the failure of the Parliamentary Labour Party to challenge the decision to send the Task Force gave credence to the Tory argument that it was the only honorable course open to the British government.

The labor movement did not succeed in building sufficiently strong alliances with movements and forces outside its own organizations, such as the women's, young people's, environmental, and ethnic minorities' movements. Thus the potential strength of all those adversely affected by the government's policies was never fully mobilized.

The Labour leadership did not identify the crucial issue of stopping Cruise and Trident as being decisive to their defense policy. The statements of the right wing, and of Callaghan in particular, alongside the failure of the

leadership to conduct a united fight for the non-nuclear peace policy of the manifesto, allowed Tory propaganda against unilateral nuclear disarmament to confuse and influence millions of voters.

The experience of millions of workers under the right-wing Wilson-Callaghan governments, and their resulting disillusionment with Labour, made it difficult to convince them that another Labour government would act differently from its predecessors. This is especially true in relation to incomes policy. It was right-wing policies and leadership that were primarily responsible for the drop in individual membership of the Labour Party throughout the post-war years, the weakening of support for socialist ideas and values among large numbers of people and the Tory general election victories of 1979 and 1983.

The right wing were preoccupied with defeating the left in the labor movement, rather than being concerned with defeating the Tories.

Faced with this challenge, the left was to some degree inevitably forced to concentrate on the fight to win left policies and positions of leadership within the movement. Unfortunately this internal struggle often seemed to take precedence over the need to conduct the political and ideological battle among the masses of the people, and notably within the organization of the labor movement. All of this explains why mass support had not been won for these policies.

Thus, the left-wing forces are faced with the need to learn a serious lesson: not only is the capability of producing in-depth formulations of policy on a wide range of problems important, but also the skill to carry this policy with the full force of conviction to the people.

In this election, the Communist Party contested 35 seats, 3 less than in 1979. At the present level of voting for communist candidates, there is no prospect of a communist MP being elected. This is partly to do with the electoral system, but this is by no means the only factor. Apart from the system's bias against "third" candidates, mentioned above, it is quite impossible for the Communist Party to contest every constituency, or even a majority because of resources, including being able to meet the heavy cost (in British elections each candidate has to put up a deposit of £150, to be forfeited if they receive less than 12 per cent of the vote cast in the constituency). There is now a proposal being considered that this already severe barrier be increased to £1,000.

However, the view of the Communist Party Executive is that there were far too few

communist candidates and that this affects the credibility of the party as an electoral force. On this occasion we also felt more strongly than ever the view from potential communist voters that the all important question was to vote Labour, and against the Tories. Thus while our votes were low, the experience in most of our campaigns was of a great willingness to discuss issues, to show an interest in communist policies. This was reflected, too, in the sales of the *Morning Star*, and the interest shown in the Communist Party Election Manifesto. Around the general slogan, "Jobs, Not Bombs," our party put forward a comprehensive program to tackle Britain's crisis. It made clear our commitment to disarmament, including withdrawal from NATO and the scrapping of Britain's independent nuclear deterrent. The first point, of course, was complete opposition to the Cruise. On the economy, we called for a big increase in public and private investment, expansion of the purchasing power of the people, opposition to any form of incomes policy, and withdrawal from the European Economic Community.

Also of particular note was the communists' demand for a democratic solution for Northern Ireland. Our call was for a fully representative assembly to replace direct rule controlled by a Bill of Rights and with financial power and resources to tackle the problems. Coupled with an end to repressive legislation and actions, the aim would be to overcome the sectarian divisions in Northern Ireland. In this respect, we condemned the British state's repression and its toleration of unionist violence, both of which help create the condition in which the bombing campaigns of the IRA take place. We condemn these campaigns. Apart from the deaths and injuries caused, these campaigns are obstacles to uniting the people of Northern Ireland and alienate support in Britain. But central to our policy on Northern Ireland is recognition that the crisis stems from the continuation of British imperialism's grip on the country. In our view, Britain should renounce all claims to Irish territory and support the right of the Irish people to decide their own future.

There will be no quick and easy answer to the Tories' electoral victory and the factors that gave rise to it, but already in the few months since the general elections the nature of the renewed Tory offensive is clear. The Labour movement conference in the autumn — the TUC and the Labour Party — will already show how the movement is responding to the Tories.

The Communist Party itself has now started preparations for its own congress in November where discussion will take place around the

theme "The General Election and the Challenge Facing the Labor Movement." There is no doubt that critical struggles lie ahead on peace and the campaign against the Cruise, on unem-

ployment and the problems of the economy, on the social-public services, and many other issues which agitate the working class and all the other working people in the country.

Non-alignment: trends and orientations

Sarada Mitra
National Council member,
Communist Party of India,
WMR Editorial Board member

Rustem Sevortyan
WMR staff member

Six months have passed since the non-aligned movement had its latest summit, namely, its seventh conference. The impact of the conference decisions is seen in the new coordinated international actions taken by participants in the movement. The program adopted at the Delhi forum to further the struggle for peace, disarmament and détente and against colonialist, neocolonialist and racist practices continues to serve many governments and liberation movements as a guideline and is consulted time and again by statesmen and the general public.

During the past months the group of non-aligned countries has taken a resolute common stand through the UN on the Namibian and Cyprus problems. The sixth UNCTAD conference this summer re-emphasized the decisive importance of radically restructuring economic relations between the developing countries and the capitalist world and indicated ways and means of doing it.

The program approved at Delhi is thus being implemented. Therefore, it is fair to return to the results of the summit and analyze the movement's present stage from the point of view of the long-term guidelines adopted at Delhi.

Solidarity with the global anti-war protest

The closer the link between the liberation process and the worldwide movement against the threat of war, the more effective the collective actions aimed at curbing imperialist claims to world supremacy, which are so dangerous in this nuclear age. The Seventh Conference of the Heads of State and Government of Non-Aligned Countries showed again that today attention all over the planet is focused on the destiny of world peace. In Asia, Africa and

Latin America, imperialism's war preparations are seen as a twin threat to world peace and to national freedom won at the price of hard battles.

The Delhi forum revealed the movement's deep concern about growing international tension, its relentless extension to the whole world and the fact that more and more developing countries are being pressured and blackmailed by imperialist reaction. The overwhelming majority of non-aligned countries refuse to view the peoples' struggle for independence and human dignity in the context of an "East-West confrontation." They condemn the resurgence of the cold war, which, the final declaration of the conference says, is accompanied by "competition for spheres of influence, domination and exploitation in more and more parts of the world." Even though this part of the declaration fails to name the direct makers of the militarist policy of expansion,¹ there is hardly any doubt about who is meant: it denounces the notorious "sphere of vital interests" policy and propaganda and the attempts to drag non-aligned countries into the orbit of imperialist bloc strategy. This line is associated primarily with Reagan's campaign against détente, which embodies the aspirations of the peace-loving peoples of the globe.

The present stage of the non-aligned movement is characterized by an increasingly close link with the worldwide movement against war. Non-aligned and socialist countries are cooperating on the international scene to curb the imperialists' acts of aggression and frustrate their plans. Both groups of countries are agreed or take a similar stand on key issues, such as the Middle East, southern Africa, imperialism's military alliances and bases, criticism of the concept of "limited nuclear war" and so on.

Non-aligned countries today deeply appreciate the anti-missile actions of the peoples. There is a trend toward close coordination of the peace efforts of the developing countries themselves, which finds vivid expression in the United Nations. These countries are in the majority in that body and account for more than half of the membership of the present Security Council (8 of 15). Their concern for making UN decisions effective is justified, for they participate in drafting proposals on the most pressing problems.

Since its seventh conference, the movement has often been called "history's biggest peace movement." This was how Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India, now chairman of the movement after Cuba, put it, underscoring the immense scope of peaceful aspirations. All the more significant, then, is the effectiveness of initiatives by developing countries to build up international security.

The movement has launched many initiatives of this nature, such as the call for the creation of peace zones in many regions of the world. It regards peace zones as not only a factor in curbing imperialism's intrigues and putting an end to its military presence in Asian, African and Latin American countries but also as a prerequisite of solving the colossal constructive problems of developing countries and an indispensable condition for consolidating their national independence.

It was obvious at the Delhi forum that a constructive, realistic approach to problems of war and peace cannot prevail without difficulty due to sharp ideological, political and class differences within the movement. Delegates were particularly interested in the discussion of security problems directly agitating dozens of countries washed by the Indian Ocean. Many of the speakers in the conference's Political Commission wanted the U.S. nuclear base at Diego Garcia to be mentioned in the final declaration, in the paragraph on the Indian Ocean. But there were some who objected to this or, indeed, to any condemnation of U.S. policy.

What was the outcome of the debate? In the view of K. Subrahmanyam, an authoritative Indian scholar, the approach to the problems of the Indian Ocean adopted by the conference is couched in more emphatic terms than in the original draft of the final document.² While Diego Garcia was dropped from the paragraph we have mentioned, it is referred to in the very next paragraph explicitly recognizing Mauritian sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago, including the island seized by imperialists. The same paragraph says that the base there is a threat to the countries situated in the region. It

mentions the Indian Ocean with deep concern, pointing to the impermissibility of the preservation of foreign military bases there and to other acts hostile to liberation forces.

Experience has shown that despite the great diversity of postures, the movement is at one on basic issues, which it approaches from an anti-imperialist, constructive standpoint similar in the main to that of the other peace forces of the world.

Components of the anti-imperialist potential

The interpretation of the Delhi forum's main results is still in the focus of a sharp ideological controversy.

Those who followed the Delhi meeting were hardly surprised when Romberg, a spokesman of the U.S. State Department, said that the political section of the final declaration was "unbalanced" and "polemical" and that the declaration "does not reflect the principles of non-alignment which the movement proclaims."³ What the State Department resented was that the USA came under "attack" at the conference while the Soviet Union did not. In other words, it saw this as a violation of the notorious "equidistance" which imperialism has been arrogantly demanding of the movement for years.⁴

However, despite external pressures and the attempts of some countries in the movement to divert it from its anti-imperialist orientation, its chief, decisive trend remains anti-imperialist. An important reason for this is the present alignment of forces in the movement itself. To quote the Indian newspaper *Patriot*, there are "three main segments" in the movement. First there are socialist countries, such as Cuba and Vietnam, then come countries with a left orientation, and lastly, countries that have embarked on a path of independent economic development, such as India, Algeria and Syria. All these countries constitute the hard core of the movement and their strength is around one-third of the total membership. Next come about 50 countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia which know by bitter experience that their aspiration to rebuild their economies "inevitably bring them into conflict with imperialism, particularly the American variety." *Patriot* also names a group of countries with economic and military links to the USA, including countries that more or less share this orientation.⁵

The movement's approach to the most diverse problems, from regional to global, is unquestionably influenced by progressive, anti-imperialist states. The demands of these states leave their imprint on the decisions taken by the movement today on burning issues, such

as the situation in the Middle East, southern Africa, war-torn Chad, Central America and the Caribbean.

Another objective factor radicalizing anti-imperialist actions of the movement is external. Imperialism is hardening its stand on every issue, whether it is the abolition of the last seats of racist-colonialist rule or the deprivation of Argentina of its legitimate title to the Malvinas Islands, which belong to it. The independence and sovereignty of many countries that have won freedom are under threat — U.S. imperialism and its NATO allies often ignore them. Hence the strong desire of the majority of non-aligned countries to unite on an anti-colonialist, anti-imperialist basis. As for countries that do not like the idea, they, too, have to reckon with the predominant view. It is safe to say that there is an anti-imperialist, anti-racist consensus in the movement on key problems, such as Palestine, the abolition of racist rule in southern Africa, the liberation of Namibia, and an end to foreign interference and to imperialist acts of aggression against Latin American countries.

The Delhi forum emphatically rejected an approach which certain countries, taking their cue from the imperialists and hegemonist forces, have been trying to impose on the movement for some years past by bringing up the so-called Afghan and Kampuchean "questions." Despite their attempts, the seventh conference provided new opportunities for dialogue, agreement and a search for ways out of complicated situations. The non-aligned countries are closely following the mediation efforts of the UN Secretary-General to settle problems involving Afghanistan; they approve of the steps being taken to this end. The policy of boycotting the lawful Afghan government shows signs of failure.

There is evidence of yet another development. Referring to the results of the voting on Kampuchean representation in the UN, K. Subrahmanyam writes that at the seventh conference 21 countries that had earlier voted in the UN for the Pol Pot clique preferred to withhold comment on the "Kampuchean question." The reason is, he believes, that in the UN this or that developing country may come under pressure — for which there is the "watchful eye" of the U.S. representative.⁶ The bourgeois press has written more than once about the methods used by guardians of U.S. imperialist interests: first arm-twisting to arouse "self-interest" and then a broad hint making clear that the cost of voting at cross-purposes with the USA is high.⁷

The situation is different where the non-aligned countries proceed as a close-knit group

within their movement. In that case it is easier for them to resist external pressure and diktat even when there are those among them who are eager to promote imperialist designs. It is the movement's unity that wins it the sympathy of those developing countries that have yet to break out of the orbit of imperialist influence. For them, non-alignment is the alternative enabling them to free themselves from this remorseless foreign grip, pursue an independent policy on the international scene, and put an end to the more obvious manifestations of neocolonialist domination.

Accents on an economic program

The diminution of the per capita gross domestic product registered by many non-aligned and other developing nations for the first time since they won independence strikingly illustrates the unprecedented acuteness of the economic problems facing these nations today. The economic situation on this periphery of the capitalist economy is grim indeed.

The prices of most of the raw materials traditionally exported by these countries have dropped to the lowest level for the past 50 years. Monopoly pressure on oil-producing countries is mounting. The aim is to make them cut oil prices. The external payments deficit of the developing nations (with the exception of the main oil exporters) has soared over the past two years alone to a total exceeding 180 billion dollars.⁸ Imperialism has greatly increased its exploitation of these countries, taking advantage of their foreign debt. This debt has reached an unprecedented high — over 600 billion dollars — the lion's share of it coming from loans and credits obtained from Western private banks and companies on so-called market terms at a 20 per cent bank rate. In 1981 and 1982 the developing countries paid over 158 billion dollars in repaying external debts, including more than 66 billion dollars in interest (according to incomplete data).⁹ Besides, transnationals took out 16.5 billion dollars in profits.¹⁰ These payments swallowed over one-fourth of the developing countries' total of export earnings.¹¹

Alden W. Clausen, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, is troubled by the fact that the past two years have seen as many developing countries ask for a deferment of payment of their debt as over the past 25 years.¹²

"... Developing countries' own payments of interest and principal," says Pakistan's Finance Minister, Ghulam Ishaq Khan, "are increasingly financing the so-called new assistance ... We must seriously review whether this is either

a fair or lasting system."¹³

We have purposely given the views of persons who cannot be described as left-wing or progressive. Pronouncements of this kind probably mirror the general mood in the non-aligned movement. Indignation against the imperialist policy of exploitation and economic discrimination is expressed in sharper terms than ever.

At a press briefing in Delhi the Prime Minister of Grenada, Maurice Bishop, said that more and more countries — left, center and right — come up increasingly against identical economic problems. He was right for two reasons: first, because imperialism is putting the burden of crisis on developing countries, and second, because there are economic difficulties common to this part of the globe and to cope with them, the countries concerned must show solidarity, act in coordinated fashion and form a united front for a radical restructuring of international economic relations on a fair basis.

A large and influential group of non-aligned countries shows the greatest consistency in taking a stand against the imperialist policy of strength and diktat in the economic sphere, against unequal trade, for curbs on the selfish activities of transnationals, for a stabilized raw materials market, against "technological" imperialism, for a radical restructuring of the existing capitalist monetary and financial system. It puts the emphasis on the need for global negotiations proposed within the framework of the UN by the sixth (Havana) conference of the movement. An important anti-imperialist move of the non-aligned countries is the demand for the convocation of a world monetary and financial conference to promote development. There are increasingly strong demands for a thorough revision of the system of functioning of the IMF and other capitalist international financial organizations controlled by U.S. capital. During the Delhi meeting it was proposed that the movement set up a "Watch-Dog Committee" to watch over their operations.¹⁴

However, there is also a different response to the problems generated by the exacerbated crisis. The official positions of Pakistan, Jamaica and some other countries betray a tendency toward moderation, with the chief emphasis on some issues brooking no delay, to the detriment of long-term problems (that is, those of radically restructuring the system of unequal economic relations). Here, for instance, is what President Mohammad Zia-ul-Haq of Pakistan said at Delhi: "The North cannot win its battle for economic revival, and the South its battle for economic survival, through mutual con-

frontation . . . The time has come that we replace recriminations with a call for reconciliation . . . We must act, and act decisively and speedily. Let us, therefore, attempt to move forward, *taking up less complex and more tractable issues* (our italics. — The Authors) with the industrialized countries, and proceeding gradually, but confidently, toward the more complicated and intractable ones."

The tendency to "appease" the capitalist "North" by ignoring or rejecting demands for which the imperialist powers have a particular distaste (global negotiations, a radical reform of the IMF, etc.) suits these powers well. Revealingly, the USA is trying to persuade the developing nations that a "pragmatic" approach, or tackling "less complex and more tractable issues," would be more useful. The bourgeois press presents with a good deal of fanfare every step toward increasing the IMF's credit resources and the Reagan administration plan to raise the bank's dollar quota. However, it says nothing about the fact that these measures are not at all prompted by a desire to ease the plight of developing countries indebted to capitalist creditors but by the hope of patching up somehow the backfiring mechanism of the capitalist economy and come out of the "danger zone" of new monetary and financial crises threatening that economy, thereby rescuing the investments of U.S. banks, which account for half of all the private loans and credits granted to these countries.

It is also noteworthy that the "pragmatic" line has been given pride of place in the present recommendations of the Independent Commission for International Development headed by Willy Brandt. The philosophy of its first report,¹⁵ claiming that the countries of the "North" and the "South" have "common" interests, led its authors to identify the interests of the victims of the crisis — the developing nations — with those of the capitalist powers. The Commission's new report is entitled "Common Crisis North-South: Cooperation for World Recovery."¹⁶ It underscores the need for a series of pressing measures supposedly designed to bring relief to the world economy. The idea is to increase the IMF's credit resources once again, offer economic and financial "first aid" to the developing countries hit by the crisis hardest of all, and so on. However, the keynote of the report is the effort to prove the alleged need to encourage in every way private investment in developing countries and safeguard the interests of private banks. This must be why it fails to concern itself in reasonable detail with the problem of curbing the diktat of international banks, which is what many new states

demand more and more emphatically. The issue of a radical restructuring of international economic relations has been shelved indefinitely.

The non-aligned movement at this stage proceeds from the need for an active, flexible and realistic line in the economic struggle against imperialism. Nothing comes of attempts to impose upon it recipes leaving out long-term, strategic aims. The prevailing approach stresses that priority must be given to global negotiations. The Delhi meeting proposed a detailed program for immediate steps in areas of international economic relations that are of key importance for the developing nations. What sets the program far apart from "pragmatic" recommendations giving priority to "common" interests and the need to "reconcile" the interests of international capital with those of oppressed countries hit by the effects of the crisis, is that urgent measures in the area of trade, raw materials, development, monetary and financial relations are approached by non-aligned countries from the standpoint of their serving national independence and economic progress.

The movement is loyal to its chosen course of collective self-reliance, or of promoting all-round economic cooperation among the non-aligned nations themselves. This cooperation is making headway despite the inherited bond of the economies concerned to the markets of capitalist Europe, the USA and Japan. During the past decade, trade between developing countries has increased from 3.2 to 7.1 per cent. The share of manufactured goods is growing steadily (25 per cent in 1955, 60 per cent in 1980).¹⁷ To give a further impetus to mutual economic relations, it is planned to hasten the formation of some new institutions of the movement (the Center for Information on Transnational Corporations in Havana, the Center for Science and Technology in Delhi, and others), and coordinate the movement's plans for collective self-reliance more closely. The Economic Declaration of the seventh conference says: "Subregional, regional and inter-regional cooperation among 'non-aligned and other' developing countries should be promoted as an essential element in the restructuring of international economic relations."

In characterizing the movement's economic program for the 1980s, it must be said that, despite the imperialists' calculations and complicated economic realities of the recent years, the program has lost none of the thrust that has marked it ever since the developing countries dramatically stepped up their struggle for economic independence. To this day the main ob-

ject of the battles on the economic front is to bring about a profound democratic restructuring of economic relations with the capitalist world. In fact, the concept of "North-South dialogue," which has gained wide currency, implies a most bitter struggle between former colonies or semi-colonies and imperialism.

Every attempt to identify the socialist countries with the "North" (not geographically but politically) is either a deliberate distortion of the actual situation, that is, of the class nature of the "dialogue," or the ignoring of the fact that the relations between socialist and developing countries are of entirely different nature. Economic cooperation between them is free of antagonism and directed against imperialism. It is a dialogue but dialogue between equals offering more and more new opportunities for trade, increased credits, the development of scientific and technological relations and so on.¹⁸

This is more than can be said about the "dialogue" between the capitalist "North" and the "South."

Factors of influence and strength

WMR has already called attention to the attitude of the imperialist powers to key issues linked with the efforts of developing countries toward restructuring international economic relations. An analytical survey published a year ago pointed out why the "North-South dialogue" was not getting off the ground and what was preventing the start of global negotiations.¹⁹ The conclusions offered in the survey tally with many of the non-aligned movement's assessments on these issues.

Indeed, little has changed in the past year. Whereas the Versailles declaration of seven leading capitalist powers (1982)²⁰ contained some rhetoric about the need for global negotiations, the new, Williamsburg, declaration of the "Seven" (May-June 1983) says not a word about it. Washington persists in its negative, obstructionist attitude to global negotiations. Nevertheless, displaying miraculous "flexibility," Reagan made out the USA to be entirely agreeable to the prospect of such negotiations. This was one of the purposes of his letter to the President of Bangladesh, General Hossain Mohammad Ershad, as the leader of the country that is currently the chairman of the Group of 77.²¹ But his curtsies misled few people. Judging from press reports, his letter is evidence of the opposite; it repeats the well-known American no-change posture regarding "mandatory institutions" (IMF, IBRD, and others) and the practices introduced by imperialism.²² The USA intends to go on resist-

ing any steps, especially of an institutional character, threatening to erode the post-1945 levers of capitalism's financial system.

The seventh conference's final declaration says that global negotiations are obstructed by "a few industrialized countries, in particular one major industrial country" (our italics. — *The Authors*). Anyone who knows the euphemisms often used in documents adopted by consensus will readily guess that the declaration is alluding to the USA.

Capitalist Europe is likewise far from taking a constructive approach to the "dialogue." On the contrary, Western Europe, which is supposed to promote "enlightened" neocolonialist ideas, is hardening its posture from year to year. This is exemplified by the EEC's links with African, Caribbean and Pacific countries formalized in the Lome conventions (ACP countries).²³ The EEC cuts the funds promised by it for the stabilization of the prices of the "South's" output and has raised still higher protectionist barriers. The share of ACP exports in West European markets dropped from 8.2 per cent in 1972 to 5 per cent in 1981.²⁴ Recently the EEC denied them a loan of 450 million dollars to stabilize export earnings. The Fijian Foreign Minister compares the EEC's present attitude with an impenetrable "brick wall."²⁵

The results of the sixth UNCTAD session (July 1983) indicate that the USA and its closest allies — Britain and the FRG — took a most tough stand on both the short-term and long-term demands of the developing countries. The U.S. delegate simply dissociated from the final declaration of the meeting, claiming that it was "one-sided" and showed an "ideological" bias.

Economic aggression against developing countries, illegal commercial and economic sanctions, curbs, bans and other devices have become part and parcel of imperialist policy. The vast majority of non-aligned countries are aware of this threat. These practices are condemned in the UNCTAD VI resolution rejecting economic coercion. The resolution was tabled by the Group of 77 in connection with U.S. economic sanctions against Nicaragua. In defending their national interests, the developing nations do not overlook the fact that U.S. imperialism is arming to the teeth, seeking to upset the global military-strategic balance, and trying to spread the arms race to outer space in an insane bid to dominate the world, including the developing countries.

At the seventh conference the leader of socialist Cuba, Fidel Castro, spoke of what Washington's militaristic policy means for the

peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America. "I often wonder," he said, "why does the United States arm itself beyond all limits, beyond all rational requirements, beyond all logic? . . . Why does it establish new rapid deployment forces? Why does it seek for and set up new military bases in all continents? Why does it create arsenals in every possible place? Why does it exert pressure on its allies among the industrial capitalist countries, which also participate in the exploitation of the Third World, for them to increase military spending and arm themselves to the teeth? Is it only to fight their adversaries — the Warsaw Treaty countries? Or is it that imperialism . . . is preparing itself militarily to impose Yankee order and peace, and with its soldiers' bayonets, the guns of its battleships and the bombs of its planes to secure indispensable oil and other raw materials?"

"This enormous build-up of conventional armaments is directly aimed against the Third World . . ."

What, then, are the main sources from which the non-aligned movement draws its strength in the context of the realities of the 1980s? In pondering this, one inevitably comes to the conclusion that the movement's potential is determined by something more than the number of its members. Today there are 101 full members plus 29 countries with observer status. The important thing, however, is something else: the movement's membership is growing because there are more and more countries which are brought into the anti-colonialist, anti-imperialist struggle by the logic of contemporary development and which identify it with non-alignment. The influx of new liberation forces is most tangible in Latin America. A growing number of governments and political circles of the region are striving to link their destiny with the movement in order to defend their national interests more effectively, break out of the orbit of foreign influence, and evolve Latin American solutions to Latin American problems. The role of progressive states in the movement is increasing. By consistently championing the unity of the movement, they are doing much to influence the course of world events in a positive sense.

Solidarity is a tested source of growing influence for any progressive movement. There are too many things linking the peoples of former colonies to other revolutionary, democratic liberation forces of the world for this fundamental factor to be ignored on the plea of "equidistance" or any other pretext. The movement has many allies among the progressive and democratic public in capitalist countries. It is also winning more supporters in

developing countries whose peoples are burdened by military, political and economic dependence on imperialism and seek an independent foreign policy, which they identify with non-alignment.

The fact that the developing countries and the socialist countries are drawing closer together is a result of the operation of objective laws of history. Socialism was the first to strike at an unequal, oppressive system of international relations. Inspired by its example, peoples languishing under a foreign yoke rose to fight. Colonialism fell. But it left the newly-free states a legacy of formidable problems which they must solve if they are to end their enormous social, economic and cultural lag. Of course, the solution of these problems depends chiefly on the peoples of the countries concerned, on the right choice of their development path. However, solidarity and varied assistance from the socialist world are invaluable in this respect. The socialist world comes out as both the most consistent champion of international relations based on sound principles and a growing powerful economic force helping the developing nations stand firm on their feet.

The very logic of the non-aligned movement calls for strengthening its unity with all the forces of peace, progress and social justice. This is the only way in which the movement can maintain and consolidate its position as a serious positive independent factor on the world scene.

1. The vagueness of some formulations of the non-aligned movement's documents is due to the fact that these are adopted by consensus, which means taking into account the most diverse, occasionally opposed views.

2. See K. Subrahmanyam, "Desolate Prophets of Doom," *The Times of India*, March 16, 1983. K. Subrahmanyam is director of the Indian Institute of Defense Studies and Analysis. At the seventh conference he was an official adviser to the Indian delegation.

3. *The Times of India*, March 16, 1983.

4. See Sarada Mitra, "Non-Alignment Today: A Time of Responsible Decisions," *WMR*, No. 2, 1983.

5. V.D. Chopra, "NAM: Friends and Foes," *Patriot*, March 14, 1983.

6. See *The Times of India*, March 16, 1983.

7. See *U.S. News & World Report*, November 1, 1982, p. 25.

8. UNCTAD/TDR/2 (Vol. II), July 28, 1982. Trade and Development Report, 1982, p. 19.

9. *Ibid.*

10. *Ibid.*

11. *Ibid.*

12. Alden W. Clausen, "Recovery: Remembering the Poorest Countries," *International Herald Tribune*, April 16-17, 1983.

13. *Far Eastern Economic Review*, September 17, 1982, p. 72.

14. A consistently anti-imperialist program for restructuring international economic relations was set out

by the leader of socialist Cuba in his report and speech to the seventh conference.

15. *North-South: A Program for Survival*, London, 1980.

16. *Common Crisis North-South: Cooperation for World Recovery. The Brandt Commission 1983*, London, 1983.

17. *Global Negotiations: A Pragmatic Approach. A Monograph*, New Delhi, 1983, p. 33.

18. Developing nations now account for 12 per cent of the foreign trade of members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. The credits extended to these nations for social and economic development by the CMEA states were more than doubled in the 1970s. The Soviet Union has lifted all customs barriers to goods imported from them and similar measures have been adopted by other countries of the socialist community.

19. See "Behind the Ups and Downs of the 'North-South' Dialogue," *WMR*, No. 8, 1982.

20. The Versailles declaration says that global negotiations are a major political aim, but sets terms that totally eliminate the very possibility of a real dialogue (guarantees against any interference by developing nations in the operations of international financial institutions).

21. The group now comprises about 130 developing countries.

22. See *The Times of India*, March 11, 1983.

23. Trade and economic agreement signed by the EEC in Lome, Togo, with 61 developing countries of the regions mentioned above.

24. *New African*, April 1983, p. 28.

25. See *International Herald Tribune*, May 20, 1983.

PRISMA

Now available in English

An unparalleled source of information and analysis on the developing countries, the non-aligned movement and liberation struggles throughout the world.

Prisma comes in the easy to read magazine style of North American popular journals, with photos, cartoons and the well known Cuban graphics.

Prisma is published monthly and is available in English and Spanish for \$1.75 from your local bookstore. Subscription information available from Progress Books, 71 Bathurst St., Toronto, Canada M5V 2P6.

Rejecting false impartiality

Johannes Pakaslahti
General Secretary,
Peace Supporters of Finland

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT

Washington's stake on a policy of strength has greatly increased the danger of nuclear war. Millions have risen to fight this threat and the anti-war movement may now be described with good reason as global. It has moved into the limelight in many capitalist countries and become a serious factor which their governments cannot discount in making political decisions.

For nearly four years now, the anti-war movement has been spearheaded against the NATO decision adopted under U.S. pressure to deploy new U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe. The Reagan administration's attempts to upset by means of these missiles the approximate strategic parity between the North Atlantic bloc and the Warsaw Treaty Organization is imperilling world peace, affecting even countries outside military alliances, like Finland. This is why the general public in our country as well has joined in a vigorous campaign against Euromissiles.

The peace movement today is marked by closer cooperation among its components on the principle of complete equality and by a revival of the dialogue between them. This, in turn, explains their effort to formulate in more specific terms the objectives making for unity and to give them priority in all their anti-war activities. However, this effort cannot succeed unless likely differences in the peace supporters' social, political and ideological positions are respected. What this means in practice is that in estimating new developments and new working methods, the participants in the peace movement should show circumspection, flexibility and tact.

In addition to common tasks, peace supporters have tasks arising from the distinctive realities of their countries. Besides, diverse currents may have dissimilar notions as to which problems are particularly important at present and in the long run and how best to contribute to their solution. It is with due regard to this that we would like to examine the fundamental principles on which the organization known as

Peace Supporters of Finland (PSF) has been carrying on its work.

Our main goal is perfectly clear; we want to bring about in common with other peace movements of Europe and the world a reversal of the NATO decision on missiles. This would help head off the impending threat of war and ease tensions on a continent that has become an international nerve center. Success in this matter could mark an important advance to substantive disarmament measures. PSF also has some other aims. The fundamental one among these is implementation of the proposal for a non-nuclear Northern Europe advanced by President Kekkonen.¹

There is no doubt that we can set ourselves such far-reaching goals. Our organization is an influential social force and has become stronger and much more active of late, as the following examples show.

When, in 1982, a campaign for a non-nuclear zone in Northern Europe was launched in the Scandinavian countries, over a million signatures were collected in Finland. It is indicative that more than two-thirds of the signatures were collected by members of our organization. PSF has to its credit large-scale participation in preparations for demonstrations during Disarmament Action Week in the autumn of 1982. The demonstrations were the most powerful peace action in Finnish history; they took place in more than 80 urban centers and involved over 100,000 participants. Last May, during the Spring of Peace and Hope campaign against the war menace and for disarmament, tens of thousands of people from all over Finland arrived in Helsinki to join in action. Demonstrators clasped hands and formed a human chain linking together the embassies of the countries which had participated in the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. This symbolized good-neighborliness and a desire for peace among nations.

Our branches whose number now exceeds 80, comprise political parties, youth and students' organizations, trade unions and other social forces. PSF encompasses virtually all the main social sectors. The composition of its

leading body is another proof of the representative character of our organization. The Board includes noted non-party leaders, cabinet members, MPs, authoritative spokesmen of the Center Party and the Finnish People's Democratic League, social democrats and communists.

We are prompted by the foreign policy for peace announced and fruitfully implemented by President Juho Kusti Paasikivi and President Urho Kaleva Kekkonen, a policy which Mauno Koivisto, the present head of state, has been following. We are certain that Finland is anything but neutral on the issue of war and peace. It always takes a stand for peace and against war. Surely it is impermissible to stay neutral at a historical junction where the very existence of humankind is in jeopardy. We therefore see our paramount task in working for a more active Finnish foreign policy toward peace and disarmament and in giving Finland's peace policy nation-wide support.

It was in this spirit that our organization held its conference last spring. The conference appeal to those active in the movement to contribute to the effort for disarmament and international understanding and join in mass demonstrations in Finland against war as well as in Peace March 83 from Oslo to Washington found response among thousands upon thousands.

The unity of our movement is a very important achievement. PSF has passed the test of time, including the cold war years, and preserved its solidity. Lately we have been faced with a change in both the quantitative and qualitative dimensions of the anti-war fight. As elsewhere, new peace groups expressing the particular positions of various social or professional sectors have sprung up in Finland. There is, for instance, the Non-Nuclear Zone for the North Now movement in which young people are prominent. We also have organizations of doctors, journalists, lawyers, engineers and members of other professions. Women show a high degree of militancy.

Along with active peace forces, however, there are others that have always taken an entirely negative view of our ideas and goals. They are now out to undermine the movement from within, to restrict the possibilities of joint action against war.

They are trying, for example, to impose the concept of an "impartial" anti-war movement. We show time and again that acceptance of this approach would make it difficult to see the roots of the war danger posed by the present international situation, mislead peace supporters and doom them to passivity. After all,

the advocates of "impartiality" extend it not only to any disarmament proposal but to the arms race. It is from this standpoint that those who have refused to join in the Spring of Peace and Hope campaign criticized its sponsors for the decision to send a protest telegram to the NATO Council meeting that was just discussing the decision on Euromissiles.

Professor Reijo Wilenius, Chairman of the PSF Board, answered the proponents of "impartiality" very aptly. "We are being criticized," he wrote, "because we direct our demands to the West rather than the East. Yet there is a reason for this tendency." We may add that it is determined by the source of the real danger threatening our security and our very lives.

Carrying forward this idea, we can say that PSF is truly impartial. We apply objective criteria in assessing forces active on the world scene, in analyzing the cause and effect of their political and military strategic decisions as well as other factors influencing the international situation. This approach gives us a better insight into the aims and policies of the Soviet Union and the United States and enables us to ascertain whose policy is making for international détente and whose for greater tension. This is a really impartial approach helping tell friends of peace from its foes.

Our critics see another criterion of "impartiality" in keeping "equidistant from the great powers." But this view proves untenable as soon as we stop to think of the substance of the Geneva talks on medium-range missiles in Europe. The Soviet Union at Geneva proposes specific steps to limit the arms race in this sphere and to cut armaments, whereas the United States rejects all realistic proposals because it wants the Soviet Union to disarm unilaterally and is trying to clear the decks for a first strike at WTO countries.

We proceed from the need to support what may serve as an alternative in the present dangerous situation and are ready to back any useful peace initiative and any measure in favor of détente, no matter whom they come from. This is demonstrated by our unqualified approval of the idea of a non-nuclear Northern Europe or the plan for a zone free of battlefield nuclear weapons in Central Europe proposed by Prime Minister Olof Palme of Sweden. We consider that the Soviet position really offers a solution for the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe. However, it would be naive to expect us to accept Reagan's "zero" or "intermediate" option, which we regard with every reason as a U.S. attempt to win military superiority.

The indefensibility of the principle of "impartiality" is confirmed by the entirely different results of the message of some Finnish public organizations to the Soviet leadership and the U.S. administration on disarmament and the role of anti-war movements. This action was part of the Spring of Peace and Hope campaign.

The Soviet side replied in specific and perfectly clear terms. "The mass anti-war movements are an important factor benefiting peace," Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, wrote after setting out in detail the Soviet attitude to major aspects of disarmament and international development. "Statesmen and governments cannot but reckon with this movement if they value the opinion of their peoples. And in this sense the peace movement undoubtedly has an effect on the arms limitation talks."

Yuri Andropov also touched in his reply on a subject of crucial importance to the Finnish people, namely, that of creating a non-nuclear zone in our region. The General Secretary of the CC CPSU said that the Soviet Union supports the idea without qualification and reaffirmed his country's readiness to commit itself by treaty not to use nuclear weapons against Nordic countries included in the zone. Furthermore, in response to the wish expressed by some Scandinavian countries, the Soviet government would also be willing to consider certain important measures with regard to its own territory adjoining the zone, measures that would help consolidate the non-nuclear status of Northern Europe. Lastly, Yuri Andropov supported in principle the Swedish government's proposal to establish in Central Europe a zone free of battlefield nuclear weapons. "I am convinced," he wrote, "that the implementation of the above proposals on non-nuclear zones would help to rid the whole of Europe of nuclear weapons in the future."²

It was only natural that the peace forces of Finland fully appreciate and approve of this position, stated, moreover, in such explicit terms.

The U.S. government's official reply indicated a different attitude to peace supporters. (Incidentally, Reagan did not bother to pronounce himself on these issues.) The reply was vague and abstract and amounted to a very thinly veiled attempt to exploit the anti-war movement for Washington's selfish ends. This convinced us again of U.S. administration's arrogant disregard of public opinion and refusal to lend ear to the voice of peace forces.

Increasingly frequent attempts are made to split the peace movement internationally. In

some countries there is a trend toward artificially dividing it into "Western" and "Eastern." Also, it is assiduously suggested that a "real" anti-war movement must by all means take a stand against its own government. This is a purely mechanical approach disregarding the main point, namely, the question of what government is meant and what its policy toward the issue of war and peace is. For if we in Finland were to accept the logic of this false notion, we would have to draw the absurd conclusion that we must take a stand against our government's proposal for a nuclear-free North.

The Finnish peace movement rejects ideas of this sort and has supported Kekkonen's proposal from the first. It has resolutely approved and approves of the fact that the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance between our republic and the Soviet Union signed in 1948 and prolonged for another 20 years in 1983 is, now as in the past, the cornerstone of Finnish foreign policy. We see this as a policy which all peace forces should back.

Now it is perfectly logical that the fight for peace in NATO countries has given rise to a marked anti-government trend due above all to the decision on Euromissiles. However, there is reason to suppose that there, too, anti-war movements would back realistic foreign policy moves of their governments if these really declared against the siting of new U.S. nuclear weapons.

It follows that unconditional opposition to the government regardless of the circumstances cannot be made a necessary condition for the activity of peace supporters. Otherwise they would be unable to detect positive changes of policy, influence developments or inspire the masses with confidence in the possibility of stopping the drift to war.

We do not think it is right to demand that the peace movement be transformed into an alternative to existing political institutions. On the other hand, it is clear that the trend and forms of the movement must not be determined by political parties. The only way to win the confidence of peace supporters is to work fruitfully in the movement, to make a real contribution to the common effort. A decisive factor in this respect is mutual understanding among diverse groups and political sectors, which can only be achieved by working together and drawing on collective experience.

The views we have set out are likely to provoke arguments. Well, discussion is not taboo in our organization. We consider, however, that discussion and arguments should help extend

and not handicap the movement.

Unity among the peace forces is hampered by attempts to make cooperation and exchanges of opinion conditional on, say, the signing of this or that ideological or political document. It must not be forgotten that in the vast area of the struggle for peace an occasional group may try to make an absolute of its point of view as allegedly the only correct one. Today's anti-war movement comes up against attempts of this nature even at the European level.³ The result is outside interference in the affairs of national anti-war forces.

PSF is operating on its own principles; it decides on its aims by itself and is committed to a policy of its own. We try to learn from one another, renouncing all preconditions and rejecting all discrimination. We are certain that this will help us overcome all difficulties, reveal the true meaning of the erroneous notions which some would like to impose on our movement, achieve closer unity and make new gains on this basis in the struggle against war forces.

We must not shut our eyes to the fact that the period ahead will not be easy for peace supporters. Our chief task today is to prevent the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe so as to clear the sky of the darkest

clouds of the war danger. We will work to bring this about. But even now we should ponder on the problems that are bound to arise in the new international political situation during the subsequent period. The way to this was shown by the World Assembly for Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War. The appeal of the Prague meeting, which also found response in Finland, provided a solid basis on which we can extend our cooperation with other peace forces in Europe and the world in the name of the lofty goal of ending the arms race, proceeding to disarmament and promoting mutually beneficial cooperation in the interests of all people on earth.

1. Proposal put forward in 1963 by Urho Kekkonen, then President of Finland. It provided for the creation of a nuclear-free zone comprising Finland and the Scandinavian countries and was formulated in greater detail in 1978. — Ed.

2. *Pravda*, May 11, 1983.

3. This refers to, among others, the Campaign for European Nuclear Disarmament, an organization making participation in its activity conditional on recognition of a platform which contains certain propositions unacceptable to real anti-war forces (such as that on the "hegemony of the superpowers" or the "equal responsibility" of the USA and the USSR for the nuclear arms race, the appeal to establish contacts with "opposition" elements and not peace committees in socialist countries, etc.). — Ed.

Jordanian society in the grip of contradictions

Izhaq al-Khatib

Political Bureau member, CC,
Jordanian Communist Party

These are hard times for Jordan. For several decades now, it has been in the epicenter of the Middle East conflict, a fact leaving an indelible stamp on it. Our society today is composed of Jordanians and of Palestinians expelled from their homeland. The unity which they forged in their common struggle helped them repeatedly defeat imperialism, Zionism and home reaction for all that the regime has tried from the outset to divide the two peoples, to provoke antagonisms between them, so as to loosen the historical bonds of their brotherhood and prevent united action against reactionary forces.

The class struggle inside the country is on the rise. Although the anti-democratic regime suppresses every protest, every action of the working people, it is powerless to check objective processes. The army of wage workers,

which includes tens of thousands of immigrants from Arab and Asian countries, goes on growing, differentiation among the bourgeoisie is intensifying and so are internal contradictions. Social problems closely intertwine with ethnic ones.

We will now look at contemporary Jordanian society in retrospect, beginning with a brief review of some aspects of its recent history.

"Divide and rule" policy

The roots of many current problems go back to the time when the Jordanian people first tried to loosen the fetters of dependence on the colonialists, who wanted to entrench themselves in our country and throughout the Middle East at all costs.

After the West Bank had become part of the

country (1950), the two fraternal peoples — the Palestinians and Jordanians — began to live together. The regime, fearing that they might unite on a revolutionary basis and that this could generate stronger patriotic sentiments, stabilize the inner political situation and encourage the country to resist imperialist plans and Zionist expansion, did its utmost to foment suspicion between them and to set them on each other. Unfortunately, this policy benefited to a degree from certain objective factors, such as distinctions in economic activity and in experience of social and national struggles.

The Palestinian people are more advanced economically and politically than the Jordanians. A number of industries sprang up on Palestinian territory as far back as the 30s. They were given a new spur when, during World War II, they had to specialize in meeting the requirements of the army. The proletariat and its political activity grew accordingly. By then the working class had a party of its own. All this plus a constant need to resist the intrigues of British imperialism and stem Zionist colonization helped the Palestinian national movement gain experience.

Developments in Jordan followed a different course. Absolute dependence on British imperialism doomed the country to backwardness and a precarious existence. There was no industry worth mentioning and as for agriculture, it was in a hopeless state because the regime deliberately neglected it. Jordanian peasants had to choose between tilling the land, an occupation which benefited them little due to frequent droughts, and taking clerical jobs or serving in the army. In this way ordinary people became part of a coercive machinery set up at the British imperialists' bidding and intended to function not only in Jordan but all over the region.

The Palestinians who found themselves in Jordan were barred from the civil service and the armed forces. They strove to join the working class, sought employment in oil-producing countries, engaged in trade or chose liberal professions. Dissatisfaction with their inferior status and the tragedy of expulsion from their homeland made for their increasing political commitment, which the authorities countered with repression and further discriminatory measures.

Taking advantage of growing distinctions in the conditions of the two peoples due to the regime's anti-democratic practices, the ruling quarters promoted the malicious notion that the Jordanians were predestined to serve as the mainstay and "defenders" of the state power. As for the Palestinians, they were said to be a

"perpetual" opposition force that was, moreover, gradually taking over the country's riches.

Understandably, the exploiting classes of the two nationalities were living in peace and harmony. Their alliance was directed against the working people. The Jordanian people lacked power in the same way as the Palestinians were denied key positions in the economy. Both were victims of bourgeois policy. The Jordanian and Palestinian masses were always drawn together by a craving for real independence and for deliverance from the imperialist yoke and a despotic home reaction.

Elections held on October 21, 1956 brought a patriotic government under S. al-Naboulsi to power. It tried to democratize social and political life and adopted an anti-imperialist position in foreign policy. But a coup staged by anti-popular forces a year later with the backing of the army restored reaction's earlier policy designed to divide the two peoples, except that this time it was implemented more subtly. This policy persists to this day but for some tactical changes.

The workers' difficult struggle

The socio-economic development of Jordan in late years has been marked by growing consumerism, continuing economic disruption and increasing neocolonial dependence. This necessarily tells on the working people's condition. The "fruits of consumerism" go to the élite while a worsening economic situation hits the people.

Being dependent on an inflow of funds from without, Jordan is racked by an economic crisis due in large measure to the diminished earnings of the oil-producing countries of the Persian Gulf, in particular Saudi Arabia, and a corresponding reduction of their financial aid to Jordan.

There is a further circumstance. In the context of the Iraqi-Iranian war and closer relations between Jordan and Iraq, many Jordanian enterprises nearly tripled production to supply that country's market. Shipping through the port of Aqaba increased and many new shipping companies were set up. But the boom came to an end. Iraq cut off its aid to Jordan contrary to the decisions of the Baghdad Conference. Indeed, it proved unable to pay its debts to Jordanian trading companies, to pay for trade deliveries. This resulted in surpluses, many enterprises had to close down and unemployment went up. Due to Iraq's increased use of communications leading through Turkey, many Jordanian transport facilities became useless.

The government has been boosting the

budget by increasing taxes while at the same time cutting appropriations for essential social services, all of which means putting a heavy burden on the working people. This is coupled with an attack on civil rights and freedoms, and political actions are crushed with an iron hand. The overall purpose is to stamp out any popular movement.

These anti-popular policies meet resistance among democrats and both the Jordanian and the Palestinian proletariat, who have gained in strength. The workers are forced to defend their rights in extremely difficult conditions. The reactionary law on trade unions not only restricts their activity but denies the right to form organizations to certain categories of working people, such as civil servants, agricultural workers or employees of certain state-owned companies. There are 17 labor unions while the employers have 25 organizations defending their interests. The Ministry of Labor constantly "improves" legislation by amending it to include new punitive provisions. As regards employees of small enterprises, labor legislation ignores them. The authorities constantly meddle in trade union activity even where it is tolerated. Many union leaders are only appointed with the approval of security agencies.

Immigrants (about 170,000) constitute the most disinherited category of workers. Foreign workers are paid very low wages by Jordanian standards and have no right to social security. They are forbidden to join trade unions and are entirely at the mercy of the employers. Immigrants are a permanent reserve of labor and operate as a safety valve whenever the authorities need to defuse worker discontent and prevent strikes. The exploiters use distinctions in the legal status of "native" and immigrant workers and foment strife between them.

Jordan's proletariat is winning new members mostly among people arriving from rural areas and bringing patriarchal views and prejudices with them. The effect is obvious. But it should also be borne in mind that the rural and urban petty bourgeoisie is the most numerous and diversified social class and that a low position on the social ladder (very few contrive to climb one or two rungs higher), low incomes and the hardships of everyday life are moving it closer to wage workers. This is giving rise to common interests and occasionally prompts workers, small traders and handicraftsmen to act together.

We would like to call attention to a new interesting phenomenon. As ordinary employees, including civil servants, are paid salaries that are not enough to meet their needs, many young people, primarily Jordanians,

move to factories and workshops. Their standard of education is fairly high and this helps them gain class consciousness and join in the struggle of the proletariat.

Attitude of the bourgeois classes

The behavior of our national bourgeoisie is largely conditioned by the fact that, while taking a common stand against the working people, it lacks unity in its own ranks. The bourgeois camp is rent by differences and contradictions stemming from dissimilar interests and distinctions in the condition of various groups and sectors.

The upper crust, which owns big enterprises and banks, is a direct accomplice of imperialism whereas a section of the middle echelon of national private enterprise is unhappy about dependence on it and feels that its activity is imperilled by the expansionist ambitions of international capital, specifically transnational. The truly national bourgeoisie is trying to ease this pressure by resisting imperialist policies and showing greater independence. This holds the promise, if a limited one, of a section of the bourgeois class joining in the national anti-imperialist movement.

Special mention should be made of the parasitical bourgeoisie, whose business interests center on mediation. It welcomes growing consumerism, which is encouraged chiefly by money orders from abroad (the 300,000 Jordanians who have emigrated to Persian Gulf countries remit up to 350 million dinars a year). There is evidence of a marked upturn in the activity of parasitical bourgeois groups intent on monopolizing the leadership of the country and imposing their diktat. This is fraught with a change in the character of the regime, which relies increasingly on both the bureaucratic bourgeoisie and the parasitical bourgeoisie (of Jordanian or Palestinian origin) closely linked with Western capital.

However, these two sections of the bourgeoisie are bickering between themselves. Having amassed wealth, the parasitical section refuses to put up with the "tutelage" of the bureaucracy any longer and is out to take possession of enterprises set up with government participation. This was the case with a government factory for marketing farm produce where large-scale misappropriation led to a scandal. Brokers and go-betweens have made an attempt to use this fact and take over the factory. They are even carrying on a campaign to persuade public opinion that the state had better give up certain enterprises and renounce its share in mixed ones. These claims annoy the bureaucratic bourgeoisie in charge of the state

sector; it wants to retain its control and keep open the channels through which it can enrich itself (bribes, embezzlement, and so on).

Domination of the economy by the parasitical and bureaucratic bourgeoisie has undermined the potentialities of independent development and intensified processes disintegrating society.

Internationally, these very influential forces are inclined to give priority to solutions meeting the interests of imperialism and Israel. These, in turn, are doing all in their power for the Middle East situation to develop according to the scenario worked out at Camp David or the recent Beirut meeting, at which an unequal Lebanese-Israeli agreement was signed.

Myth of an "alternative homeland"

For years U.S. imperialism has been trying to use Jordan for furthering its own plans for a Middle East settlement as conceived by the USA and Israel. It is now giving special publicity to its project for a Jordan transformed into an "alternative homeland" for the Palestinians.

The advocates of an "alternative homeland" stress that living in Jordan are Palestinians who have already become naturalized. They plainly want to tempt the Palestinians with the prospect of a state of their own on Jordanian soil. But their sole purpose in doing this is to call the justice of the Palestinian national movement into question. Also, they want to put across the idea that for the Palestinians the "place in the sun" in Jordan would be enough. In this manner politicians committed to genocide are trying to fan discord between the Jordanian and Palestinian peoples and poison relations between them with distrust and suspicion.

Obviously, the Palestinians' fate is of little concern to Israeli and U.S. leaders. And while the main thing for Tel Aviv is to prevent the rise of a Palestinian independent national state on the territory of Palestine, the Zionist rulers virtually reject the very idea of such a state coming into existence anywhere — in the West Bank, the Es Salt mountains in the East Bank, the littoral of the Indian Ocean or the Rub' al Khali desert.* It is immaterial to them whether the site is near or far, for they see their main task in fully precluding the possibility of the Palestinians vindicating their identity and exercising self-determination. Meanwhile militarized settlements are going up fast in the occupied areas of the West Bank. The Israeli regime wants to make it clear to the world that a few years hence there will be no vacant land left for a Palestinian state.

The plan for an "alternative homeland" also indicates that despite the Jordanian regime's close ties with Washington, it is seen as a pawn which can be given away if the political interests of the imperialist-Zionist alliance necessitate it. In the context of these designs, the very existence of Jordan seems to be entirely dependent on U.S. and Israeli "good will."

"Pacification" plans like these, including the latest "Reagan Plan," are aimed at delivering a blow to the joint struggle of the Jordanians and Palestinians, which has an "adverse" impact on Jordan as the imperialists see it. By invading Lebanon, Israel furnished new proof of its aggressive intentions. The Zionists' bid for expansion is also a threat to Jordan, which is to be made in this way to sign a separate peace.

Our party exposes these plans and brings it home to the masses that the Palestinians' fight for the establishment of their own state in their homeland is following the same line as the fight of the Jordanian people. That state is intended to serve both peoples as a bastion of unity and a dependable barrier to Israeli expansion into Jordan. The political declaration adopted by the Palestine National Council (PNC) at its latest meeting stresses the importance of these fraternal relations. Their existence provided the basis for the PNC decision on the prospect of a confederation between Jordan and the future Palestinian state.

Loyalty to internationalism and patriotism

We have endeavored to show the evolution of a society torn by contradictions big and small and exposed to the pernicious influence and unrelenting pressure of imperialism. This society has no future. The only way out of the impasse is to effect deep-going social, economic and political transformations.

The communists of Jordan, like other national liberation forces of the country, are operating in difficult conditions. We have a law on combating communism and many other decrees curtailing democratic freedoms. The conditions of illegality make us vary the methods of work among the masses. We give special attention to the working class and the trade union movement. Our party has won influence in the leadership of some major unions. Communists are prominent in all mass actions and take the initiative of launching diverse political actions. Among other things, they organize trade union election campaigns, which are political rather than purely trade union in Jordanian conditions. The party is guiding many mass organizations of women, students and youth. Communists are on the General Secretariat of the Alignment of Popular

*Desert in the south of the Arabian Peninsula. — Ed.

and Trade Union Forces as well as on the newly established Committee of Political Parties and Organizations. The JCP is engaged in a constant creative search for new and more effective forms and methods of struggle for democratic freedoms and the working people's everyday demands and of mobilizing them to carry out anti-imperialist actions.

We see the fundamental task of the party of the working class at this stage in bringing about national democratic rule. This means establishing a new system, breaking with imperialism and opting explicitly for a policy of close relations with the Arab national liberation movement, the Palestinian revolution and, of course, the world revolutionary movement and the Soviet Union. To embark on national democratic development, it is necessary to form a patriotic army, democratize public life and create conditions for the people to take an active part in decision-making on problems of

vital importance to them. We need a decisive change in domestic and foreign policy if the aspirations of the Arab people of Palestine fighting for a return to their homeland and for a state of their own on their native soil are to materialize.

The ethnic composition of the JCP reflects the militant unity of the working class, the other working people, the unity of the Jordanian and Palestinian peoples, since there are both Jordanians and Palestinians in the party. Our party attaches vast importance to the solution of the Palestinian problem and is working to bring about a really just settlement in the Middle East. Its members directly help the Palestinian people in every sphere of their struggle, including the military sphere. The destinies of our peoples are interlinked by close historical ties. Now as in the past, their joint struggle is our common internationalist mission.



The anti-war movement and the trade unions

The movement in defense of peace and against the threat of a nuclear war, which is sweeping across the globe, is unprecedented in the wide spectrum of the forces involved: political parties and numerous public bodies, women, young people, businessmen and spokesmen for religious denominations, members of parliament and environmentalists are taking an active part in it. But the movement is given special scope with the involvement of broad masses of the working people, and their anti-war action within the framework of trade union associations is considered in this survey prepared by the WMR Commission on Scientific Information and Documentation.

The trade unions are involved in the struggle against war quite naturally, because defending the interests of the working people means above all assuring them of a peaceful tomorrow and of the necessary conditions for solving vital social problems. This task is most significant in the face of the thermonuclear danger, and that is why it is brought to the fore at every level of the trade union movement.

Uniting efforts

The central topic at virtually all the international trade union forums, conferences and meetings in the recent period has been the need to preserve and strengthen peace and avert a nuclear catastrophe. Here are some of these.

1982

February. The 10th World Congress of Trade Unions in Havana, attended by representatives of 269 million working people from 138 countries, called for more vigorous action to halt the arms race started by imperialism and insistent-ly demanded that the huge funds going down the arms drain should be used for the needs of socio-economic development, in particular, the creation of additional jobs and the solution of the problem of mass unemployment in the capitalist countries. It was emphasized at the congress that on vigorous and concerted action by the trade unions of all affiliations largely depends the solution of the most urgent problem of our day, which is to avert a nuclear-missile holocaust and to preserve and strengthen peace.

May. An international conference "Trade Unions for Trade and Economic Cooperation and Social Progress in Peace" held in Moscow issued a call for struggle for détente and disarmament.

An international meeting in Dublin set up an International Trade Union Committee for Peace and Disarmament, a standing body of the World Trade Union Conference on the Socio-Economic Aspects of Disarmament, which met in Paris in December 1981.

July. An international trade union meeting of solidarity with the victims of the Israeli aggression in the Middle East arranged in Paris on the initiative of the International Confederation of Arab Trade Unions developed into a broad anti-war protest.

August. The tasks in the struggle against the nuclear danger and for disarmament and peace were discussed at a Pacific trade union conference held in Sydney, Australia.

September. On the initiative of the 10th World Congress of Trade Unions, supported by the International Trade Union Committee for Peace and Disarmament, September 1 was marked in many countries as a Day of Trade Union Action for Peace. A special session of the Bureau of the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) held in Prague to discuss the problems of peace and disarmament called for unity in anti-war action by all the international trade union associations.

The struggle for peace was central to the regular conferences of the Trade Unions International (TUI) of Workers in Metal Industries (Moscow) and of the TUI of Textile, Clothing, Leather and Fur Workers (in Berlin).

November. The problems of security and disarmament in Asia were examined at an international trade union seminar in Tokyo.

The role of the working class in the struggle for peace was emphasized by the participants in the special session of the General Council of the Permanent Congress of Trade Union Unity of Latin American Workers, which met in Nicaragua.

A call against war was issued by a regular conference of the TUI of Workers of the Building Trades in St. Etienne, France.

A meeting of the International Trade Union Committee for Peace and Disarmament was held in Copenhagen. It issued a call to turn 1983 into a year of trade union struggle against the deployment of new nuclear missile weapons in Europe.

December. The participants in an international trade union seminar in Cotonou, Benin, sponsored by the Organization of African Trade Union Unity, came out in favor of united

inter-African action in the struggle to strengthen peace.

1983

January. The participants in an international symposium of printing workers' trade unions (Moscow) called for more vigorous struggle for peace and against the nuclear arms race.

February. The will of the working class for peace and for disarmament was voiced by the representatives of West European trade unions at an international meeting of working people in defense of jobs organized in Brussels on the initiative of the European Trade Union Confederation.

March. The Administrative Committee of the TUI of Miners meeting in Larnaca, Cyprus, urged the miners of all countries to protest against the imperialist escalation of the arms race.

April. The WFTU's participation in the struggle for peace and social progress was the main item on the agenda of the 35th session of the WFTU General Council held in Nicosia.

The TUI of metal workers addressed an open letter to all the working people and trade unions of the world urging resolute support for the World Assembly "For Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War" in Prague.

May. An international conference "The Role and Place of the Trade Unions in the Modern World" was convened in Moscow to sum up experience of action in defense of the working people's interests in the context of the anti-war struggle. It was attended by representatives from 118 countries and 5 international trade union organizations.

"The Trade Unions of the World in the Struggle Against Chemical and Bacteriological Weapons" was the motto of an international conference in Ho Chi Minh City. It was organized on the initiative of the TUI of the Chemical, Petroleum and Allied Workers to discuss problems in joint trade union action against the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical and other types of mass destruction weapons.

June. A discussion on how to fight for peace more effectively and to check the nuclear madness was held by the participants in a traditional forum of trade union representatives from nine European countries in Tallin (USSR).

The delegates of 17 ports, including Leningrad, Le Havre and Rotterdam, took part in an international conference of port workers in Hamburg. The main question at the forum was the further development of the struggle against the deployment of the U.S. Pershing-2 and Cruise missiles on the territory of Western

Europe. The conference called for efforts to turn Europe into a nuclear-free zone.

Some 500 delegates from 82 countries attended a trade union meeting within the framework of the World Assembly "For Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War" in Prague. In the course of the discussion, the organic connection between the struggle for peace and the struggle for social progress, and the need to explain this truth to the broadest masses of working people, were emphasized.

August. The socio-economic aspects of disarmament in the energy industries were discussed by representatives of trade unions of miners, oil workers and power engineers from dozens of countries at a World Trade Union Conference in Moscow.

These and similar other actions not only voiced the common stand of the trade union movement on the main issue of our day. They also serve as a powerful mobilizing factor in developing trade union action for peace in various countries.

Where the working people are in power

In the socialist countries, the working people effectively translate their will for peace into government acts of policy and their governments' broad peace initiatives. That is why their contribution to the anti-war movement is most tangible. This peace policy pursued on the state level is invariably backed up with resolutions by trade union forums and mass measures in defense of peace.

Thus, September 1 is being marked with great scope everywhere as a Day of Trade Union Action for Peace. Impressive May Day demonstrations are always held by the working people under anti-war slogans. Their determination to safeguard peace is also clearly manifested in other mass action. Here are a few facts.

Bulgaria. Mass anti-war meetings were staged in Sofia and other major towns in October 1982. Trade union representatives taking part in these acts condemned the aggressive policy of the U.S. administration and the plans to deploy U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. A Week of Mass Action for Peace and Disarmament last June was marked by wide ranging demonstrations by the working people.

Czechoslovakia. Almost 1,000 resolutions adopted at anti-war meetings by Czechoslovak working people were addressed to the WFTU Secretariat last year. The country's trade unions have actively helped to prepare the World Assembly "For Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War" held in Prague in June 1983. Responding

to their call, hundreds of work collectives decided to work special shifts and on Saturdays and to donate thus earned money to a fund sponsoring the Assembly.

GDR. In January 1983, the working people of Berlin staged a mass rally under the slogans of peace and disarmament in Luxembourgplatz, the square where an anti-fascist demonstration was staged by workers half a century ago. In February, a large demonstration was organized by the working people of Dresden, who called on the citizens of West European countries to do their utmost to frustrate the imperialist plans for deploying new U.S. missiles in their countries. In May, over 6 million people were involved in 7,000 functions arranged throughout the country with the active support of the trade unions. These included 423 large rallies within the framework of youth action for peace, and against NATO missile plans in Western Europe.

Hungary. The working people of Budapest thronged in their thousands to a solidarity rally to welcome the participants in the international Peace March-82 as it entered the Hungarian capital in August of last year.

USSR. In May and June 1982, more than 60 million Soviet working people taking part in 20,000 demonstrations and rallies called for effective decisions by the Second Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament. In the course of a Week of Mass Action for Disarmament in October, the trade unions either staged or supported over 80,000 rallies, marches and various demonstrations. In May of this year, more than 30,000 such measures were held in support of the goals and tasks of the World Assembly "For Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War." They were attended by more than 50 million Soviet working people. Anti-war meetings within the framework of the world campaign for disarmament proclaimed by the United Nations were held in June at large industrial enterprises in a number of cities.

Vietnam. Full support by the working people of Vietnam for the socialist countries' peace initiatives aimed to remove the danger of war, especially nuclear war, and preserve peace in Europe and throughout the world was voiced by Nguyen Duc Thuan, chairman of the Federation of Trade Unions of Vietnam at a meeting in Hanoi in April 1983.

Mass rallies and demonstrations in defense of peace were held by trade unions in Cuba, Mongolia, Romania and other socialist countries over the past several months.

* * *

Let us note that the working people's anti-war

action in the socialist world has its own specific features: in these countries, there are no forces which need war, the arms race and a worsening international situation. The working people and their trade unions do not have to convince their governments of the need to take effective measures to avert the danger of war, because the socialist countries' policy is aimed to achieve détente and disarmament, and strengthen world peace. Mass anti-war action in these countries is above all support for this policy, a powerful protest against the militaristic preparations by imperialism, and a manifestation of solidarity with the international working class and the peace forces of the whole world.

Despite the difficulties

Anti-war action by trade unions in the industrialized capitalist countries has become more vigorous although the mass involvement of the working people in this struggle is still being constrained by the growth of unemployment, some influence of militaristic propaganda, reprisals against peace fighters and frequently also the stand taken by trade union leaders claiming that action for peace allegedly falls outside the traditional trade union ambit. Still, whereas in the whole of 1981, 5 million working people were involved in anti-war demonstrations in these countries, in the spring and summer of last year alone, the figure was 20 million and the militancy of the trade union action also grew. Consider the following facts.

Australia. In March of this year, a group of trade unions affiliated with the organization called "The People for Nuclear Disarmament" arranged a seminar to discuss ways of mobilizing the working people for the struggle against the danger of war. The Australian Council of Trade Unions, representing more than two million members, called on the government to support the idea of nuclear disarmament. The councils of trade unions of Western Australia, the Northern Territory and the city of Brisbane decided to boycott all warships with nuclear weapons on board entering the country's ports.

Austria. In February 1983, the left bloc of the Austrian Trade Union Federation called on the country's Federal Government to oppose NATO's missile plans in Western Europe.

Canada. In March 1983, the country's major trade union association, the Canadian Labor Congress, came out against the testing of cruise missiles on the territory of Canada. A number of trade unions were among the organizers of the 100,000-strong demonstration in defense of peace staged in Vancouver in April. The Cana-

dian Labor Congress is giving full backing to a Peace Caravan which will cross the country.

Denmark. Over 20 trade union associations initiated a "Stop the Nuclear Missiles" Campaign, which started in November of last year.

France. About 500,000 French men and women took part in a Peace Festival held in Paris in June of this year. Among the organizers of that mass anti-war action was the General Confederation of Labor (CGT), the country's largest trade union center. Hundreds of thousands of demonstrators warmly supported Appeal of 100, which was read out to them, and which resolutely rejects the arms race, including the nuclear missile race, and demands successful completion of the negotiations at Geneva.

FRG. A congress of the Confederation of German Trade Unions (CGTU) declared in May 1982, on behalf of its 8 million members: there must be no new medium-range weapons on the continent. The CGTU's address, "Peace Through Disarmament," which met with a wide response, also demonstrated the FRG working people's opposition to the attempts to deploy new U.S. missiles in Western Europe, and to the nuclear arms race. In January 1983, some sectoral trade unions organized anti-war rallies attended by more than 100,000 working people in Cologne, Hamburg, Frankfurt, Munich and other cities. In February, a CGTU provincial organization took part in a powerful demonstration in Pirmasens (Rheinland-Pfalz) against the conversion of the FRG's territory into an arsenal of U.S. chemical weapons. On its initiative, peace fighters called on the country's constitutional court to prohibit the siting of chemical weapons in Rheinland-Pfalz. In April, the CGTU's Hessen board, considering further action against NATO's missile decision, did not rule out the possibility of staging a political strike.

Great Britain. At the beginning of this year, 120 trade union activists of London visited the camp of the fighters for peace near the air base at Greenham Common and gave them material assistance. In March, the 53rd Women's Conference of the British Trades Union Congress in Scarborough ended with an impassioned call for peace. Its participants denounced NATO's plans to deploy 160 Cruise missiles in Great Britain, and the re-equipment of submarines with Trident missiles. A resolution demanding that the government should give up the idea of realizing these plans was motioned by the country's biggest Transport and General Workers' Union.

Greece. The General Confederation of Labor of Greece gave broad support to a mass demon-

stration by peace fighters which was held in Athens last spring.

Italy. In February of this year, the Christian Association of Italian Working People issued a document condemning the U.S. "zero option" for nuclear armaments. A mass anti-war demonstration in Rome was actively supported by the United Federation of the Trade Unions of Italy.

Japan. From September to November of last year, Japanese trade unions carried on a broad campaign for cuts in the country's military budget. An extraordinary congress of the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan, bringing together more than 4.5 million workers and employees, was held in February 1983 and called on the working people to thwart the government's dangerous plans to rewrite the peace provisions of the constitution and to turn the country into a gear in the Pentagon's war machine.

Norway. In conformity with the decisions of the Norwegian Federation of Trade Unions and a number of other working class associations, the regional board of the trade unions of Trondelag region, where NATO's heavy military equipment is stored, issued a protest early this year against the plans to convert the country into a base for the U.S. rapid deployment force. The trade unions of the region came out in support of the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in the North of Europe.

Portugal. The General Confederation of Portuguese Working People — National Intersindical was among the initiators of the extensive explanatory campaign in connection with the World Assembly "For Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War" in Prague.

United States. The International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, the American Federation of the State, County and Municipal Employees, the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union, and the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union — four of the largest labor unions in the United States — have demanded a freeze on nuclear weapons arsenals. Major trade union associations not affiliated with the AFL-CIO, among them the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers' International Union and various local chapters of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America have supported this demand. Many labor unions across the country variously joined in the mass demonstrations for peace and disarmament. In April 1983, they took an active part in the measures within the frame-

work of the Jobs with Peace Week in 75 industrial centers of the United States.

West Berlin. A resolute protest against the plans to site new U.S. missiles in Western Europe was voiced by the participants in a youth conference of the metal workers' union.

Everyone's concern

Trade unions in the developing countries which not long ago often regarded action against the nuclear danger as being of secondary importance and as being rather the concern of working people in the industrialized countries are joining in the struggle for peace and disarmament. Here are some of the facts indicating activation of this movement.

Afghanistan. In November of last year, more than 300,000 working people attended a mammoth march in the Afghan capital to mark the end of Peace Month in the country. During the month of action for peace, meetings and rallies were held at enterprises in all the 29 provinces. In June of this year, the working people staged a demonstration in Kabul to voice their solidarity with the goals and tasks of the world movement for peace.

Ethiopia. The Ethiopian working people's determination to carry on a tireless struggle for stronger world peace and security and against subversive acts by imperialism and reaction was declared by the plenary meeting of the Central Council of the All-Ethiopia Trade Union held in the spring of this year.

Guinea-Bissau. Thousands of working people in Bissau responded to a call by the country's peace fighters to join in the mass demonstration held last March under the slogan: "Africa — A Peace Zone!"

India. Last year, a mass demonstration was staged by the working people of Lucknow, the administrative center of the State of Uttar Pradesh, on the occasion of the day of trade union action for peace and disarmament. In September, 35 Delhi trade unions held a conference under the slogans of "Trade Unions for Peace, No to War!" In October, organized contingents of workers broadly participated in the nation-wide peace march in the Indian capital. Trade union leaders put their signatures to an appeal in defense of peace, which was issued early this year by the West Bengal Youth League. The India Trade Union Congress declared its support for the international campaign of action against the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Europe.

Philippines. The country's major trade unions were represented at the Second National Assembly of Peace Fighters held in Manila in August 1983. Three thousand Filipino

working people took part in the peace march early this year which was organized within the framework of the National Week for Disarmament.

Venezuela. A National March for World Peace and Satisfaction of Working Class Demands was staged in the country's industrial areas by the United Working People's Center of Venezuela. On its initiative, a meeting was held in Caracas of numerous political leaders and public figures campaigning for peace.

* * *

These are only some of the facts showing that the trade unions' daily struggles for the working people's rights and for social progress have merged with action for peace and against the threat of war. But even these few facts carry an important message. First of all, they show that trade union actions are of fundamental impor-

tance in advancing the anti-war movement as a whole by giving it an additional dimension of concrete goals and a constructive approach to the solution of primary problems which is characteristic of the working class stand. The trade unions bring to the movement their own methods of vigorous action which they have honed and tested in the long years of struggle for the working people's interests, and this makes the movement much more effective. Finally, it is the trade unions that have great potentialities for bringing into the ranks of the peace fighters the broadest masses of people.

The international trade union movement, whose core consists of the working class, with its long-standing anti-war traditions, now has in its ranks 340 million working people, a force capable of playing an important part in the struggle to rid humankind of the nuclear danger.



Leninist unity of theory and practice

Yuri Andropov, *Izbrannye rechi i statyi* (Selected Speeches and Articles), Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 1983, 320 pp.

There is growing interest throughout the world in the historical development of the country which first blazed the trail to socialism, and in the policy of the Leninist party and the Soviet state. That is why the publication of a new book by Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU CC, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, is a notable event of international importance. The book covers a period of more than 40 years of the author's activity in high party and government posts, and contains articles and speeches dealing with important questions of the CPSU's internal and foreign policy, and showing the leading and guiding role of the party in the life of Soviet society.* It gives the reader a panoramic

view of the main problems of our time, with the growth and spread of humankind's inexorable advance to peace, freedom and justice, to socialism, and to the heights of social progress.

"The distinctive feature of Marxism is the unity of consistently scientific theory and revolutionary practice," says the author (p. 231). These words fully apply to the whole content of the book under review, which is a blend of the ideological and theoretical wealth and the wide-ranging practical experience of the Soviet communists and of the Soviet people as a whole. It brims with social optimism, gives an insight into the dialectics of social development, and contains a realistic analysis of the present-day situation and clear-cut assessments and well-defined reference points.

This is a wide-ranging and multi-faceted Marxist-Leninist analysis of the development of Soviet society, whose present stage has been defined by the CPSU as the stage of developed socialism. It is a society in which an economic basis, a social structure and a political system in

*The collection includes items from a 1979 collection and also works dating from the subsequent period.

accord with socialist principles have already been built, and in which socialism is developing on its own, collectivist basis. Such a society cannot, of course, be regarded as a perfect one, and it does face objectively rooted difficulties of growth and shortcomings caused by subjective factors and by human effort which is not always skilfully or adequately organized. That is why, considering at the June 1983 plenary meeting of the CPSU CC the preparation of the party's new program, Yuri Andropov stressed that it "must above all be a program for the balanced and all-round perfection of developed socialism and, consequently, its further advance to communism" (p. 286).

The economy, the basis for strengthening the country's might and the steady rise of the people's material and cultural standards, is the main sphere on which the pace of advance to that goal depends. The author has provided comprehensive substantiation of the key tasks facing the party and the people on the economic front in the present-day conditions. The chief of these is the boosting of labor productivity, a task which is of special importance both for our domestic construction and in international terms. The main ways of its complex fulfillment are considered on many pages in the book, including ways to make the whole economic mechanism function smoothly and without a hitch, to use its potential effectively, to go on to intensive development and raise the efficiency of production, to combine in practice the advantages of the socialist system with the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution, and to perfect the relations of production, through fundamentally improving the planning and management of the economy.

The 26th congress of the CPSU said that economic and social policy should be integrated with each other into a coherent strategy of social development. The items in the collection show the vastness and growing complexity in the present conditions of its constituent factors: economic and social, national and demographic. The "rising living standards" formula is frequently oversimplified to mean only a growth of the population's incomes and production of consumer goods. In actual fact, the concept is much broader: it includes a steady growth of consciousness and culture in everyday life, exemplary law and order, a high standard of services and public health care, and meaningful use of leisure time, in fact, everything that is fit to form a part of the concept of socialist civilization. The major problems in these spheres have to be solved not just because they are there. Their solution will

signify a marked advance toward the social homogeneity of the society. This is a great goal which was outlined in theory, a vision for which several generations of communists have worked, and which now is a matter of actual practice. There are various indications in life itself that a classless structure of society should take shape in the most general terms at the stage of mature socialism.

The CPSU's scientifically grounded nationalities policy has a tremendous part to play in the multinational Land of Soviets. It is based on the principles bequeathed by Lenin: the complete equality and free development of all the nations within the framework of their fraternal union. The accomplishments of this policy cannot be denied: socialist nations have taken shape and now constitute a new historical entity — the Soviet people; the all-round progress of each of these nations naturally leads to the ever greater integration of all the nations. At the same time, problems in relations between them are still on the agenda (see p. 12). They require special care and constant attention from the party, and active education of the masses in the spirit of internationalism.

The improvement of socialist democracy is considered at length in the collection, with emphasis on overcoming that which actually hampers this effort, like practices which do not go beyond form or the semblance of democratic norms and institutions. The author shows that the development of the Soviet state of the whole people and the ever broader involvement of the working people in the administration and management of all its affairs are determined both by society's material potentialities and by the level of the political consciousness and culture of the masses. "It is highly important to understand and remember this. The point is not to engage in abstract inventions of further ways and forms for developing democracy, but to proceed from life itself" (p. 293).

The solution of the multi-faceted problems in perfecting developed socialism is directly linked with the growing role of the Leninist party of communists, the mobilizing force which ensures a steady advance along the lines of social progress. Ideological work now tends increasingly to move to the fore, alongside the party's leading organizational activity. The author says: "We clearly see the grave harm being done by defects in this work and by the inadequate maturity of some people's consciousness when it exists. Conversely, we already feel strongly today how the pace of advance quickens when ideological work is made more effective, when the masses have a better under-

standing of the party's policy, accepting it as their own, as a policy meeting the people's vital interests" (p. 284). That is why ideological work is an endeavor for every communist, for the party as a whole.

There are many interesting pages in the book on the Leninist peace-loving foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state, which meets the vital interests of the Soviet people and of all the other peoples. This policy, says the author, is a class policy both in terms of principle and of goal (see p. 131). It is a class policy above all because socialist and communist construction requires peace, a relaxation of international tensions. Our foreign policy is a class policy also because the CPSU, while conducting its consistent, persevering and sincere line of peace, takes a firm stand for proletarian internationalism and solidarity with the peoples' struggle for freedom and social progress. It is also a class policy because it proceeds from a realistic understanding of the profound distinctions which exist between states with different social systems and which make the competition between the two systems, the struggle of ideas objectively inevitable. But that should not in any way erode the stability of peace or the good-neighbor relations which the USSR offers to other countries.

The programmatic report "Sixty Years of the USSR," with which the collection opens, says: "We are for broad, fruitful cooperation among all nations of the world to their mutual advantage and the good of all humankind, free from diktat and interference in the affairs of other countries. The Soviet Union will do everything it can to secure a tranquil, peaceful future for the present and coming generations. That is the aim of our policy, and we shall not depart from it" (pp. 18-19).

The entire course of world developments has shown again and again that it is existing socialism that is the most consistent champion of sound principles in international relations, and of détente and peace. Nowadays, life demands not just a strengthening of cooperation and cohesion of the countries of the new world on the basis of the principles of socialist internationalism, but also efforts to improve the quality and enhance the effectiveness of such cooperation. This implies the need to improve political interaction between these countries further, attain a higher level of economic integration and steadily bring their peoples ideologically ever closer together. Yuri Andropov says: "We firmly believe that socialism will ultimately demonstrate its advantages precisely in peaceful competition with capitalism. Indeed, we are not advocates of competition in the military

field, which imperialism is trying to impose on us" (p. 298).

It would be fatal for humankind to try to settle the historical dispute between the two world social systems through an armed clash, as imperialist reaction now seeks to do. The only way to avert this mortal danger is for the anti-war forces to unite and be more active. The threat of a nuclear war impending over the world also induces a re-appraisal of the gist of the activity of the whole communist movement (see p. 295). The communists have always been fighters against oppression and man's exploitation of man, and today they are also carrying on a struggle to save human civilization and safeguard man's right to life.

The collection contains a deep analysis of the most acute problems in the military-strategic equilibrium between socialism and imperialism, which is of such paramount importance for the destinies of the world. The author says: "The attainment of this equilibrium is one of the most important results of the past several decades. It demanded of our people and the peoples of the other socialist community countries considerable efforts and resources, and we will not allow it to be upset. We shall continue to do everything that is necessary to ensure the security of our country and of our friends and allies, and will raise the combat capability of the Soviet Armed Forces, a mighty factor in containing the aggressive aspirations of imperialist reaction. But if the levels of armament and military expenditures on both sides could be lowered, if a start could be made on disarmament, for which we are actively striving, that would be a great boon for all the countries and peoples" (p. 298).

The items in the collection range over a long period abounding in events of historical importance and show the CPSU's consistent strategic line and policy, formulated on the solid foundation of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. They show very well that our party has been developing and enriching this great doctrine in the light of the new experience of revolutionary creative endeavor, in the course of building socialism and communism.

Over the past year, collections of Yuri Andropov's selected speeches and articles have been published in a number of countries in various languages and have naturally aroused much international interest, because they present Soviet policy and the CPSU's leading activity on the most authoritative level, and provide answers to the burning problems of our day which agitate the whole of humankind.

Sergei Tsukasov

Pondering the way of the revolution

SURVEY OF WRITINGS ON NICARAGUA

This is a general survey of original writings on the victorious freedom struggle of the Nicaraguan people and their vanguard. These books enable the foreign reader to find out much that is new and instructive, and to follow the development of revolutionary thinking in Nicaragua. Although the wording may now and again be somewhat naive, they contain a compelling truth confirmed by the victory.

Among the recent publications are the works of Carlos Fonseca,¹ founder of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (SNLF), a brilliant political leader of the Marxist-Leninist type, whose whole life was committed to the cause of his people's national and social liberation. He was killed in a clash with Somoza guardsmen in 1976, but his theoretical legacy and heroic memory still inspire Nicaraguan revolutionaries. The survey also includes a collection, *Vanguard Leadership Speaking*;² *On the Ideological Struggle and the Pastora Case* by Humberto Ortega, one of the SNLF leaders;³ the second volume of *Notes on Nicaraguan History*;⁴ *The Mountains Are Something Greater than the Immense Green Steppe* by Omar Cabezas;⁵ and *Sandino's Ideological Legacy*, a collection printed in the USSR on the basis of material published in Managua and Havana.⁶

Bourgeois ideologues and their opportunist yes-men have been trying to present the Sandinista victory in Nicaragua solely as the result of adroit tactics, alleging that any other political force with a similar tactics could have been just as successful. But, first, it is silly to reduce the whole revolution solely to tactics and, second, one is bound to ask why no "other" (meaning bourgeois-oriented) political force was able to elaborate successful tactics.

The point is that the platform proposed by the SNLF was the only one that made it possible to forge a broad alliance of popular forces in the country. Over less than two decades of selfless and principled struggle, the Sandinistas won the conscious support of the working masses. Naturally, there was also the flexible tactics closely tied in with the content of the tasks and the goal of the struggle.

According to Carlos Nunez, member of the SNLF leadership, the Sandinista Front was recognized both in the country and abroad as an authoritative organization capable of run-

ning the state precisely because "all, including the reluctant, were convinced that the SNLF... was the only force in Nicaragua which could back its words by deeds in politics and armed struggle."⁷

Nicaragua is known as one of the least developed countries in the Western Hemisphere; its working class is small and has little experience of class struggle. But, being the target of more imperialist interventions than any other country in the region, it was not brought to its knees owing to broad popular resistance. The country's objective backwardness was compensated by subjective progress, which manifested itself in the revolutionary maturity and combat experience of the masses.

The U.S. interventionists and their creature, the Somoza dictatorship, for decades maintained Nicaragua in a state of isolation and backwardness. But the people always remembered the glorious and heroic past, especially August Cesar Sandino, the Free Man's General, who in the early 1930s headed a worker-peasant army, which defeated the occupation forces of the U.S. Marines.

Sandino nominally belonged to a liberal party which was bourgeois in its ideology and class content. But as an ardent patriot, the guerrilla leader was able to break with it and give his activity and public speeches such a radical turn that even though these did not fully correspond to Marxist theory, they contained many elements of proletarian revolutionary strategy. Since Sandino opposed the neocolonialist intervention and carried on a struggle against U.S. imperialism, his legacy is very relevant today.

Sandino's numerous ringing proclamations, interviews and messages written in the patriots' mountain hide-outs give a convincing picture of his political views. He assumed that the liberation struggle of the Latin American people was largely a struggle for independence, so that its main task was to unite all forces against the common enemy. He believed that the only way to strengthen national sovereignty and improve the condition of the working masses — the mainstay of his army — was to set up a people's government. In other words, the guerrilla general realized that national independence was closely connected with democratic people's rule. One of his well-known ideas is that "only the workers and

peasants will follow us to the very end, and only their organized force will bring us to victory."⁸

Sandino also realized that armed struggle by the masses was crucial in winning independent statehood. That is why he assigned a major role to his National Sovereignty Defense Army, the precursor of the present Sandinista People's Army. Even after the expulsion of the U.S. interventionists from Nicaragua (1933), the signing of a peace and the disbandment of a large section of his army, the leader of the insurgents sought to form a popular party that would continue the political struggle, and retained military units which included his best men, who enjoyed the greatest political confidence and had military talent.

In Sandino's revolutionary activity, fervent patriotism was combined with defense of the interests of the whole of Latin America against imperialist encroachments. He saw that activity as a part of the Latin American people's struggle. His "Letter to Latin American Heads of Government" (1928)⁹ and his oft-repeated idea on the need for a united trade union organization of Latin American working people are particularly indicative in this respect. He repeatedly proposed the introduction of progressive principles in international law, notably, the principle of non-interference and self-determination in relations among peoples.

Sandino's social ideas were most impressive. He realized that the cruel and selfless struggle against the foreign intervention would be senseless unless it led to internal transformations in the country, and saw collective ownership of land and the social nature of every individual's work as the basis of Nicaragua's non-capitalist way of development.

But the circumstances tended to limit Sandino's political brilliance: the anti-imperialist forces were just beginning to take shape, and "Sandino had no chance to supplement his correct military-strategic line with a political strategy that would ensure continuity of the revolutionary process."¹⁰

Nevertheless, the military-political movement organized by Sandino played an important historical role; it was wiped out by the brutal repression mounted after the treacherous assassination of the General and his closest associates in 1934. Like a fire smoldering under the ashes, the movement was latent for many years, only to burst forth anew at the right moment. Before the formation of the SNLF in 1961, the veterans of Sandino's army dispersed across the country told the younger generation of their leader and his ideas, inspiring them with confidence in the movement's future. Omar

Cabezas tells of an old peasant who fought in Sandino's army as a young man and then for 40 years kept hidden a knapsack with cartridges in the hope that the bugle would call him to battle once again.

In the early 1960s, a new revolutionary situation began to take shape in Nicaragua. The Cuban Revolution pointed the way to the liberation of all Latin American peoples. In the new conditions, Carlos Fonseca was able to fuse the rich historical heritage with scientific revolutionary ideology and the experience of the international working-class movement. On that basis, he set up a vanguard political and military organization of the most revolutionary social strata in Nicaragua. As Humberto Ortega, member of the SNLF leadership, wrote, Fonseca had put that vanguard on an ideological, political, moral, juridical, and philosophical foundation.¹¹

The ideological work of the SNLF founders was for the most part primarily aimed to substantiate the idea that the ruling classes would not give up their power without desperate and ferocious resistance. Realizing that the liberation process in Nicaragua would most probably unfold into a civil war, the Sandinista Front from the earliest days of its existence opposed the opportunist conception according to which the armed struggle should be put off indefinitely to give the masses a chance to "mature"; the front urged the need to combine armed struggle with other mass action. Its strategy of revolutionary struggle envisaged a combination of insurrectional struggle and efforts to put forward various demands before the authorities, to orient the masses' initiative toward effective forms of struggle. Fonseca called on the people to use the advantages of peaceful means, but without putting aside the guerrilla rifle altogether. "Our experience shows," he wrote, "that the revolutionary armed people of town and country are the motive force of the revolutionary process in Nicaragua."¹²

The period between 1970 and 1975 is instructive in this respect. At that time, the SNLF mobilized the masses in different ways, relying on a solid base of clandestine action in the mountains, in rural localities and urban centers.¹³

The relationship between the masses and the armed vanguard changed from one stage to another and even within one and the same stage. Guerrilla action in the mountains was military in form and political in content. The guerrillas formulated various demands, carried on political education and propaganda, and tried to inspire the masses who had no opportunity to demonstrate, to hold a rally or read

a militant proclamation.

The practice of the Sandinista movement confirms that the role of the masses and armed struggle in the revolution cannot be determined simply or in advance, but depends on the concrete situation. Thus, in the early stages of the Nicaraguan revolutionary process, it was the armed vanguard that was of crucial strategic importance, and later on, especially in the last few years before the victory, the main role belonged to the masses.

Revolutionary example was of great importance in the Sandinista movement. The armed vanguard's readiness to die for the homeland's liberation, its enduring militant spirit unbroken by defeat and the death of comrades gave the people confidence that, in contrast to the boastful opposition bourgeoisie and the corrupt and demoralized army of the dictatorship, it was a steadfast, courageous and incorruptible section of the people. Undoubtedly, the overthrow of the dictatorship would have been impossible without the two decades of heroic struggle and self-sacrifice, without what Cabezas calls "the vanguard's legendary invincibility."

Carlos Fonseca and other SNLF leaders devoted special attention to the formation of such a vanguard. The task was not only to cultivate high moral standards, based on respect for national heroes and revolutionary example, although that was one of the main factors behind the strength of the Sandinista movement. It was most essential that the organization should be capable of leading the masses forward along the revolutionary road. Although the Sandinistas believed that in the course of the armed struggle against the Somoza dictatorship there was no time to set up a revolutionary party, the SNLF attained the high level of revolutionary efficiency that marks proletarian organizations.

Shortly before his death, Fonseca noted the difficulties that arose in the formation of a monolithic revolutionary party in Nicaragua and urged the SNLF to press ahead with its formation along three main lines: attainment of ideological unity; use of diverse forms of struggle; and strengthening of the ties with the masses as the movement was beginning to develop into a popular uprising.¹⁴

In its early years, it was first of all necessary for the Sandinista front to let the people know of its existence. The vanguard's consistent revolutionary goal and armed action helped to rally around it the best sons and daughters of the working class and peasantry. At that time, it was "primarily building up moral prestige, the spirit of self-sacrifice, model behavior and perseverance, so as subsequently to carry all this to

the masses and organize them . . ." ¹⁵ In those days, Cabezas later noted, "the vanguard was fundamentally identified with policy, with a just—and so dangerous—struggle. That is why its following was at first quite small." ¹⁶

The battle of Pancasan (1967) between the guerrillas and government troops was of great importance. Although it ended in a defeat for the revolutionaries, it was a point of departure for the spread of the Front's influence across the country.

Soon afterwards, the revolutionary process put forward new tasks. In view of Nicaragua's political backwardness and the absence of opposition organizations independent from the bourgeoisie, the vanguard had to review its social composition. As early as 1969, Fonseca maintained that all Nicaraguans who refuse to accept the dictatorship should be able to join the Sandinista Front, for that, he believed, would not prevent the representatives of the working class and peasantry from playing the main role in the SNLF. Such hegemony could be (and was) exercised owing to the ideological and moral fortitude of the Front's leadership, which systematically gave a principled rebuff to any attempts to solve the revolution's problems on reformist lines. The Sandinistas kept explaining to the masses that the dictatorship was not just Somoza himself, but imperialist and oligarchic rule, and that the point was to bring about a radical transformation of the social system.

When in 1977, following several defeats of the armed vanguard and the loss of many of its leaders, the bourgeois opposition invited the SNLF to start up a dialogue with Somoza on "democratization" and peace, the Front declared that although unity among the democratic forces and a democratic dialogue among the members of the opposition were historically necessary, the first and most important step on the way to democratization was to overthrow the dictator and destroy the regime's basis. The masses' consciousness, enhanced over the two decades of constant struggle, and the Sandinistas' combat operations deprived the bourgeoisie of its initiative and led to the upsurge of the popular movement that ensured the revolution's victory in 1979.

The Sandinista vanguard, however, remembered Fonseca's idea that "an armed insurrection does not necessarily mean revolution or social change . . . That is why we should invest the Nicaraguan insurrection with profound revolutionary content connected with radical social transformations." ¹⁷

That behest has been fulfilled. Sandino's successors have started building a new

Nicaragua. Revolutionary transformations were set in motion in the backward and devastated country, illiteracy is being wiped out, and a new culture is being created, assimilating the people's fine traditions which were once suppressed by the "dollar culture"; child mortality and epidemic disease are on the decline, and new schools, enterprises and plantations are appearing across the country. A profound agrarian reform has been carried out to meet the aspirations for which the peasants fought for generations. A housing reform is in progress, and the towns that were destroyed by Somocist aircraft are being rebuilt. Most important of all, a new state power has been set up, a truly democratic and representative power, which guarantees human rights. Under the new power, the country is being run with the direct involvement of workers and peasants, students and patriotically minded businessmen, clergymen and secular leaders, civilians and the military. The Sandinista People's Army and militia units — direct successors of the National Sovereignty Defense Army led by Sandino — are an important part of the young state; these are units of the armed people themselves, who are ready to defend the gains of the revolution. *The Vanguard Leadership Speaking* collection mostly deals with all these complicated issues of constructive work.

The imperialists were enraged by the victorious revolution in Nicaragua, a country which the USA had traditionally seen as its own backyard. Right after Somoza's overthrow and the establishment of people's power, Nicaragua became the target of unceasing provocations, of diplomatic and economic pressure on the part of the United States. The terroristic acts of the armed bandits, who enjoyed U.S. patronage and assistance, were followed by a direct military intervention. Progressive world opinion is concerned over the situation in that country caused by the invasion of bands of surviving Somoza henchmen, equipped and trained by U.S. instructors. The territory of neighboring states is being used as a bridgehead for the counter-revolution. The goal of that undeclared war is to restore the dictatorship. As usually happens in such instances, Washington has launched a propaganda drive to cover up the aggression, alleging that Nicaragua threatens the USA. President Reagan has publicly declared that the United States cannot allow Central America to go communist.¹⁸ Civilians, women and children are being killed. The invasion has also inflicted grave material damage on the country, which is facing economic difficulties as it is.

The revolution is in grave danger. But the

patriots are resolved to repulse the imperialists and their hirelings. In face of the foreign intervention, they are joining people's militia units and reserve battalions. There is no doubt that the Nicaraguan people, relying on international solidarity, will uphold their indisputable right to be masters of their own destiny, a right for which many generations of Nicaraguans have shed their blood.

Manuel Delgado
Costa Rican journalist

1. Carlos Fonseca, *Obras*, two volumes, Managua, 1982.
2. *Habla la Direccion de la Vanguardia*, Managua, departamento de Propaganda y Educacion Politica del FSLN, 1981.
3. Humberto Ortega, *Exposicion: la lucha ideologica y el caso Pastora*, Managua, Departamento de Propaganda y Educacion Politica del FSLN, 1982.
4. *Apuntes de Historia de Nicaragua*, Vol. 2, Managua, 1980.
5. Omar Cabezas, *La montana es algo mas que una inmensa estepa verde*, Managua, 1982.
6. *Sandino's Ideological Legacy. Collected documents and material*, Edited by I.R. Grigulevish, M.F. Kudachkin, and K.N. Kurin, Moscow, 1982 (in Russian).
7. *Habla la Direccion de la Vanguardia*, p. 125.
8. *Sandino's Ideological Legacy*, p. 97.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 67-70.
10. Carlos Fonseca, *Bajo la bandera del Sandinismo*, Managua, 1981, p. 273.
11. Humberto Ortega, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
12. Carlos Fonseca, *Obras*, Vol. 1, p. 88.
13. See *Apuntes de Historia de Nicaragua*, p. 225.
14. See, Carlos Fonseca, *Obras*, Vol. 1, p. 140.
15. *Apuntes . . .*, p. 235.
16. Omar Cabezas, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
17. Carlos Fonseca, *Obras*, Vol. 1, p. 68.
18. *Newsweek*, June 20, 1983, p. 23.

The USSR, the USA and the People's Revolution in China

A. Ledovsky

A detailed study of American
and Soviet policy toward the
Chinese national liberation
movement from the late
1940s to the early 1950s.

cloth 250 pp \$3.50

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.

Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6

There is no justification

Herbicides and Defoliants in War: The Long-Term Effects on Man and Nature. Hanoi, Published by Vietnam Courier, 1983, 99 pp.

Robert Harris, Jeremy Paxman, *A Higher Form of Killing. The Secret Story of Gas and Germ Warfare.* London, Chatto & Windus, 1982, 274 pp.

Early this year Ho Chi Minh City played host to an international symposium on the effects of the use of herbicides and defoliants in the U.S. war against the people of Vietnam. The symposium drew 160 noted biologists, botanists, doctors, chemists and ecologists from 21 countries. Its main purpose was to sum up the results of research into the military use of herbicides and defoliants. Shortly after the meeting, its main records — the final report and the communications of seven working sections of experts — were published in Hanoi in Vietnamese, English and French.

The problem was first discussed at an international scientific conference in Paris in 1970. World opinion was appalled by the evidence on the dimensions of the ecological war fought by the United States. The conference came to the conclusion that what U.S. Senator Nilson described as the ecological time bomb planted in Vietnam would affect the whole life cycle by doing damage that could not be estimated until later. But nobody knows how much later.

Official data indicate that during the Vietnam war the aggressors used about 72 million liters of chemicals, poisoning 1.7 million hectares, or one in every ten hectares. Plant life was destroyed mainly by three chemical weapons: Agent Orange (61 per cent of the chemicals used), Agent White and Agent Blue. Agent Orange contained dioxin, a highly toxic and extremely durable substance known as one of the strongest and most insidious poisons. As well as being very dangerous even when introduced into the human body once, it is capable of accumulating and becomes still more toxic when absorbed slowly and over a long period. Several milligrams of dioxin are enough to kill a person. But even smaller, "non-lethal" quantities cause terrible diseases, including cancer, and irreversible genetic mutations. "It is impossible to determine how much dioxin was in Agent Orange, but a conservative estimate is that the total amount was no less than 170 kg" (p. 14 of *Herbicides and Defoliants in War*).

The U.S. military used poison chemicals chiefly within the framework of Operation Ranch Hand, described in the symposium's final report as "a chemical war conducted with herbicides on a large scale in space and time, the first such massive employment in human-kind's history of war" (p. 13). The Pentagon launched the operation over South Vietnamese territory in 1961 and extended it three years later to North Vietnam and then to Laos and Cambodia. The spraying was carried out by transport aircraft equipped for the purpose. The U.S. administration and military command alleged that the object of the operation was to destroy plant life and not people. However, only a child could believe the assertion that officials knew nothing about the tragic effects of defoliants and herbicides on the population. They knew everything. Indeed, military censorship carefully deleted from American journalists' reports the slightest mention of chemicals used by the U.S. army.

A Higher Form of Killing, published in London last year, depicts Operation Ranch Hand in great detail. Ever since the beginning of the dirty war, the authors write, Pentagon generals had been planning large-scale chemical warfare in Vietnam, considering that country an "excellent field laboratory." Peasants called the area sprayed with Agent Orange "the land of the dead." By the time Ranch Hand was over, the soil of Vietnam contained about 240 pounds of dioxin, a few ounces of which would have been enough to destroy the population of London or New York (pp. 192-193).

Even before the end of the operation in South Vietnam, the number of still-born babies showed a substantial increase, the authors say. During the period of heaviest spraying doctors at Saigon Children's Hospital discovered that the number of babies suffering from spina bifida and cleft palates had tripled. The rate of "monsters" in families of Vietnam war veterans is higher than in ordinary families (see p. 18 of *Herbicides and Defoliants in War*).

The Americans devastated millions of hectares of evergreen forests, paddies, havea plantations and coconut palm groves. Toxic substances altered the biological composition of some soils, destroyed useful micro-organisms and lowered crop yields. "Many areas which were covered with trees and other woody plants throughout the year have become

savannas of low productivity with only wild grasses or a number of secondary successional plant species of little economic value..." (ibid., p. 16). Experts estimate that it will take decades or even centuries to make up for the damage done to Vietnam's forests.

Chemical weapons are doubly insidious in that they are highly dangerous to their users as well. *A Higher Form of Killing* points out that while Americans were trying to forget the Vietnam war, the number of former servicemen damaged by Agent Orange continued to grow. By the time the book came out, no less than 17,000 American former servicemen, and some 4,000 Australians and over 1,700 New Zealanders and South Koreans, who had fought on the side of the USA, had gathered together to sue the chemical companies which had manufactured the defoliant. These veterans included both direct and "indirect" victims of chemical poisoning: the men exposed to the defoliant are suffering from various diseases and the children fathered by them, no less than 40,000, are said to suffer from serious birth defects (see p. 196).

The suit was unsuccessful. But the matter could not have been hushed up. Early this year the Associated Press reported from Washington that nearly 16,000 American servicemen exposed to Agent Orange during the Vietnam war demanded that the government should pay compensation for the damage done to their health. A Federal court on Long Island ruled that the demand was lawful. Legal proceedings were started. However, the indictment was not brought in against the government or the Pentagon but against Dow Chemical and four other companies charged with withholding from the U.S. government crucial information on the effects of the use of herbicides.

The utterly hypocritical charge was just another ruse of official U.S. quarters aimed at exonerating them from responsibility for their crimes. Even with "orange rains" already falling on Indochina, Washington flatly denied the use of chemical weapons. Subsequently it brought forward its "experts" who claimed the use of herbicides and defoliants to be harmless to people and described it as selective and their effects as limited. With the infamous war at an end, Washington began to doctor the evidence, hoping that its crimes would be written off under the statute of limitations, and to invent stories about the alleged "use of Soviet chemi-

cal weapons" in Afghanistan and Kampuchea. But the crimes were not forgotten, and so Washington resorted to a new tactic. It wanted to whitewash itself by prosecuting businessmen, saying that the government had had no information about the likely effects of the use of poison chemicals and was therefore free of blame.

The Pentagon, for its part, issued urgent orders for the medical services of the U.S. Air Force to investigate the effect of Agent Orange on people. The relevant report came in last July. It affirmed that the poison was harmless to people and only destroyed plants, and as for the veterans taken ill, their illness could be due to anything. The veterans' suit was rejected on the basis of this patent forgery. Nor is this surprising, for the United States is preparing all out for new chemical wars, building up its already huge stockpiles of chemical weapons; in the next five years it is to spend nearly three billion dollars for this.

Speakers at the Ho Chi Minh City symposium voiced deep concern about the lack of exact information on the proportions of poisoning. Experts believe that dioxin and products of the decay of herbicides and defoliants may have been carried by air and water currents from Vietnamese territory to neighboring countries and the surrounding seas. But how far does the danger area reach? What may the decay of dioxin lead to? When will it stop? "These points cannot yet be established" (p. 18).

Therefore, the symposium called on scientists everywhere to continue and deepen research into the effects of chemical warfare in Vietnam with a view to removing them. The meeting was a milestone in the effort to unite scientists opposed to the manufacture and stockpiling of arms of mass destruction.

Reading special or popular literature on poison chemicals and the effects of their use is no pleasant pastime. Understandably, some readers turn away from photographs showing victims of this weapon. But this is certainly not to say that the general public need not know the terrible truth. In fact, everybody should be told and shown how the imperialist policy of aggression urged scientists to invent "a higher form of killing," should be given a clear idea of the extent and source of the impending danger. Both publications under review are helpful in this respect.

Alex Willough

In memory of Gustavo Machado

The international communist and working-class movement suffered a grave loss with the death at the age of 85 of Gustavo Machado, prominent political and social leader and Chairman of the Communist Party of Venezuela. Throughout his life, he was a staunch and consistent advocate of working-class interests and the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, an active fighter for the freedom and sovereignty of his homeland and of all oppressed peoples, for peace and international détente.

Gustavo Machado was born into a rich family in Caracas on July 19, 1898. As a youth, he took an active part in revolutionary activity, for which he was repeatedly arrested and exiled from the country.

Wherever he lived, he joined the revolutionary movement. In France and the USA, he established links with communist organizations. In Cuba, he closely cooperated with Julio Antonio Mella, a founder of the Communist Party. In Nicaragua, he joined Augusto Cesar Sandino in the armed struggle to liberate the fraternal people from U.S. invaders. For several years, he was General Secretary of the American Anti-Imperialist League. The logic of struggle brought him into the ranks of the communists. He did a great deal in setting up the Communist Party of Venezuela, which emerged as a clandestine party in 1931.

At the first congress of the CP Venezuela in 1946, Machado was elected a member of the CPV Central Committee's Political Bureau; in 1958, a member of the Central Committee's National Secretariat, and in 1971, Chairman of the CPV. He was longstanding director of the Central Committee's newspaper, *Tribuna Popular*, which recently marked its 35th anniversary, and wrote many articles, making a tangible contribution to the formation and legalization of the CPV.

Gustavo Machado's principled approach and loyalty to the people's interests earned him high prestige among the working masses. He was a CPV deputy at the National Constituent Assembly, ran as a candidate for the presidency of the Republic, and was many times elected deputy of the National Congress. As a prominent politician, social leader and parliamentarian, he enjoyed great respect not only among his associates, but also among those who did not share the communist ideals.

The international collective of *World Marxist Review* knew Gustavo Machado as a friend who had done a great deal to strengthen the CPV's cooperation with the journal.

The communists and revolutionaries of the world will always remember him as an ardent revolutionary, patriot and internationalist, who dedicated all his strength to a selfless struggle for our ideals.

Subscription Rates for 1984 to World Marxist Review

	Individual	Institution
Canada	\$15.00	\$30.00
USA	\$15.00	\$30.00
Other countries	\$20.00	\$35.00

Subscribers to *WMR* receive *Information Bulletin* at no extra charge.

Subscribe or renew now at 1983 rates.

Subscriptions or renewals at 1983 rates, for the calendar year, must be received by November 30.

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'Editions,
16, rue Christoph Plantin,
Luxembourg/Gasperich

Société Populaire d'Editions,
rue de la Caserne, 33-35
1000 Bruxelles, Belgique

Editions Nouvelles Frontières,
185, rue Ontario est,
Montréal, Québec H2X 1H5, Canada

Gestu BP 2678

Dacar, Senegal

AMHARIC EDITION:

Press Department
Ministry of Information and
National Guidance
P.O. Box 30232
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wokt, POB 6247,
Beyrouth, Liban
32, rue Ledru Rollin B.P. 152
Casablanca, Maroc
Dar Al-Hilal
16 Mohamed Ezz-Arab Street
Cairo, Egypt

BULGARIAN EDITION: Hemus,
Russki 6, Sofia, Bulgaria

CZECH EDITION: Artia,
Praha 1, Ve smeckach, 30, CSSR

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden,
Bredgade 37, 1260 Kobenhavn K, Denmark

FINNISH EDITION: Aikakaulehti Kommunisti,
Kotkankatu, 11, 00510 Helsinki 51, Finland

GERMAN EDITIONS:

Buchexport Volkseigener Aussenhandelsbetrieb
der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik,
701 Leipzig, Leninstrasse 16, DDR

Brücken-Verlag GmbH Literatur-Vertrieb,
Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf,
Ackerstrasse 3, FRG

GREEK EDITIONS:

Papayannis Stephanos,
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, Caracás, Venezuela

SWEDISH EDITION: Internationell Revy,
Fack, 12206 Enskede 6, Stockholm, Sweden

TURKISH EDITION: Baris ve Sosyalizm
Sorunlari, PK: 41, Sirkeci
Istanbul, Türkiye

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'ô xuất nhập,
Khẩu sách báo 32, Hai Bà Trưng,
Hà-Nôi, Vietnam

