

WORLD

Problems of

MARXIST

Peace and Socialism

REVIEW

December 1983, Volume 26, Number 12 \$1.00



**On the
Party / 27**

**Two lines in
world politics / 1**

**Latin America &
cultural identity / 20**

**FRG: factory
peace groups / 37**

**Canada: national
question / 62**

Africa / 14



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

December 1983, Vol. 26, No. 12

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

Features

- 1 Two lines in world politics and the problem of limiting nuclear weapons
B. Ponomarev (USSR)
- 9 Czechoslovakia: our society's revolutionary task
M. Jakes
- 14 A social democratic "project" for Africa, or the way to an impasse
S. Cissokho (Senegal)
- 20 The Latin American intellectual and the defense of cultural identity
V. Teitelboim (Chile)

The party

- 27 Organized and organizing force
- 33 Jamaica: the conditions for mass support
A. Harriot
- 36 Solidarity with the people of Grenada

Exchange of views

- 37 Workers oppose missiles
- 41 The French communists' research activity
J. Milhau
- 47 The peculiarities of anti-Marxism
E. Fromm (GDR)

Viewpoints

- 53 Do everything possible for disarmament and peaceful development
K. Sorsa
- 55 Socialism: unity of theory and practice
D. Poryazov, J. Aroyo, T. Pachev (Bulgaria)
- 62 On the national question in Canada
S. Walsh

Book reviews

- 67 There is no other way
I. Montagu
- 69 Who is shielding the nazi butchers?
J.M. Holden

Facts and figures

- 70 Serving peace and socialism
- 76 Index of contents for 1983

In memory of Yusuf Mohammed Dadoo



Two lines in world politics and the problem of limiting nuclear weapons

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

The thoughts and feelings of millions of people throughout the world are now turned to the destinies of peace, to whether there is to be a nuclear war or whether it can be averted and humankind saved from a nuclear catastrophe.

Never before in the entire history of humankind has there been a situation like the one that has now taken shape on the issue of war and peace. The point is that the revolution in military technology has produced such powerful means of destruction and devastation (nuclear missile weapons in the first place) and there is a real danger of hundreds of millions of people and even of all life on the Earth being wiped out in the event of a nuclear conflict. People are aware that this danger, which threatens everyone, is not only present, but is constantly growing.

That is why it is important for every human being, especially for those who are active in public life in their countries, to know where the source of the war danger lies, and, most importantly, how to combat it, and how to prevent a devastating war. At this point there arises the cardinal question of the antithesis between the two lines in world politics which reflect the nature of the two different social systems.

One line — the line of socialism and all the other peace-loving progressive forces — is aimed to preserve and strengthen peace, to check the arms race and to relax tensions, and to have mutually advantageous cooperation between states. The other — the militaristic line of the aggressive forces of imperialism, U.S. imperialism above all — is aimed to assure the United States of dominant positions in the world by stepping up the arms race and increasing tensions in defiance of the interests of other states and peoples.

International developments over the past several weeks have brought out the diametrically opposite nature of these two lines in even bolder relief.

The statement by Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU CC and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, of Sep-

tember 28 forcefully emphasized the Soviet Union's resolve to work to stop the forces of militarism and to prevent the world from sliding toward a nuclear war.¹ This fundamentally important document testifies once again that the USSR's policy is based on common sense, realism, and a deep sense of responsibility for the destinies of the world.

Yuri Andropov's answers to questions from the newspaper *Pravda* published on October 27 contain a new set of the USSR's foreign policy initiatives aimed to reduce nuclear missile armaments and to strengthen peace in Europe. The same goal inspired those who took part in the unprecedentedly large demonstrations held in European capitals and cities on other continents at the end of October. These demonstrations were visual confirmation that the overwhelming majority of the population of Western Europe is opposed to the U.S.-NATO military plans and backs the line of détente and disarmament.

Ronald Reagan's speech at the session of the UN General Assembly on September 26 was shot through with a totally different spirit. It was a concentrated expression of absurd egoism, of a haughty unwillingness to reckon with the reality, and of the present U.S. administration's dangerous claims which lack common sense. Reagan's high-flown rhetoric about adherence to the cause of peace and the sovereignty of nations remains a string of words.

And what are the U.S. government's deeds? The bandit invasion of Grenada by the United States, the escalation of the subversive war against Nicaragua, the spreading U.S. intervention in Lebanon — all this shows that for the sake of its imperial aims, the Washington administration has not only built up its nuclear and other arsenals, but has ever more frequently resorted to the use of weapons against independent countries rejecting its diktat. Indeed, no one can guarantee that it cannot cross the nuclear confrontation threshold before which every thinking person must halt.

The military expansionism of the United States has attained unprecedented proportions. Behind a barrage of talk about the "global spread" of Soviet military might, U.S. imperialism has been conducting a policy of international piracy, military diktat, and armed suppression of revolutionary liberation movements, trying everywhere to change the balance of forces in its own favor.

The main danger to humankind is now posed by the acts of the most reactionary part of the monopoly elite of the United States, as embodied in the policy of Reaganism. The campaign of hatred, the crusade against the truth, which the United States has carried on with unheard of cynicism are keynoted by the old and well-worn idea that the Soviet Union poses a "military threat" to other countries. Although Washington's propaganda methods tend to be primitive, their perniciousness should not be underestimated. One cannot afford to ignore the vast dimensions of the unprecedentedly inflated propaganda machine, the total lack of scruple in using cheap misinformation-and-slander ploys, and the reliance on the public's credulity and lack of information.

A tireless comparison of the two political lines and persevering exposure of the mendacity of imperialist propaganda are the key line in the struggle against the nuclear warmongers' sinister schemes and acts.

I

The U.S. administration is trying to justify its intention to go on with the nuclear arms race by claiming that over the past 10-15 years the USSR has allegedly gained an advantage in the sphere of strategic weapons. These inventions completely contradict the actual state of affairs.

The United States has always taken the initiative in developing nuclear weapons, their ever new types and their delivery vehicles, and in building up the nuclear arsenals. The United States tested its first atomic bombs in 1945 on Japan's civilian population, annihilating nearly 400,000 people. It was the first to deploy a fleet of intercontinental strategic bombers and missile-carrying nuclear submarines. It was the first to begin equipping its missiles with multiple warheads. Everything the USSR has done in the sphere of defense constituted no more than a forced response to that aggressive military activity of NATO's aimed against our country and against the socialist community.

"It has always been so that we merely followed the Americans in the arms build-up, and not the other way round," says Yuri Andropov. "While catching up with the United States, we kept proposing a halt to the arms race, a freeze

on the level of armaments on both sides and their reduction."²

For a number of years, the United States had a monopoly of nuclear weapons. Just now Reagan boasts that this monopoly was not used by the United States for its own interests. But that is a deliberate deception. The fact is that at the time, intensive preparations were under way in the United States for a nuclear attack on the USSR. Now unclassified U.S. documents show that the use of nuclear weapons against the Soviet Union was considered even at the end of 1945. A plan code-named Charioteer, which was drawn up in 1948, provided for the dropping of more than 130 atomic bombs on 70 Soviet cities. Under the Dropshot project (1949), up to 85 per cent of Soviet industry was to be destroyed by 300 nuclear strikes.

These barbarous aggressive plans were not realized because the U.S. atomic weapons monopoly was liquidated in the late 1940s and early 1950s. The USSR soon developed the corresponding delivery vehicles, which deprived U.S. territory of its erstwhile invulnerability. But the United States continued to build up its nuclear potential and maintained superiority in strategic weapons for a long time. However, in the 1970s, as a result of the Soviet people's tremendous efforts, a rough military-strategic parity was established between the USSR and the United States, between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

The strategic equilibrium is a gain of fundamental historical significance. It is a factor containing the aggressive aspirations of imperialism, and this meets the interests of all the peoples. The maintenance of the military equilibrium is a necessary condition for realizing the principle of equality and equal security of the sides.

The USSR has repeatedly and perseveringly raised and continues to raise the question of halting the arms race and reducing the stock-piled potential with the indispensable maintenance of the military equilibrium. Yuri Andropov has emphasized: "Everything the Soviet Union has done and is doing in no way testifies to an urge for military superiority on its part. The treaties and agreements which we have had and are prepared to have with the American side are aimed to reduce the level of nuclear confrontation without the parity being upset, i.e., without detriment to the security either of the USSR or of the United States."³

Meanwhile, the United States has not only refused to ratify SALT 2, but has made the break-up of the strategic equilibrium and attainment of military superiority the dominant

idea of its military policy. This is proved by incontrovertible facts.

First, the Reagan administration has openly taken the line of sharply building up its so-called "counter-force" potential, i.e., weapons capable of destroying the USSR's strategic forces and depriving it of the possibility of delivering a retaliatory strike. Simply speaking, the idea is to create a first nuclear-strike potential. This idea is being materialized in the programs for deploying MX and Trident 2 missiles, which have an especially high accuracy, the Midgetman missiles, many thousands of long-range Cruise missiles, and B-1 and Stealth bombers, and in the projects for creating a space anti-missile defense system, which completely contradicts the treaty on limiting anti-missile defense systems concluded by the USSR and the United States in 1972. The same "counter-force" purposes are served by the U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe.

Second, contrary to the President's declaration from the UN rostrum, the Reagan administration's military strategy is based on the adventurist notion that the United States can win a nuclear war. The 1982 directives for building the U.S. Armed Forces envisage that "the United States nuclear capabilities must prevail even under the conditions of a prolonged war..." They "must prevail and be able to force the Soviet Union to seek earliest termination of hostilities on terms favorable to the United States."

There is continued elaboration of plans for a "limited" nuclear war, above all in Europe, which is to be carried on with the use of Pershing-2, Cruise missiles and neutron weapons, whose large-scale production is already being carried on in the United States. This completely ignores the fact that physicists and military specialists have declared that it is impossible to "limit" a nuclear war, if one should break out.

Third, in complete accord with these conceptions, with reliance on a "first, pre-emptive strike," the United States has flatly refused to follow the Soviet Union's example and to commit itself to no-first-use of nuclear weapons. The U.S. administration and some of its NATO allies do not just allow for but directly plan the first use of nuclear weapons.

The Declaration of the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe, adopted by the 36th session of the UN General Assembly on the Soviet Union's initiative in 1981, says: "There will never be any justification or pardon for statesmen who would take the decision to be the first to use nuclear weapons." Any doctrines allowing for the first use of nuclear weapons and any acts

pushing the world to a nuclear catastrophe were declared by the General Assembly to be incompatible with the laws of human morality and the lofty ideals of the United Nations.

The United States and its closest allies voted against that declaration.

Fourth. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been appropriated for the mass production of binary nerve gas. U.S. military leaders have openly demonstrated their intention to use chemical weapons in violation of the international obligations assumed by the United States. General Bernard Rogers, Commander-in-Chief of NATO armed forces in Europe has declared that a truly flexible strategy in Europe requires the modernization of chemical weapons and an increase in their power. He also hypocritically asserted that the use of chemical weapons could allow enough time for political and diplomatic efforts to end a conflict before it went across the nuclear threshold.

In other words, if you don't want a nuclear death you will get a chemical one. Let us recall that even the Hitlerites did not dare use chemical weapons on a mass scale. However, U.S. generals and politicians are now prepared to commit this crime and to outdo the fascist organizers of genocide.

Fifth, the United States and NATO have been building up their conventional weapons at a rapid pace. For that purpose, Washington has been exerting strong pressure on its allies to make them increase their "contribution to the common defense." The gist of the so-called Rogers Plan is the urge to get all the NATO members to increase the growth of their military expenditures to 4.5 per cent a year in real terms.

Sixth. For decades, the United States kept building up a sprawling network of military bases in all the strategically important areas of the world. The Pentagon now has on the territory of 32 countries more than 1,500 military bases and installations, with most of them deployed along the perimeter of the USSR and its allies. More than half a million U.S. troops are constantly stationed on the territory of other countries. Under Reagan, a rapid deployment force numbering several hundred thousand men has been set up. The U.S. military presence has been increased in the most diverse areas of the world.

All of this keeps producing crisis situations, hotbeds of military tension and armed conflicts. The latest visual examples of the criminal consequences of such activity are provided by Lebanon, Central America, South America and, finally, the bandit pogrom in tiny Grenada. In the light of the situation in which it was staged,

the unprecedentedly brazen and treacherous provocation with the dispatch of a South Korean plane on a reconnaissance mission into the air space of the USSR, which led to the death of innocent people, makes one recall another one staged 50 years ago: the setting on fire of the Reichstag by the fascists. At that time, the capitalist world was also in the grip of a deep crisis. At that time, there was also a "crusade against communism," and everyone knows how that ended.

Here is something the peoples should not forget: Hitler's blatant anti-communism and anti-Sovietism led to a world war. Reagan's cynical anti-Sovietism and anti-communism are also fraught with war, this time a nuclear war.

So, along every line there is evidence of the growing aggressiveness of U.S. imperialism and attempts to upset the military parity. Nor is this a matter of responding to some imaginary military "superiority" of the Soviet Union, but an urge to secure nuclear superiority and to dictate one's will to the whole world. Yuri Andropov has stressed: "The military-strategic parity which has been attained has deprived the United States of the possibility of blackmailing us with a nuclear threat. This parity is a reliable guarantee of peace, and we shall do everything to preserve it."⁴

It is indicative that the U.S. hawks themselves now and again, with a large dose of cynicism, refute their own inventions about some Soviet military superiority. Thus, when the Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff General John Vessey was asked in the U.S. Senate Armed Forces Committee whether he would change places with the Chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, without giving it a second thought he said that he would not. In the same committee, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger reaffirmed that he would not agree to exchange the U.S. nuclear arsenal for the Soviet one. Behind these statements are both a recognition of the approximate equality in the sphere of strategic nuclear might between the United States and the USSR, and the far-reaching plans of the U.S. militarists to acquire a crushing superiority.

The unwitting admissions of former President Jimmy Carter reveal the true motives of the U.S. militarists. Carter recalls how he was upset by the false assertions of his military commanders that the United States was weak and the USSR strong. Carter believes these claims to be a very serious distortion of the facts. A balanced assessment will show, he says, that the United States is not inferior to the USSR in nearly all the elements of military might. But in

order to get the Congress to increase budget appropriations, the military keep complaining about "lags" in warships, missiles, planes, tanks, etc.

What an eloquent admission! The only remarkable thing here is that such admissions tend to be made by former U.S. presidents, who meet the demands of the military-industrial complex when they are in the White House.

The men in Washington are perfectly well aware that there is no threat of an attack by the Soviet Union. Thus, in the spring of this year, a Presidential Commission on Strategic Forces (the so-called Scowcroft's Commission), which includes former defense secretaries and other high-ranking members of the armed forces and intelligence, admitted quite unambiguously in its report that Soviet military "programs do not, in and of themselves, indicate plans to initiate nuclear attacks."

Despite such admissions, Washington's futile drive for its lost military superiority continues. For the sake of that elusive goal, the Reagan administration has used various pretexts for systematically destroying the system of international treaties and agreements, which had been created over the preceding period through the joint efforts of the Soviet Union, the United States and other countries, a system designed to stabilize the international situation and prevent a slide toward nuclear war. The letter and spirit of the Soviet-American agreements on the principles of mutual relations, and on the prevention of a nuclear war are being daily trampled. In addition to SALT 2, the present administration has also refused to ratify the treaties on limiting underground nuclear weapons tests (1974) and on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes (1976). The United States blocked the Soviet-British-U.S. negotiations on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests when they were in the final stages. Washington also interrupted the talks on limiting military activity in the Indian Ocean, on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their liquidation, and other negotiations.

In justification of its "sincere desire" to reduce nuclear weapons, Washington loves to refer to the U.S. participation in the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva. But the facts show that in all these cases the U.S. administration has taken a stand impeding the achievement of an understanding or has conducted a line of actual sabotage.

Guided by the principle of equality and equal security, the Soviet side has proposed that all the components of strategic weapons, and not

just some individual and arbitrarily chosen ones, should be subject to reductions and qualitative limitations, and that by the year 1990 the total number of strategic delivery vehicles should be reduced by both sides by 25 per cent. It has also proposed a reduction in the total number of nuclear warheads on strategic delivery vehicles and in the number of vehicles with multiple warheads.

The main purpose of the Soviet proposals is to put an end to the strategic arms race at long last, to reduce the level of nuclear confrontation with the maintenance of a rough parity, to strengthen strategic stability without any detriment to the security of the sides. These proposals take account of the interests both of the USSR and of the United States, and, given good will on the U.S. side, an understanding could be reached on that basis.

But the United States clearly does not want an agreement on just principles. Behind a barrage of endless talk about its "good intentions," it has proposed a procedure for cutting back strategic weapons that would be tantamount to the United States receiving unilateral advantages. This refers both to the initial U.S. proposals, and to Reagan's proposals announced in early October and containing the showy "build-down" modernization idea.

If everything the Americans have proposed is summed up, the total number of warheads on U.S. strategic delivery vehicles would increase from 13,000 to 15,000. This includes the forthcoming deployment of long-range Cruise missiles. Consequently, in practice this means an increase in the strategic potential, although it is dubbed a "reduction."

Washington has flatly refused to discuss the question of a freeze on strategic weapons, i.e., it wants to have a free hand in implementing all its programs for building up its strategic weapons. At the same time, the United States has proposed the destruction of a sizable part precisely of the weapons which are most developed in the USSR, and to force us to spend vast material resources in restructuring our strategic nuclear forces. Meanwhile, the weapons in which the United States is strongest are to be left intact. And this patently self-seeking approach is dubbed "fair"!

The U.S. approach is a straightforward attempt to axe the foundations of the USSR's strategic forces, to facilitate the deployment of the latest U.S. strategic weapons, and to achieve superiority over the Soviet Union on that basis. The talks at Geneva are used by the Reagan administration as a smokescreen to cover up these intentions.

II

The aggressive line of the USA and NATO has posed a threat to peace in many areas of the globe. But, Yuri Andropov has emphasized, "the nuclear arms race in Europe has now become the nerve center of international relations. It could become the source of a swift and sharp growth in the threat of a new world war."⁵ As in the sphere of strategic weapons, the Reagan administration is trying to upset the rough parity, to secure superiority over the Warsaw Treaty countries, and to create a first-nuclear-strike potential. In order to vindicate these plans, imperialist propaganda keeps plugging the false claim that the Soviet Union has a "monopoly" of medium-range weapons. The same purposes are served by the transparent trick of withdrawing 1,400 obsolete U.S. nuclear projectiles from Europe and making claims about NATO's "restraint," as is done in the communiqué of the recent meeting of NATO's Nuclear Planning Group in Montebello, Canada. Let us look at the incontrovertible facts, past and present.

The nuclear confrontation problem in Europe was not created by the Soviet Union but by the United States. Soon after the Second World War, the United States concentrated hundreds of bombers with nuclear bombs on board at its bases in Europe. In the 1950s, the number of planes and then of missiles belonging to the United States and its NATO allies kept growing: by the early 1960s, the number of nuclear weapons deployed in West European countries reached 7,000.

The Soviet Union could not, of course, look on indifferently at how more and more death-dealing weapons were being aimed at its cities. From 1959 to 1961, the USSR deployed its SS-4 and SS-5 missiles as a counterweight to these forward-based weapons of NATO's. While doing so, it repeatedly invited the United States to hold talks for the purpose of fully or at least partially ridding Europe of nuclear weapons. However, its proposals always met with a stubborn refusal.

In 1969, the United States began to develop a new medium-range missile which subsequently came to be known as Pershing-2. By the mid-1970s, the program for the production and deployment of this missile and of long-range Cruise missiles in Europe had been determined.

Contrary to Western assertions, the appearance of Soviet SS-20 missiles in the late 1970s did not upset the equilibrium. First, the new missiles came in as substitutes for the old SS-4 and SS-5 missiles which were being dis-

mantled and taken off the weapons list, with more of the old missiles being withdrawn than new ones installed, so that the total number was even reduced. The liquidation of SS-5 missiles has already been concluded. Secor 2, alongside the earlier deployed British missiles, in that period there was an intensive deployment of French missiles, and the nuclear bomber force of these countries was modernized.

At present, NATO has 857 medium-range vehicles in Europe, including 162 missiles belonging to Britain and France. The Soviet Union has a somewhat larger number of medium-range nuclear delivery vehicles — 938, including 473 missiles. But in the capability of delivering nuclear warheads at one time, NATO has a 50 per cent advantage. Overall there is, therefore, a rough parity.

The deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles on the scale envisaged by NATO's 1979 "twin-track decision" (108 Pershing-2 and 464 Cruise missiles) — in the absence of counter-measures on the part of the USSR — would produce a considerable advantage for NATO in the number of delivery vehicles and an even greater one, in the number of nuclear warheads. But it is not only a matter of quantitative indicators. The main thing is that, with their accuracy (besides, the Pershing-2 has a very short flight-time of between 6 and 12 minutes), the U.S. missiles are a dangerous first-strike weapon. This is, in effect, the build-up of the material facilities for the adventurist concept of a "limited" nuclear war. What is more, it will disrupt not only the European but also the strategic parity between the United States and the USSR, since the new U.S. missiles will be able to hit targets on the territory of the USSR, while the SS-20s do not reach U.S. territory.

The initial U.S. position at the Geneva negotiations was formulated in Reagan's "zero option." It amounted to the demand that the USSR should unilaterally liquidate all the medium-range missiles it had — both in Europe and in Asia — whereas NATO's nuclear forces, including the U.S. forward-based forces, would remain completely intact. What is that but a peremptory demand for the USSR's unilateral disarmament?

In the "interim solution," which then followed and which was presented as a display of flexibility, the Soviet Union was invited to give its blessings to the deployment of a definite number of U.S. missiles unilaterally to reduce to the same limit the number of its missiles, both in Europe and in Asia. In the process, the corresponding nuclear weapons of Britain and France were not counted. Nor was any pro-

vision made for any reductions in the U.S. medium-range aircraft. It turned out, therefore, that all the reductions of medium-range weapons would fall to the USSR, while the United States and NATO would be enabled to increase their nuclear potential in Europe.

Nor did the situation change after Reagan's loudly advertised proposals which he announced at the end of September. What do they boil down to?

The Soviet Union is once again required to include in the medium-range-weapons equation all its corresponding missiles, and not only those within reach of Western Europe. As for the United States, it claims a free hand in deploying medium-range missiles beyond the boundaries of Europe. The United States wants to have as many warheads on these missiles capable of hitting the USSR as there would be on Soviet missiles which do not reach the territory of the United States. And that is presented as equality!

The United States is still flatly opposed to the counting of British and French nuclear forces.

Reagan has vaguely promised to think about the possibility of limiting nuclear-carrying aircraft. But in so doing he demands the fulfillment of a condition known to be unacceptable to the USSR: its consent to the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Europe and elsewhere. Besides, the limitation would not involve all the medium-range aircraft vehicles but only those arbitrarily selected by the U.S. side.

Our principled assessment of these U.S. proposals was given in the September 28 Statement by Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU CC and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, when he said: "Details aside, the essence of the so-called new move in the U.S. position billed as 'superb,' boils down to a proposal to reach agreement, as before, on how many Soviet medium-range missiles should be reduced and how many new U.S. missiles should be deployed in Europe in addition to the nuclear potential NATO already has.

"In short, we are invited to carry on a conversation on how to help the NATO bloc to break the medium-range nuclear weapons balance existing in the European zone to its advantage. And it is this move that, without batting an eyelid, is being presented as something new."⁶

In contrast to the United States, the Soviet Union has set the goal of achieving an agreement at Geneva that would in fact sharply reduce the level of the nuclear confrontation.

The USSR's position is based on a genuine zero solution for Europe: to clear it completely

of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical.

Since the United States and the other NATO countries do not agree to this, the Soviet Union has proposed an agreement on a radical reduction of the existing medium-range weapons of NATO and the Soviet Union, with the reduction to affect both missiles and bombers.

The USSR has proposed a reduction of medium-range nuclear weapons that would be based entirely on the principle of equality and equal security of the sides. From this standpoint, the question of counting the British and French nuclear forces is of fundamental importance.

No one can deny that the British and French nuclear forces exist and are targeted on the socialist countries. There is a broad understanding in the West of the logic and fairness of counting them in the total nuclear forces balance. As much has been recognized, in particular, in a number of documents of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and other social democratic parties.

As Yuri Andropov stressed in his answers to questions from the newspaper *Pravda* on October 27, "we have displayed and continue to display flexibility in seeking concrete solutions with the observance of a single but indispensable requirement: the equilibrium of forces in Europe in medium-range nuclear weapons must not be upset."

Striving to set a good example and induce the other side to take a constructive stand, the USSR has repeatedly taken unilateral steps along this way.

At the negotiations in Geneva, the USSR put forward a number of important initiatives and took major steps for the purpose of achieving an agreement, namely:

- a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of new missiles in the European part of its territory, and also in every place from which the missiles could reach Western Europe;

- in the past two years, considerable reductions have been made unilaterally in the number of Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe;

- the Soviet Union has agreed to the establishment of individual sub-levels for reduced missiles and aircraft;

- it has agreed to reduce its missiles by hundreds of units — to an appreciably lower number than that held by Britain and France — and to equalize the number of warheads on the remaining missiles;

- the USSR declared its readiness to get down to a unilateral reduction of SS-4 missiles (and we have over 200 of them) and to complete

their liquidation in the course of 1984 and 1985, if the United States abandoned the deployment of its missiles in Europe by the declared deadline, thereby making it possible to continue the talks;

- finally, we agreed to destroy all the reduced missiles and launching ramps, and not to relocate them to the East.

We have now also agreed not to make any transfer of Soviet missiles from east to west. What is more, with the achievement of a mutually acceptable agreement, the deployment of SS-20 missiles in the eastern regions will also be stopped, provided there are no substantial changes in the strategic situation in the Asian region.

It is also important to note that, displaying additional flexibility, the USSR has expressed its readiness to agree to sum-total levels equal for the USSR and NATO of medium-range aircraft-vehicles which could be substantially different from those we had earlier proposed.

This shows that all the inventions and demagoguery about the USSR's "intransigence" and "rigidity" of approach to the negotiations are absurd and totally groundless.

For a long time, the propagandists of NATO's "additional armament" themselves asserted that it would become superfluous if the Soviet Union reduced the quantity of its medium-range nuclear weapons targeted on Western Europe to the 1977-1978 level. But realization of the Soviet proposals would signify that we would have left fewer missiles and warheads on them than there were in 1976.

The Soviet Union is prepared to do all it can to find solutions at the talks. But our flexibility is not boundless. It has a clearcut limit: the vital interests of the security of the Soviet Union and all the other socialist community countries. Any attempts to impose on the Soviet Union terms of an agreement going beyond that limit are hopeless.

Realizing the tremendous importance which Western public opinion attaches to the very fact of continued negotiations at Geneva, the NATO men are already asserting that the negotiations can and must continue even after the missile deployment is begun, as if nothing had happened. They also keep saying that that is precisely when the Soviet Union will become more amenable. So here is something that everyone must know: that will not happen. The Soviet leadership has warned on the most authoritative level that the appearance of new U.S. missiles in Western Europe would make the continuation of the negotiations now under way in Geneva impossible. It was said that in that event the Warsaw Treaty countries

would be forced to take effective defense counter-measures.

The May 28, 1983 statement by the Soviet Government said that the USSR would be forced to review its decision concerning the unilateral moratorium on the further deployment of medium-range weapons in the European zone. There would arise the need to effect measures to create a threat with respect to the United States itself similar to the one which the Pershings and Cruise missiles would create with respect to our countries.

Washington, the men of NATO, the advocates of "additional armament" are perfectly well aware that comprehension of the significance of our counter-measures by Western public opinion will generate a fresh upsurge in the anti-missile movement. Hence the attempts to "calm" people: the assertions that the socialist countries will not dare to take large-scale counter-measures. The announcement by the USSR Ministry of Defense of the start of preparatory work for the deployment of operational-tactical missile complexes on the territory of the GDR and Czechoslovakia, as agreed to by the governments of the USSR, the GDR and Czechoslovakia, has debunked these demagogic assertions. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that the counter-measures will be very serious and tangible in military terms.

None of this has anything to do with face-saving or considerations of prestige, let alone a desire to achieve military superiority. The purpose of the socialist countries' counter-measures would be to preserve the nuclear forces parity. And that is necessary, in particular, also to deprive the adventurists in Washington of any possibility of resorting to nuclear blackmail. In other words, the socialist countries' counter-measures will simultaneously be an act of self-defense, and a means for checking the hegemonistic ambitions of U.S. imperialism, which are a danger to the whole of humankind.

* * *

In his reply to an address from a group of social democratic deputies of the FRG Bundestag, Yuri Andropov emphasized that "the most vigorous and resolute actions are necessary in order to break the dangerous course of events and to remove the nuclear threat from humankind."⁷

The efforts of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries aimed to normalize the international situation, to remove the threat of

nuclear war and reach mutually acceptable agreements on arms cuts are meeting with wide support throughout the world. The Madrid meeting has shown that, in defiance of the U.S. line of openly pushing the world toward a political and military confrontation, the majority of European states opt for finding mutually acceptable solutions. The Madrid meeting once again confirmed that the policy of détente has a solid reserve of viable forces.

This is also evidenced by the meeting of the heads of delegations of the non-aligned states which was held at the UN headquarters on Indira Gandhi's initiative. In their final document, its participants came out in favor of an immediate prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, for a freeze on them, and for the creation of nuclear-free zones. They condemned the interventionist line of U.S. imperialism and resolutely demanded that the United States should stop its overt and covert acts of intervention and aggression.

The U.S. ruling circles' policy of imperial expansionism and provocations, of stepping up the arms race and sabotaging the peaceful cooperation of states is a challenge to the manifest will of all the peoples. It does harm to the interests of hundreds of millions of people. That is why there is an inexorable growth and expansion of the movement of protest against the warmongers' schemes. The peoples resolutely demand a halt to the arms race, and attainment at the on-going negotiations of responsible agreements on the basis of equality and common security.

In a statement issued in Berlin on October 20, 1983, the heads of government of the countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) addressed a pressing call on the United States and the other NATO countries "to weigh most seriously the dangerous consequences that would be caused by the deployment of new medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, and to work for the achievement of an agreement meeting the interests of peace in Europe and throughout the world."

The Soviet Union will continue to do its utmost in the future as well in order to bring about a crucial change in the international situation and to safeguard peace.

1. See *Pravda*, September 29, 1983.
2. *Ibid.* April 25, 1983.
3. *Ibid.*, March 27, 1983.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*, August 18, 1983.
6. *Ibid.*, September 29, 1983.
7. *Ibid.*, September 21, 1983.

Our society's revolutionary task

Milos Jakes

CC Presidium member, CC Secretary,
Communist Party of Czechoslovakia

For our people, the 16th congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPCz) was the start of another stage in realizing our long-term strategic line: the building of a developed socialist society. The new line was approved by our party's 14th congress (1971) and elaborated by the 15th (1976) and 16th (1981) congresses. Along this way, we draw support from the wealth of experience in other socialist community countries, the Soviet Union in the first place, while the deepening of the international socialist division of labor is an important external economic factor of our society's efficient development.

The socialist countries' economic, scientific and technical cooperation, and the deepening of socialist economic integration are of increasing importance. The successes scored by the individual states and by our community as a whole have created the prospects for advancing to a qualitatively new stage in building a developed socialist society. The present stage is characterized by the switch of the national economies to intensification in which scientific and technical progress and the application of its achievements in production provide the main propelling power.

Science and technology have an ever greater role to play in the class struggle between socialism and capitalism. In the present situation, when our countries are faced with thoroughly planned and coordinated economic subversion, whose sponsors want to weaken to the utmost the economic basis of the fraternal states and of the community as a whole, to reduce their economic growth rates and to make socialism less attractive in the world, in such conditions the development of socialist economic integration becomes a prime vital imperative for all the members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA).

The socialist economy can be kept on a steady upgrade and an effective change in the boosting of social labor productivity brought about only through constant use of the results of the scientific and technological revolution (STR). That is why we agree with what Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), said at the June 1983 ple-

nary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee: "The main way to a qualitative advance in the productive forces is, of course, a switch to intensive development and conjunction in practice of the advantages of our socialist system with the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution."¹

Alongside the progress of science and technology and the extension and deepening of economic integration ties, the further development of the working people's creative activity is a crucial factor in intensifying economic development. Better planning and administration of all the social processes, especially the raising of the level and efficiency of economic planning and administration, are crucial in making these factors more effective. This means not only economic processes as such, but the whole spectrum of social phenomena on which economic development depends. This means that orientation toward applying STR achievements requires greater coherent direction of all the social forces and the creation of a social climate that would have a stimulating effect on every sphere of life.

That cannot be done without strengthening the leading, unifying role of the communist party in the society's political system, without improving its ideological and organizational activity among broad strata of the working people: workers, cooperative peasants, engineers, technicians, scientists and administrative personnel.

Socialism's supreme goal is to attain material well-being for and ensure all-round perfection of every member of society, and that is the goal to which the development of the productive forces, science and technology is geared. Instead of the haphazard development, unemployment and competition which are the hallmarks of the capitalist way of life, we have planning, full employment, massive participation in economic management, and socialist emulation among the working people. Those are the incontestable advantages of socialism, which have stood the test of history.

Of course, the use of advantages and the realization of potentialities do not occur of themselves. This requires intense effort, which depends on the concrete conditions, and on the

operation of objective and subjective factors. Here, no one is insured against failures and mistakes. For various reasons, we are now only at the first stage in combining the achievements of the STR with the advantages of socialism. But this problem is central to all the community countries, including Czechoslovakia, and we are sure that it will be successfully solved.

The line of intensifying production, which is now the basis of the CMEA countries' economic strategy, has become the practical embodiment of the conjunction of STR achievements and the advantages of the new society.

By intensification Marx meant the use of "more effective means of production."² In this sense, economic intensification is variously realized at all times. But the point is how high the rate is, and how much of the whole range of methods consists of intensive methods of development, as compared with extensive methods.

At the initial stages of socialist construction in Czechoslovakia, as in other countries of our community, the extensive way played a highly progressive and predominant role. It was possible to involve in production uncommitted man-power resources, develop still untapped mineral deposits, build new enterprises, etc. In that period, the fast-developing economy achieved high results. But by the 1970s, these potentialities turned out to be largely worked out. There arose the need, which was realized by the party in good time, to shift the emphasis mainly to an intensive way in developing production, which meant constant renewal of the stock of equipment to ensure the use of the latest technologies; introduction of technologies which made it possible constantly to rationalize the use of raw and other materials and energy, so increasing their economies; creation of the best working conditions; perfection of the structure of production and management; and deepening of socialist integration, primarily with the USSR.

The role of scientific and technological progress as the main economic development factor in the building of mature socialism was examined by a special plenary meeting of the CPCz CC in May 1974. The 16th congress of the CPCz considered the course of scientific and technological progress in interconnection with economic intensification and ranked it as the revolutionary task of our society as a whole. Consequently, the switching of the economy mainly to intensive reproduction has now been under way for a number of years, and although, like any restructuring, it has entailed difficulties that, among other things, resulted in a temporary slowdown in the quantitative

growth of production, the qualitative improvement of the economy has already yielded results.

It can be safely said that, despite some departures from the adopted plans, our national economy has, on the whole, developed and continues to develop normally. The various measures taken to improve planning and administration, the growth of the working people's initiative and the steadily strengthening cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other CMEA countries were the factors that have helped to cope with the emerging difficulties.

In the 1970s, our national income went up by 58 per cent, industrial output by 74 per cent, agricultural output by 22 per cent, and building by 87 per cent. This helped substantially to raise the people's living standards. Social consumption grew by 68 per cent, and personal consumption by 37 per cent, with food consumption per head (in terms of calorific value) ranking among the highest in the world. Incidentally, here the achievements in some ways tend to develop into shortcomings; in calorific value, our average daily diet is 8 per cent higher than the recommended scientific norm, and that mainly because of a heightened consumption of sugar and fats. The supply of consumer durables to the population has been markedly improved; indeed, the sale of some of them has even stagnated. That does not at all imply that we need to reduce the level of consumption; its structure must be perfected and product quality raised so as to meet the constantly growing requirements of consumers more fully.

Today, the economy continues to be dynamic. In the first two years of the current five-year plan period (1981-1982), centrally-run industry increased output by 3.4 per cent. In 1982, agricultural output was 4.4 per cent up on 1981 (and cropping 13.8 per cent up). We have managed to maintain an uninterrupted supply of the domestic market with the staple foods, and also despite some shortcomings in assortment, to cope with the difficulties caused by changes in demand following the increase in some retail prices. On the whole, we have successfully tackled the problem of balancing out our external economic relations and reducing our debt.

Some of the qualitative characteristics of the Czechoslovak economy have improved. Fuel and raw and other materials are being more rationally used; the reconstruction of industrial enterprises is proceeding more vigorously; a number of our industries are up to world standards, while some products are rated as the best

in the world. Ninety per cent of the increase in industrial output comes from higher labor productivity. The features characteristic of highly efficient production are ever more pronounced.

That is our positive balance. But one has to admit quite frankly that, despite the deepening positive trends, Czechoslovakia's communists cannot be quite satisfied with what has been achieved, above all with the rate of scientific and technological progress and the slow application of its achievements in practice, which falls short of the requirements of the present stage. That was the problem on the agenda of the eighth plenary meeting of the CPCz CC, which met last June.

Analyzing the factors which tend to slow down the practical application of scientific and technical achievements, it said that among the main ones was the fact that STR development has not yet become pivotal to *planning and administration*. The drive for extensive and consistent realization in practice of new discoveries and inventions does not quite adequately determine the content of administrative, planning and organizational activity. In other words, we still make less than full use of the advantages of the socialist economy.

All of this is evidenced, in particular, by the fact that science and technology still have little influence on the development of the key branches of industry which determine its upswing. There is an excessive diffusion of forces, and duplication of research projects, which are out of touch with the practical needs of the national economy. The science-technology-production chain is, on the whole, not yet sufficiently adjusted and works much too slowly.

The plenary meeting decided on the fundamental measures which are to speed up the application of scientific and technical achievements in practice. Among these are: the working out and creation of conditions for conducting a coherent state policy in science and technology, determination of the main lines and tasks of scientific and technological progress in Czechoslovakia's national economy, further deepening of economic integration and scientific and technological cooperation with the CMEA countries, notably the Soviet Union, and efforts to ensure greater research-and-development efficiency and stimulation of the working people's initiatives.

Of much importance in formulating the CPCz's coherent scientific and technological policy will be its 10 main lines, as determined by the plenary meeting. These range over important spheres, such as rational consumption of fuel and energy, development of nuclear

energetics, optimal use of raw material resources, enhancement of the level of the country's self-sufficiency in foodstuffs, perfection of the structure of industry, broad introduction of complex mechanization and automation of labor with the use of microelectronics and robots and the elimination of arduous manual labor on that basis, assimilation of discoveries in genetics and biomechanics, improvement of public health care, and protection of the environment.

Ways to improve the planning and administration of scientific and technological progress have also been outlined. In this context, attention was drawn to prognostication and to ensuring a comprehensive and goal-oriented approach to national-economic administration. It was said that before plans are drawn up there must be a study of long-term trends in science and technology. It was recommended that, in tackling the key problems, use should be made of *long-term comprehensive goal-oriented programs*. Such programs, comprising all the economic, scientific, technological, social and regional aspects, are to unite the efforts of diverse enterprises and industries. The comprehensive programs are to ensure a close connection between science and production and to provide one of the chief instruments for ensuring the state interest in the application of scientific and technological achievements. They are to help enhance the role of the state plan in accelerating scientific and technological progress and increasing its influence on the economy.

Important proposals were also made to improve the planning of capital investments, the system of forming and using internal funds at enterprises, and proposals on credit, price formation, and material incentives for inventions and new ideas.

Consequently, *mobilization of all the internal resources* for accelerated development of science and technology and application of their achievements, and full use of our society's powerful material and technical facilities and inexhaustible creative powers will be of crucial importance for the Czechoslovak economy in the 1980s. The party is well aware that success cannot be achieved through a mere improvement of planning and the activity of state organs. It is important that every production association, enterprise, team and working person should display the greatest concern for scientific and technological development. Here, much depends on how their interests can be concerted for the attainment of the common goal. We want to adjust our system of economic instruments of administration so as to have an effective interconnection between the pro-

duction results of work collectives, the mobilization of their own reserves, growth in the technical level of production and higher product quality. Only then will what is advantageous to the society be simultaneously advantageous to the enterprise, to each working person, and vice versa: that which is not advantageous to the society cannot be advantageous to the factory, the team, the worker.

Production associations, which have at their disposal nearly two-thirds of the country's research potential, have an important role to play in stimulating scientific and technological progress: working for them are more than 100,000 men and women, including 30,000 with a higher education. Moreover, in order to accelerate the application of scientific and technological results in production, we have drawn special attention to the earlier, pre-production stages of the work. Those who work at these stages have a crucial impact on the pace of scientific and technological progress and the efficiency of capital investments. However, for the time being, the role of the workers in the pre-production cycle, especially of designers, is being underestimated, and this is evident from the low moral and material incentives held out for their work. The party wants to see more capable people working in these units, with greater material incentives for researchers, planners, designers and technologists — all those working in the pre-production cycle. The enterprise management has been advised to take a bolder stand, with the support of party and trade union organizations, against wage-leveiling and to be more generous in encouraging those whose work is of greater benefit to society.

All the measures which we are taking or preparing to accelerate the intensification of production, to boost labor productivity and efficiency, to increase material incentives for the working people in applying scientific and technological achievements are connected with harmonizing state and local, social and personal interests. This should also be taken into account and coordinated by the overall plan, which expresses the interests of the whole people and the demands being made on the economic sphere.

The application of what is new does not, of course, depend only on decrees, instructions, or inventions in organizational methods. The crucial thing is the people's social and labor activity and their attitude to what they are doing. We expect the working people of our Republic to make greater efforts and perseveringly to combat conservatism and complacency. That is the only way to accelerate the intro-

duction of scientific and technological achievements in practice. The main role here belongs to the working class, the leading force in building a developed socialist society. At present, there are 62 specialists with a higher education and 260 with a secondary education per 1,000 persons employed in Czechoslovakia's economy. As science and technology progress, there is a rise in the cultural and technical standards of labor in which mental activity has an ever greater role to play, and a growth in the education and skills of workers. There is ever greater evidence of initiatives on the part of the working class as the vehicle of the most advanced methods of labor. Only in close alliance with the working class can the intelligentsia realize its social mission on a massive scale, a mission which also tends to increase in importance with the development of the STR.

The party and the state in Czechoslovakia, as in the other socialist community countries, seek to make the broadest use of the potentialities of socialist democracy for constantly renewing and enriching the forms in which citizens take part in the management of the economy, in general, and of scientific and technological progress, in particular. Among the most effective of these are socialist work teams, complex rationalizer teams, and the inventors' and innovators' movement as a whole. It should be emphasized that all of this helps to strengthen the creative cooperation between the scientific and technical intelligentsia and the workers, and to overcome conservatism and ingrained attitudes in working and thinking.

Our working people are actively involved in rationalizing work and inventions, because they are well aware that, far from threatening them with a loss of jobs, improvements in production, in effect, provide essential conditions for raising their living standards. No wonder that the number of innovations filed in 1982 was more than three times the figure for 1970. Their annual economic effect is estimated at 8,180 million crowns. To this should be added 2,020 million crowns received from the application of inventions.

The Revolutionary Trade Union Movement has an important role to play in the solution of the pressing tasks considered at the plenary meeting. The 16th congress of the CPCz emphasized that it is up to the trade unions to display concern for producing a creative atmosphere in the work collectives by organizing socialist emulation and comradesly mutual assistance, and maintaining a high sense of responsibility for the fulfillment of plans. All of this implies the need to maintain a high level of discipline, to combat various disorders, neglect

and inattentiveness to work, bureaucratic practices and levelling of wages, and also to display constant attention to improving working conditions and the environment.

The party is working hard to involve young people in the development of science and technology and in using their achievements. The young people are making an ever greater contribution to the common effort. Young workers, technicians, designers and scientists are in the forefront of the drive for progress, and against clichés and routine. A considerable national-economic effect comes from the youth movement known as ZENIT, which has been developing under the sponsorship of Czechoslovakia's Socialist Youth League.³ At the latest exposition of scientific work it organized, there were 2,000 exhibits, ranging from small devices to new models of machine-tools and equipment which are up to the highest world standards.

Much is being done to activate the work of scientific, technical and administrative personnel by the Czechoslovak Scientific and Technical Society, which has more than 500,000 members, among them intellectuals, front-ranking workers, cooperative peasants, inventors and rationalizers. We seek to have it participate even more effectively in the activity of the socialist countries' Federation of Scientific and Technical Societies, which was set up in 1980.

The various classes, social groups, public bodies and unions have an exceptionally diverse role to play in boosting our overall economic development, with the leading and unifying activity of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia being the crucial condition for pooling their efforts in attaining this goal. Greater demands are being made on the party's political and organizational work, on its capacity to produce correct formulations of strategic and tactical tasks, to determine the main links, to choose the most effective tactics and forms of work, correctly to select, train and appoint personnel and to control fulfillment of adopted decisions.

On the communists' resolve and vigor, on their capacity to mobilize the masses for successfully implementing our policy's strategic line largely depends the fulfillment of the extensive program of scientific and technological development. The communists' vanguard role is determined not so much by their words as by their deeds. Wherever party organizations have concentrated efforts on supporting scientific and technological progress, good results are rapidly achieved. This was shown, for instance, in the course of the

country-wide public verification of economies and rational use of fuel and energy resources which brought out many latent reserves.

But we still have economic executives who hold fast to the old methods hailing back to the period of extensive development. Some of them pay lip service to progressive solutions but do little to realize them. This kind of two-fold approach is nothing but opportunism in practice. The party organs will make higher demands on executive personnel to induce them to be more active and take a responsible attitude to their business.

Matters of economic development and scientific and technological progress are to be more important aspects of our political education work also because there is a need to raise the quality of workmanship. We are aware of the importance to analyze constantly the activity of planning, design and scientific bodies and to improve control of it. It is up to the party organs and all the communists to create a social climate in which every scientist, engineer, technician and worker will regard it as a matter of honor to engage in scientific quest and to attain the highest results in scientific and technological development.

While in possession of adequate internal reserves for intensifying the national economy, we also pin great hopes on our fraternal cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other CMEA countries. Unanimity and comradely mutual assistance of the fraternal parties and states in tackling these problems will help to multiply the forces of our community as a whole and of each of its member countries individually.

We intend to participate more actively in realizing international long-term goal-oriented programs, to coordinate them and to tie them in with the relevant national programs. Specialization and cooperation in production are to be deepened as a basis for raising labor productivity and increasing the size of production batches.

The 1980s will undoubtedly be a period of intensive scientific and technological cooperation and coordination of capital investments in the crucial spheres of the economy. Another important stride forward will be taken with the drawing up of the complex program for the CMEA countries' scientific and technological development for the next 15-20 years.

Such are the tasks with which we are confronted ever more sharply by life. We continue, of course, to advocate the extension of equitable economic, scientific and technical ties with all states and firms which refrain from

discrimination and which are guided by the principles of mutual advantage. At the same time, we shall resolutely fight the reactionary forces of imperialism, which regard science and technology above all as an instrument of exploitation, military domination and attainment of their aggressive goals. Together with all people of good will, the working people of Czechoslovakia protest against the plans to build up the nuclear weapons arsenals and to deploy new U.S. missiles in Europe. We understand the deep concern of the group of scientists who declared at last summer's World Assembly for Peace and Life in Prague that nuclear war would inevitably mean the end of humankind, the end of all life on the globe.

One can well imagine the tremendous potentialities for the progress of civilization on the Earth if scientific and technological development is geared solely to peaceful purposes. That is precisely what the communists, what all the peoples of the socialist countries want. In working to combine the advantages of the new society with the STR achievements,

they provide a visual example of the lines on which socio-economic progress will run in the future and what it holds in store for humankind.

This was emphasized in his closing speech at the eighth plenary meeting of the CPCz CC by Gustav Husak, when he said: "The use of scientific and technological achievements is not just a current task, but a matter of vital importance for the further progress of the developed socialist society. A revolutionary solution of the problem of using science and technology as the crucial factor of long-term economic and social development will be our people's contribution to the common struggle of all the progressive forces for socialism, democracy and peace throughout the world."

1. Pravda, June 16, 1983.

2. Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. II, Moscow, 1957, p. 172.

3. The ZENIT movement emerged in 1970 as a main form of youth participation in scientific and technological progress. It sponsors annual expositions of youth projects. The name is an acronym for five Czech words meaning skill, inspiration, exactingness, initiative and creativity.

A social democratic "project" for Africa, or the way to an impasse

Seydou Cissokho
General Secretary,
Senegal Party of Independence and Labor

In the recent period, there has been a marked growth of interest in Africa on the part of the Socialist International, of West European social democracy.¹ How is this to be explained? What is the significance of the growth of such interest in the present situation of contest between the forces of progress and the forces of political oppression and reaction? Has the drive started by social democracy ultimately any chances of success, in view of the socio-political conditions which have taken shape on the continent, or is it doomed to failure?

Such are the questions one should like to ask. The Senegal Party of Independence and Labor (SPIL) has always given particular attention to these problems. We have been interested both in that which is related to the main strategic line of social democracy, and everything that characterizes its present active role, and ideological and political plans, notably those concerning our country.

Africa now stands at the crossroads. The

neocolonialist order, the foundations of neocolonialism are in crisis. The chronic instability of the state apparatus, of the organs of power, whose activity serves the purpose of preserving and reproducing in new forms imperialist domination and exploitation, is one of the most striking manifestations of the crisis in many countries. Wherever it is in power, the bureaucratic bourgeoisie has managed to retain it only by resorting to methods which cause legitimate discontent among the masses and lead to its greater isolation. At the same time, there is a growing urge among the people for change, and this produces in the midst of the ruling classes a constant sense of insecurity and fear, and impels them to increase expenditures on the army and the police, which swallow up an ever larger part of the national budget. The solution of vital problems in public health, education, provision of housing and food supply is being constantly put off.

The deepening crisis of neocolonialism and

the attendant difficulties are evidence of the failure of the capitalist way, which has allegedly been "borrowed" in order to solve the cardinal problems of socio-economic development. But life has shown that the movement along the capitalist way tends markedly to undermine the national economy, to intensify its dependence on the world capitalist system, and often sharply to curb the political sovereignty of the young states. Hence the growth of discontent among wide popular strata and the rise of the democratic movement, whose ranks are being filled with new groups of fighters against the order which suits only the imperialists and their local placemen.

On the other hand, we are witnessing an ever more considerable increase of the political weight of those states on our continent where the multifaceted process of constructive activity has been under way since the elimination of colonialism, and where the strengthening of national independence is being closely tied in with the creation of prerequisites for advance to socialism.

With the entry of these states upon the historical stage, despite the tremendous difficulties they have had to overcome in order to assert and consolidate their choice, the socialist perspective ceased to be for the African peoples a kind of abstract or remote hypothesis. Thanks to the accumulated experience and the daily labor effort of millions of Africans, it has acquired flesh and blood, the features of tangible reality, and this is having both an inspiring and a mobilizing influence on the continent.

These processes, gradually but radically changing the face of Africa, naturally arouse deep disquiet among the imperialists. In their efforts to put a brake on or to derail these processes, they resort to the most diverse methods, ranging from overt intervention and brutal aggression to subtle moves of political intrigue. This includes attempts to "normalize" explosive internal situations, malicious ideological campaigns to distort the meaning of the patriotic and progressive forces' struggle, and many other similar acts.

It is in this context that one should examine, we believe, the feverish efforts now being made by international social democracy in an effort to secure a footing on African soil. The goals of the Socialist International in Africa do not, of course, always coincide with those of imperialism, which continues to be our chief enemy. Being heterogeneous in make-up and subjected to pressure by broad masses of West European working people, international social democracy now takes a stand on many issues which cannot but meet with a response on the part of

the communists. There is the attitude of some of its contingents to the fight against racism and apartheid, and what is especially important, to the defense of world peace, the key issue of our day. Nevertheless, the social-democratic circles' main orientation in Africa (most explicitly expressed in the leadership of French social democracy) gives no reason for closing one's eyes to the line being conducted.

One should like to draw attention to the propositions incorporated in these circles' strategic plans. Their substance is made abundantly clear by the words of French President Francois Mitterrand, as quoted in *Le Monde*. Having in mind the peoples of the Third World, notably Africans, the leader of French social democracy said literally the following: "Communism sprang from misery, and if the West fails to display a greater comprehension, these people will take up arms and will turn to other forces, that is to say, toward the Soviet Union."² We find this to be an attitude that is fully comprehensible to imperialism. The anxiety among leaders like Mitterrand has been caused not only by the growing radicalization of the national liberation movement, but — what they see as the worst thing — its links with existing socialism.

It would perhaps be hard to express oneself more frankly to convey the anti-communist and anti-Soviet orientation of the social-reformist offensive. Nor was that a casual statement, let alone an innocent slip of the tongue which responsible politicians now and again make under pressure from much too enterprising journalists. It is a conscious and thoroughly elaborated line, and this will be seen, among other things, from the content of an official 1981 document of French social democracy entitled "The Socialist Party and Africa South of the Sahara." Entirely in the spirit of the above-quoted words, the document refers to the existence of an "ideological vacuum" and the changes resulting from the appearance of states such as Angola, the new Ethiopia and Mozambique, and asserts that the adoption of Marxism-Leninism by these revolutionary countries was rather an act of "political and diplomatic choice than of adherence based on an analysis of social relations." While suggesting this idea, which completely ignores the actual state of things, namely, the fact of the conscious adoption by revolutionary democracy of the ideological positions of the working class, the ideologists of social-reformism are nevertheless inclined to entertain the hope (however groundless) that with the deepening social differentiation the history of these states can be reversed by playing up their economic difficulties. To

pretend that they appreciate some of the most burning problems of Africa (the urge to set up a new international economic order, and so on), and even to allow oneself perforce to issue a few harmless anti-American tirades (the kind of "criticism," for instance, to which Paris resorted during the 1982 Franco-African conference in Zaire) — those are only some of the methods used in attempts to contain the anti-imperialist movement on our continent, while leaving the positions of monopoly capital intact.

Until recently, the impression was created that the Socialist International was only groping for ways to attain its goals. One wonders whether it has found them even today, judging by the hesitations which mark its acts with respect to Africa. Nevertheless, one could say that a highly important step along the way has already been taken with the establishment in Tunis two years ago of the African Socialist International (ASI).

Indeed, whereas in the past the social democratic "breakthrough" into Africa was effected by individuals or by parties, since the establishment of the ASI there has been an association for acting on a continental scale, a fact which opens up greater potentialities for concerting and coordinating action by the reformist forces.

It took many years to prepare the social democratic "breakthrough" into Africa. The colonial period aside (even then SFIO sections already existed in France's "overseas territories"³), one could draw the conclusion that the West European social democrats began to devote systematic attention to Africa only in the late 1960s. The "African question" was considered at the 1969 congress of the Socialist International. The document it adopted, "The African Way to Socialism" formulated the main propositions for its African strategy. In particular, it said that on our continent, where much is being said about socialism, "democratic socialism" was least represented, which is why there was a need to consolidate the "African socialist movement" in face of the danger of the further radicalization of anti-imperialist processes.

The Socialist International decided to use as its trojan horse for penetrating into the African countries the idea of an "African socialism," whose ideological spectrum was so broad and amorphous that it included vehicles of the neo-colonialist line like Leopold Senghor, and progressives like Julius Nyerere. That was the label for a "socialism" which claimed to call itself "democratic." It was said that it was allegedly "more adapted to the African cultural realities"

and that it was "more in accord" with our peoples' mentality. In actual fact, everything was much more prosaic: the aim was to erect between the African peoples and scientific socialism a kind of ideological Maginot line,⁴ behind which those who set the neocolonialists' plans above their own peoples' interests could operate safely.

The Socialist International opted for the theme of "African socialism" also because in the eyes of a sizable segment of the progressive petty bourgeoisie in Africa it was in a way akin to the program (however unfeasible) of "ideological non-alignment," whereas the scientific socialism of the Marxists appeared to be an "imported ideology." The ravages worked by bourgeois propaganda on the consciousness of a part of the anti-imperialist forces are indirectly manifested even today, being expressed in the sincerity with which some patriotic-minded people still adhere to this aberration.

To divide the ranks of the participants in the anti-imperialist movement either on the ideological or some simply invented issue, to isolate its most consistent circles by deflecting the liberation struggle into the channel of reformism — such was the Socialist International's stake on "African socialism."

But the realization of the reformists' mooted propositions came up against a number of grave difficulties. Here are only two, the most essential ones. If the scheme of infiltrating the continent was to succeed, there was above all a need for regimes prepared to carry out cosmetic political measures in domestic life to bring about some "liberalization." However, none of the potential African allies of the social reformists risked doing so at the time. Second, the ideological platform on which the Socialist International had pinned its hopes ("African socialism") turned out to be a flimsy one. Formulated for the purpose of attracting the greatest number of supporters, it was much too vague and did not arouse any enthusiasm even among adversaries of social progress like President F. Houphouët-Boigny of the Ivory Coast. Following a colloquium, held in Tunis in 1975 under the auspices of social democracy on the subject of "Planned Liberalism and African Ways to Socialism," he altogether preferred to stay away. As for the progressive leaders of organizations like the Congolese Party of Labor or the National Liberation Front of Algeria, they soon saw through the scheme, which was designed to involve them in another crusade against scientific socialism. That is what ultimately predetermined the failure of the above-mentioned colloquium.

In the light of these lessons, supporters of the

Socialist International, led by Leopold Senghor and Habib Bourguiba, decided to get together a year later — in Dakar. There they expected to lay the foundations of an African analogue of the Socialist International. The Senegalese delegation actively insisted on the immediate approval of its basic organizational structures, but these demands were tactfully declined. The participants were able to agree only on a continuation of contacts and the maintenance of cooperation.

The second meeting in Tunis in 1981 was already less representative, although, with a number of exceptions, it was more homogeneous from the standpoint of the class orientation of the parties represented. Present were the delegations of the Socialist Destour Party (Tunisia), the Senegalese Socialist Party, the Istiqlal Party (Morocco), the Sudanese Socialist Union, the Mauritius Social Democratic Party and the Mauritius Labor Party, the People's Progressive Party (Gambia), the People's Alliance for Progress (Djibouti), the People's National Party (Ghana) and the Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party.⁵

The final document of the meeting said that "democratic socialism" was the ideological platform for the African Socialist International which the meeting set up. The document flatly rejected the Marxist theory of the class struggle and the scientific conception of historical development. It asserted that Marxism, being allegedly based on a "philosophy of violence," was incompatible with the spirit of the "African dialogue." The continuity of the ASI's ideological premises with respect to those preached for decades by the Socialist International is more than obvious. Indeed, the association set up with its tacit patronage was designed to undertake the realization of the above-mentioned 1969 political program of social democracy. It is highly symptomatic that Leopold Senghor, a vice-president of the Socialist International, was elected president of the ASI Bureau.

The existence of the ASI has introduced a new element into African political realities. It marks the institution of a supranational organization, whose ideological and political tenets are alien to the cause of social progress. The ASI's members are mainly ruling parties. Considering their pro-capitalist, and in some cases pro-imperialist orientation, it becomes clear that the new organization poses a real threat to the anti-imperialist movement on the continent. This is especially clear, considering Africa's concrete conditions, where broad masses of people have a vague notion of ideological demarcation and where a petty-bourgeois elite

under the influence of Western cultural stereotypes still has a considerable weight. In pressing for its goals, the Socialist International also relies on support from forces which, while not belonging to social democracy, are always prepared to support its struggle against the radicalization of anti-imperialist processes. To this should be added a host of "funds," "centers," and "institutes" backed by international capital and reformist circles. Their activity is aimed to erode the growing anti-imperialist consciousness of the working people and to reduce the influence of the masses on social processes.

Experience shows that reformist strategy can claim success only when the forces acting for genuine change, notably the communist party and the working class, are neutralized. One of the main lines in the activity of social reformism, in which the ASI is already directly involved, consists in trying, in every possible way, to prevent the emergence of strong and influential communist parties firmly adhering to Marxism-Leninism and scientific socialism. Such a line is also being conducted with respect to the trade union movement, with efforts to prevent the formation of genuinely revolutionary, democratic, class syndicalism.

Overt and covert repression, ideological campaigns to sap the prestige of existing socialism, and attempts ideologically to undermine from inside the young communist parties of the continent whose social base contains a sizable petty-bourgeois element — in short, a whole arsenal of methods is now being used against the consistent anti-imperialist movement in Africa. Among such methods is participation in the establishment of or support for definite types of organizations, which engage in waving "Marxist" slogans, while actually serving to discredit the communist parties and the Leninist norms of their organization. Even the religious beliefs of the masses are being shamelessly manipulated in order to present the communists as dangerous "enemies."

At the same time, it should be emphasized: for all the growing activity of the African Socialist International, we feel that it has not yet become the most important element of social democratic strategy in Africa. The Socialist International, which played such a prominent part in the establishment of the ASI, does not dare to this day openly to recognize it as its African "branch." That is so first of all because the members of the ASI have still a long way to go before they reach an identity of views. While they did accept the Tunis platform, there are still differences in defining the role which the organization is to play. The Dakar meeting of the ASI in 1982 clearly revealed the different

views even among the members of a single delegation, the Senegalese. Running true to form, Leopold Senghor held forth on "democratic socialism," launching upon endless anti-communist tirades, while the incumbent President Abdou Diouf preferred to hold to the idea that the activity of the ASI is not aimed against anyone, and that henceforth more attention should be given to searching for ways of solving economic problems facing the member countries, than to ideological discussions.

Of course, these nuances of style, which distinguish the incumbent Senegalese President from the former, do not yet amount to ideological differences. Nevertheless, the existing situation allows one to assume that the result of Senghor's retreat into the backstage of the African political scene could lead to an outward easing of the anti-communist and anti-Soviet tenor of the campaign mounted by the ASI during its establishment.

Furthermore, there is a need to reckon with the ASI's present stand, gravitating too far out to the right for the African masses to put any trust in it. The social base of the parties represented on it consists of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, and some elements of the trade union bureaucracy, that is, forces which have heavily compromised themselves. There is no doubt that for this reason, too, some circles of the Socialist International have always opposed the entry into the organization of international social democracy of some of the African parties which later joined the ASI.

A key point that needs to be stressed is that, in realizing its African strategy (reckoning with the ASI's "congenital flaws," mentioned above), the Socialist International has no intention of "putting all its eggs in one basket." It would, in our party's view, be a mistake to draw the conclusion, in the light of the ASI's weaknesses, that the Socialist International's African strategy is bound to fail. After all, there are many socio-political factors on our continent which these circles are trying to use for their own interests.

To begin with, even among the forces fighting for genuine change there are, as has been said, some strata which are highly sensitive to the ideological themes raised by social democracy. These strata could serve as a "reserve" for it and provide a social base in the event the parties which it now prefers cease to be of any further use. This idea is suggested by the experience of Senegal and some other countries. One could, for instance, imagine a situation in which, thanks to the adoption of some measures of "liberalization" presented to the masses as a sign of important political changes, the

ASI parties may try to win new supporters by playing up on the inconsistency of the petty bourgeoisie and its inclination to compromise.

One should also take into account the fact that the situation of the protracted socio-economic crisis could limit the potentialities of the consistent revolutionary forces. Imperialism seeks to shift the burden of the crisis onto the shoulders of the neocolonized peoples, aggravating their social misery and cultural backwardness to such an extent that the masses lose any hope of finding a way out of the existing situation. The idea is spread that any change is preferable to the existing situation, an idea on which the reformists are quick to pounce. They speak of the possibility of "changes in the spirit of continuity," and this always looks attractive to the middle strata which tend to be wary of extremes. For instance, the Senegalese Democratic Party (SDP) operating in the country has made use of the slogan of *sopi* ("change") to establish itself as the main opposition force, although the program it proposed did nothing to undermine the pillars of imperialist domination.

Finally, one must note the emergence and gradual strengthening of elements of what could be called a trade union aristocracy in the capitalist-oriented countries where the working class movement has demonstrated a fairly strong dynamism. This is a thin layer consisting of corrupt senior trade union officials. Its leaders are frequently members of the ruling party (often claiming to be "socialist," as in Senegal and Tunisia), they enjoy various benefits and frequently hold ministerial posts and parliamentary seats (under the pretext of representing the workers in the organs of power). Some of them even hold stock in private enterprises, and these men frequently claim to act on behalf of the rank-and-file personnel. The trade union aristocracy receives solid financial assistance from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) and the AFL-CIO to exercise the influence the reactionaries want on the state of affairs in the workers' organizations and on trade union discussions, the outcome of which is frequently decided by money, sometimes running to millions.

Members of this stratum are given special training under a program of reformist syndicalism, on which considerable time is given for the anti-communist indoctrination of the students. Such activity is carried on in Senegal by the Ebert Institute and the Neumann Foundation. Directed by German liberals, this foundation increasingly strives to engage in politics, and this is promoted by its

ties with the Senegalese Democratic Party. It has set up a local institute of political and social studies and helps the party in training its cadre. There is also an Afro-American Center. Its blatant interference in the trade union movement is not a secret to anyone, least of all the government, but the government is not sufficiently anxious to display concern for "independence" to prevent it. In the recent period, the ICFTU alone offered the central governmental trade union to organize 18 seminars. Six seminars were held in May and June under the auspices of the World Confederation of Labor (WCL), the ICFTU and the Afro-American Center. The Senegalese journal *Daan Doole* noted that they are arranged mainly "in expensive hotels, where the atmosphere is most propitious for recruiting reactionary trade union leaders and agents for the CIA."

All this subversive activity along the trade union line is designed not only to bolster the positions of the trade union aristocracy, the "natural" social support of the advocates of "class peace," but also to corrupt the consciousness of the working class in order to prevent it from becoming a class capable of fulfilling its historical mission.

Consequently, the new aspects we have noted, from the establishment of the ASI to the reformist circles' attempts to set up ideological and political control over the trade union movement, together with the policy of seducing a section of the progressive-minded petty bourgeoisie, are diverse and extensive. This gives some idea of the different ways and means used by these circles in their efforts to establish themselves on our continent. However, there are now powerful objective factors of a totally different kind, and this makes the success of reformist "projects" highly unlikely.

Although capitalism, including its somewhat made-up social democratic version, still retains considerable potentialities and has an extensive field for maneuvering, it is historically doomed. Socialism has become the leading motive force of our epoch. The Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries have scored crucial victories in building the new society. The communists, being consistent adherents of the scientific materialist theory, and not idealists, are aware that idylls can exist only in the imagination of those who hover in the spheres of abstract socialism far remote from reality, and who are naively capable of being surprised that life does not develop as fast as they would like. For our part, we believe that on all

the issues crucial for the masses and bearing on the construction of a truly fair and humane society, existing socialism has demonstrated its incontestable superiority over capitalism.

Socialism is now accumulating the experience and the means which enable it gradually, on its own basis, to resolve the contradictions which, as a rule, arise in consequence of the rapid development along the path of progress, and which are simultaneously a factor in the further advance. This enables the peoples of the socialist world to look confidently to the future just when capitalism is being rocked by new crises, breeding a mentality of despair, a policy of nuclear blackmail and armed threats. It is the dynamic and mobilizing power of the new system, its peace-loving substance that need to be carried to the minds of the African masses vividly and in bold relief.

Our propaganda is sometimes not imaginative enough and wants more offensive vigor. Its best weapons are the realities of socialism, taken together in their complexity. It is perfectly obvious that every contradiction that has been overcome, every new step in realizing the profoundly humanistic and democratic ideal inspiring the communists tends to complicate the subversive activity of the salesmen of "socialist fakes" on our continent.

Alongside the power of example set by existing socialism, another important factor counteracting the reformist ploys in our day is the ever more diverse experience of the socialist-oriented states. Their successes could tip the scales in favor of the consistent revolutionaries, arming our peoples with incontrovertible proof of the advantages of the system which has rejected the order based on exploitation. This experience will serve as an additional moral stimulus for those who, locked in the hard battle with neocolonialism, blaze the trail to scientific socialism on the African continent. Our party believes that consistent and effective support of the young states which have opted for the socialist perspective, being aimed to defend and strengthen their gains for the purpose of their further peaceful advance along the chosen way, constitutes an invaluable condition from the standpoint of the assertion and triumph of the socialist ideal.

To us, African communists, has fallen the mission of playing an outstanding role in this endeavor. There is a need to fortify our parties, their revolutionary orientation, their Leninist ideological seasoning; it is important to multi-

ply our ideological and political potential, so as to exert a more effective influence on the existing national realities. The interests of the struggle call for a creative approach and initiative in elaborating and realizing new tactical lines required by the revolutionary change of situations, which frequently contains much that is new and unknown. Finally, there is a need to conduct, without fear of admissible compromises a principled and firm ideological line against all species of opportunism.

That is the only way in which we can, despite our limited resources, actually give the anti-imperialist movement the right orientation in accord with the profound aspirations of the

African masses, who strive for genuine national independence, for peace and social progress.

1. For articles on this subject see WMR: A. Dansoko, "The Socialist International and Africa," No. 12, 1975; M. Ba, "A Social Democratic Model for Africa and Neo-colonialism," No. 3, 1978; and also "Africa in the Early 80s," A Political Survey, No. 9, 1981. — Ed.

2. *Le Monde*, October 14, 1981.

3. SFIO — The French section of the Workers' International, since 1971 known as the French Socialist Party (FSP). — Ed.

4. A powerful line of defense fortifications erected by France along the border with Germany before the Second World War. — Ed.

5. Apart from these organizations, which then became members of the ASI, a number of African parties were represented by observers, while 11 invited parties did not then send representatives to Tunis. — Ed.

The Latin American intellectual and the defense of cultural identity

Volodia Teitelboim
Political Commission member,
Communist Party of Chile

As far back as 1753, Jean Le Rond d'Alembert¹ criticized in his *Essai sur la société des hommes de lettres et des grands* spiritual activity under the protection of Maecenases as a form of corruption of culture. But what the White House is after today greatly exceeds the ambitions of Maecenas, the wealthy Roman patrician, adviser to Emperor Augustus, mediator between him and men of culture. It is no longer mediation but a bid to buy up Horaces, Vergils and Propertius.²

The big companies reared by capitalism have far greater opportunities than the Maecenases of antiquity, the medieval nobility, the princes of the church, the Louises of France or bourgeois magnates of the 19th century. Transnational companies, which express the interests of their class and disguise the power of money with fine words, pretend that their suspicious interest in culture is prompted by a desire of the rich to pay tribute to creative work, to support genius with wealth. And to soothe the conscience of the intellectual bribed by them, they assure him that patronage of art does not threaten bondage to money but is rather an offer of fruitful dialogue between the economy and culture, two worlds that know little of each other. Dotting their i's and crossing their t's, they remind him time and again that the whole cultural industry is in their hands.

There are also capitalist enterprises that use patronage of the arts and letters as a means of

evading tax (these things occur even on the periphery of the capitalist world, as the case of Chile shows). However, the "father," or imperialism in the role of arbiter of fashion, does this neither out of charity, nor because it would like to be absolved from its numerous sins, let alone because it has a bent for culture. Imperialism simply wants to tie the intellectual hand and foot and make it his chief task to denigrate socialism and embellish the image of the selfish philanthropist and the capitalist system as such.

It is precisely out of fear of the advance of revolutionary ideas that imperialism has drawn up a veritable charter of treason³ inviting the intellectuals of Latin America to join in overcoming national "narrow-mindedness," that is, the identity of our countries. It would be delighted if some of those favored by it declared sarcastically, with the irony of well-paid sceptics, that "to fight for cultural independence" and seek freedom from "foreign dependence" are no more than meaningless phrases uttered by those whom imperialism hatefully calls "self-styled progressives of the Third World."

Now the idea of "cultural independence," first formulated early in the last century by those who fought for Latin America's freedom from Spanish domination, did not imply self-isolation or autarky but a process open to fruitful contacts with world culture. More and more often, Latin American intellectuals today speak

of the culture of our planet as a whole, which presupposes defense of the right of the globe to existence, since it is threatened with being reduced to smoke and radioactive ashes.

The nuclear bomb is a supreme argument of present-day imperialist policy. Brainwashing is intended to make people accept the bomb. This goal is being pursued through the cultural industry, the monopoly and blocking of information, the manipulatory devices of the mass media, the transnationals of the film industry, television, video, direct broadcast satellites — in short, culture as a spectacle designed to fill and control the leisure hours of the population of a considerable part of five continents. All these elements may be said to constitute imperialism's cultural plan. The aim is to determine people's orientation, reproduce ideology and influence human perception, including the subconscious. Imperialism's "culturologists" are past masters of massive and deliberate propagation of banality and ignorance. French Minister of Culture Jack Lang admits that nowadays cultural and artistic activity is entirely under the financial control of transnationals.

A UNESCO conference held in Mexico City in July 1982 called for a struggle against "financial and cultural imperialism," which not only takes possession of foreign territory but molds the social consciousness, habits of thought and lifestyles of other nations.

The whole capitalist-dominated part of the globe is an object of this continuous manipulation of people's thinking. What is the lot of Latin America in this immense empire of profit? Is it doomed to be a perpetual vassal of imperialism and an object of its ideological subversion? Resistance to imperialism is mounting. This is an epoch when our continent is marshalling all its forces to offer the enemy real resistance, in particular on the cultural front. Many intellectuals are playing a notable role in this.

Why this preoccupation with being Latin American?

The intellectuals in the American colonies of Spain and Portugal were mostly clergymen or officials of the monarchy. Throughout the 19th century, the typical intellectual was a teacher, lawyer, writer or artist, who were also bureaucrats and politicians. But how greatly things have changed since 1898, when the word *intellectual* first rang out all over the world in connection with the Dreyfus case!⁴ A defiant "Manifesto of Intellectuals" was published in Dreyfus' defense; the men of culture who

signed it included Emil Zola and Marcel Proust.

By now the word has gained currency, not only as a result of the growth of the number, role and influence of intellectuals in society, but because new and different "free professions" have come into being as have numerous technological and scientific specialized fields typical of contemporary society.

The Third World is now something more than exoticism and peasant culture. There are struggle and labor there too, including intellectual labor, as well as reflections on how to hasten the advance from illiteracy to knowledge, to a society in which knowledge will hold pride of place.

As a result of the division of labor, the proportion of members of intellectual professions is increasing in Latin America, and many of them cannot find a job. They form a not always clear-cut sector that is not a class in the right sense of the term but clearly has social leverage. Added to the traditional professions, which remain mass occupations (adapted to our time), such as those of teacher, doctor, lawyer, engineer, architect, clergyman, journalist or politician, are new scientific and technological groups or categories associated with industry and with organization and control of production and the tertiary sector. These include ad men, psychologists, sociologists, researchers, designers and information analysts, which is only natural in an epoch when technologists must respond to the impact of computers and the electronic revolution. Specialization is an inevitable imperative at a time of political, social and economic as well as scientific and technological revolution, in a complex world in which man is discovering the secrets of the atom, the infinitesimal, and thrusting into outer space.

While intellectuals in Latin America are fewer than in highly industrialized countries, their numbers have grown considerably and go on growing; so do those of students, who are to ensure the future achievements of the "intellectual" sector of society.

More and more intellectuals are joining together with the proletariat and the people as a whole in the revolutionary process; many of them adhere to a Marxist orientation. They take guidance from Lenin's theory of two cultures, realizing that the people, who are the spiritual heir to all knowledge, reject all that is dead, decrepit or reactionary while critically assimilating all that is advanced, living and fruitful in the culture of previous times and making it their own. Lenin repeatedly stressed that "Marxism has won its historic significance

as the ideology of the revolutionary proletariat because, far from rejecting the most valuable achievements of the bourgeois epoch, it has, on the contrary, assimilated and refashioned everything of value in the more than two thousand years of the development of human thought and culture."⁵

The revolutionary movement throughout Latin America and in each of its countries is likewise trying to take a dialectical approach to the assimilation of the most creative, important and progressive elements of the culture of the past. It rightly takes as its patrimony the loftiest and noblest ideas of great makers of history.

Significantly, the Communist Party of Chile is also called Recabarren's and Neruda's⁶ party. These names symbolize the fusion of the finest traditions of the working class and the intellectuals in the party. We always remember the old truth that our struggle is going on in three inseparable spheres: political, economic and cultural.

To be sure, there are not a few intellectuals who succumb to the temptation of "big money" and desert to Latin America's enemies, just as there are those who stay out of struggle because they do not believe that a better society can be built. On our continent as everywhere else in the West, there are still intellectuals preoccupied with their narrow personal interests, looking on themselves as an élite and taking a scornful view of the "ordinary man" and the "mass of people." But it is not they who make history or to whom credit is due for the highest accomplishments of the human mind.

Some of the diverse controversial publications appearing today contain an exchange of views between West European and Latin American intellectuals. While the former group includes many people who speculate on the crisis of bourgeois ideology and are steeped in scepticism (which generally implies acceptance of the capitalist order), the most noted Latin American intellectuals are, by contrast, aware of their historical responsibility to their peoples and nations; they reject the role of deserters dodging their public duty. Many of our most brilliant intellectuals, particularly persons active in the arts and letters, share the ideas of socialism and revolution.

This was confirmed in September 1981, when Havana played host to a meeting of intellectuals for the sovereignty of Latin America. The participants included numerous exiles. Absent for tragic reasons known to all were Victor Jara,⁷ Haroldo Conti⁸ and many others who fell in struggle. For intellectuals in Latin America are killed in the same way as workers; they enjoy no privilege in this respect.

These sons and daughters, exponents of the culture of the New World did not go to Havana with the sole aim of discussing their professional problems. They also went there to analyze the vital interests of the masses, to take a stand on them and close their ranks in defense of Cuba, Nicaragua, Grenada, the patriots of El Salvador, all the peoples of Latin America, their independence, and of course, their culture. They unanimously rejected Reagan's allegations about the "foreign origin" of social conflicts in Latin America, a continent inhabited, from what the U.S. President implies, not by sovereign nations, but by mere pawns being moved on the global chessboard by a vicious player alien to them. Reagan cannot bring himself to admit that the problems of our region have roots inseparable from its history of oppression, exploitation, imperialist plunder, dramas engendered by the system which the head of the U.S. administration directly and unabashedly personifies.

The specter of socialism is a nightmare to those who want to scare it off with the nuclear bomb. As for the peoples, including the numerous intellectuals of Central and South America, socialism has a tremendous impact, for it is opening the road to humanity's liberation, a road first taken in the western hemisphere by the victorious Cuban revolution.

Socialism, says Julio Cortazar, a non-party Argentine author, who proceeds from his own experience, sees its ideal in leading the whole of humanity and not a minority of it to a higher level of moral, aesthetic and material evolution. "... What brought about a change that was to find reflection in my literary work was my acquaintance with the Cuban revolution. It made me realize that as a writer, even one fully retaining his interest in literary fact, in aesthetic fact, I could not stand aside from a very elementary, very simple and very formidable thing: being Latin American."⁹

To be Latin American is the key problem which, like a common denominator, largely conditions the anxieties, preoccupations and the very life of our peoples and the more committed part of their intellectual community.

The question might be asked: What makes us long so strongly for an identity — a longing which an impatient critic might regard as metaphysically abstract? Why must we keep on stressing that we are Latin Americans? Isn't this evident to any Cuban, Salvadoran, Chilean, Nicaraguan or Paraguayan as well as to anybody born south of the Rio Grande by virtue of the fact that they were born in Latin America? There can be no simplistic or unequivocal answer. This calls for formulations and explana-

tions that might appear unnecessary in a different set of circumstances.

Obsession with painting more stars into the U.S. flag

To begin with, an example: Puerto Rico is part of Latin America geographically, ethnically and historically. Yet it was annexed by the USA.

Not long ago, U.S. Senator Goldwater made a call to turn Cuba into the 51st star of the U.S. flag. If many eminent Latin American intellectuals, like all its peoples, are emphasizing the urgent need to stay Latin American, they are doing so because this identity of theirs is in peril. For there exist too powerful and inexorable forces armed to the teeth with the up-to-date weapons, including missiles, and intent on ending the independence of Latin America and making it a U.S. dependency, disregarding both its sovereignty and the national identity of its peoples.

Were the ideas set out by President Reagan in his speech to the U.S. Congress on April 27, 1983 to become reality, first Central America and then Latin America as a whole could lose every vestige of independence. The head of the U.S. administration adduced reasons or would-be reasons which if applied as standards of international relations would put an end to the independence of not only the majority of countries of our continent but the whole globe. His argument gives one the shudders. "We cannot afford," he said, "to lose sight of our neighbors to the South. El Salvador is nearer to Texas than Texas is to Massachusetts. Nicaragua is just as close to Miami, San Antonio, San Diego and Tucson as those cities are to Washington... But nearness on the map does not even begin to tell the strategic importance of Central America bordering as it does on the Caribbean, our life-line to the outside world. Two-thirds of all our foreign trade and petroleum pass through the Panama Canal and the Caribbean. In a European crisis at least half of our supplies for NATO would go through these areas by sea."¹⁰

This kind of argument is absurd. But its absurdity is extremely dangerous. It is easy enough to imagine the consequences which an acceptance of this line of reasoning would have for humanity. Nothing would be left of respect for the sovereignty of nations or of peace among them.

In the light of such extravagant sophistry, even the construction of a passenger airport on the "big" island of Grenada is seen by the "little and defenseless" USA as fraught with mortal danger. The U.S. President has already invaded

Grenada and is fighting a war against Nicaragua through Honduras, by using former Somoza guards. His false allegation that the security of the whole American continent is at stake in Central America and that "our alliances would crumble and the security of our country would be threatened"¹¹ unless the peoples of El Salvador, Grenada, Nicaragua and Cuba were suppressed, shows how very far and by means of what shameless lies the United States is trying to extend its domination to the entire continent. And while Reagan concluded his call for the subjugation of peoples murmuring piously "God bless you," the Catholic church in the USA is against the nuclear policy of the White House and there is a growing movement in that country against new Vietnams, a third world war and the policy of aggression in Latin America.

Fidel Castro, speaking on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the Moncada assault, aptly defined both the gravity of the situation and the peoples' resolve to resist aggression. "Nicaragua and Central America," he said, "are seriously threatened. The United States, spoiling for a fight, is threateningly moving its squadrons and troops against another Latin American people. A new Vietnam in the heart of America? May that never happen! There is still time to avoid it. The peoples of America and the world would not look calmly on such a crime."¹²

This was the theme of an inter-American dialogue on sovereignty held in Mexico City in September 1982. The dialogue drew over 300 intellectuals from North, Central and South America and the Caribbean.

Now is the time to mobilize people's conscience. In May 1983, intellectuals from Cuba, Grenada, Surinam, El Salvador, Guatemala and Puerto Rico directed to their colleagues in Latin America and the Caribbean a message exposing the traditionally aggressive policy of the USA. The message said that as early as the end of the last century, it was in this part of the globe that one of the first imperialist wars began, with the result that Cuba found itself in neocolonial dependence for more than 60 years while Puerto Rico became a colony. This happened in 1898, or 19 years before the October Revolution in Russia (1917), so that the most reckless liars would not venture to claim that events in Latin America at the time were episodes of a quarrel between "West" and "East."

In the name of restoring the truth, without which no spiritual activity is possible, the authors of the message called on all intellectuals worthy of Latin America to fight against the concealment or cynical distortion of reality,

against the manipulation of public opinion, or methods used by imperialism day after day. They called for the reconquest of the word taken away from them along with other riches by the transnationals and for the use of this word in defending the truth about our peoples for everyone to hear. Such is the motto of Latin America's creative intellectuals. This will be another way of helping head off a world conflagration.

What requires joint efforts by us Latin Americans is not only the community of our origins, problems and needs but the common threat coming from one and the same enemy. Carlos Fuentes, the Mexican novelist, rightly considers that Latin America will either save itself as a whole, or fail to save itself at all. From Patagonia to the Mexican-U.S. border, he adds, we all have the same problems. He stresses that this Latin American frontier is the Third World's only frontier with a Western country.

Culture also means awareness of one's historical identity. Latin American culture certainly did not come into being overnight. Its genealogy, especially in Mexico, Central America and Peru, has deep and numerous roots in the pre-Columbian period. Like a living creature, which cannot survive outside its element, our culture bears the imprint of the backwardness of its society, of its continent, of its painful realities as well as its dreams, its ideals of justice, peace and progress. They found reflection throughout the 19th century. However, it was not until this century, particularly its second half, that a leap took place, the cultural process attained maturity, work on the same themes rose to the stature of artistic creations and drew worldwide attention. This was not achieved at the price of concealing our Latin American identity, or of disregarding our specifics, pre-occupations, problems and dramas. Latin American culture won world recognition precisely because artists spoke out forcefully and with great depth about the reality surrounding them, depicting, occasionally even with the aid of myth, the truth of the whole continent, the cataclysms and grandeur of its nature, but above all the dramas of its history and the misfortunes brought on it from without.

This leads many historians of culture to the conclusion that our arts and letters play a role which has a marked and direct social and political connotation. Both contribute to the formation of national consciousness and are at the same time a shield of the people's identity.

Marxism played a decisive part in Latin Americans' realization of their identity. This is reflected in the fact that the names of Marx and Lenin are associated with those of Martí¹³ and

Sandino¹⁴ in the Cuban and Nicaraguan revolutions and that Marxism is gaining ground and finds expression in the work of advanced men of culture of each of the countries whose intellectuals link their lives and struggles with the revolution by making common cause with the proletariat.

It is essential to underline that anti-imperialism is our common denominator and broad platform. Operating from this platform are communists, socialists, members of other revolutionary and left-wing forces, nationalist patriots, atheists and believers, who form a wide spectrum comprising very diverse classes, philosophies and ideologies but united by one idea that Latin America must not belong to the USA but to Latin Americans and must constitute a sovereign part of the world.

Revolution: a cultural development

With the victory of the Cuban revolution, many more Latin Americans, above all revolutionary intellectuals, rallied together under the banner of anti-imperialism.

In the context of imperialist aggression and threats, many intellectuals see the ideas of Nation and Revolution as inseparable. Revolution is always a cultural development. Latin America has never been an exception in this respect and can never be. "The revolution," says Sergio Ramirez, Nicaraguan author, member of the Council of National Reconstruction, "is the most important cultural fact of our history. Nor is this only because our people wove its intricate fabric with imagination and creative capacity, evolved new forms of military action and new fighting methods, drew on their finest traditions and developed new and novel possibilities of mobilization and organization in order to triumph, but also because their poets, musicians and painters took up their places in the trenches and joined in the assault on the enemy's redoubts."¹⁵

Many intellectuals fell in struggle but the rest contributed — as did the fallen — to the awakening of the people's sense of the collective. It is not mere coincidence that Ernesto Cardenal, a poet, became Minister of Culture, and Tomas Borge, a writer, was appointed Minister for the Interior. Nicaragua's revolutionaries see nothing surprising in this. Both the leaders and the people stress proudly that they are heirs to Dario¹⁶ and Sandino and that their roots lie in poetry and politics.

No need to explain why Nicaraguans are so strongly devoted to their national traditions and why in the face of imperialist aggression against their people and revolution they always remember the tradition of culture and struggle

consistently upheld by Dario and Sandino. The artist's creative effort in the sphere of revolutionary action and culture is national, anti-imperialist and popular, for the people are the primary defender of national values, as we know from history. They always regard the revolution as a creative act, an indicator of the growth of social consciousness. The revolutionary realizes that culture must develop among the people and help provide better conditions for the development of the creative work of the individual.

The spring of revolution is always the spring of culture. The Great October and all other revolutions were accompanied by an explosion of innovating energy. Hence it is at once surprising and not surprising that the young Nicaraguan revolution was marked by the rise of workshops of poetry in factories, troop units, barracks of the people's militia, rural communities and urban working class neighborhoods. Poetry becomes a mass phenomenon when the people arrive at a new perception of the world. This also applies to dramatic art, the dance and music. And it is added evidence of the democratic origins of culture, of the release of the creative energy that had been hidden and suppressed in the people's heart. Chile passed through a similar experience under the Popular Unity government.

A fantastic reflection of reality

Marx investigated the rise of ideas in connection with society's material and social development. Nor can the problem of the intellectual and his work be considered and interpreted abstractly.

Some believe that fantasy plays too big a role in contemporary Latin American literature. They regard this as a product of a morbid mentality that wants to get away from the palpable and grim realities of today and from a cruel society torn by an internal war and dominated by the gringos. There is no denying that the contemporary Latin American novel is an outgrowth of an anguished consciousness and is rooted in our social reality.

It would be wrong, however, to believe that the most prominent novelists of present-day Latin America are writing a new mythology of the continent. Without renouncing the magic of hyperbole, they depict violence and peoples immobilized by the rule of life-long dictatorship; the terroristic practices of banana companies whose trains sometimes carry the bodies of the shot instead of fruit; dictators and their underlings who specialize in massacre and fill whole graveyards overnight with the bodies of "missing" people; torturers trained by U.S.

"experts" and "advisers" on the basis of the latest achievements of "science" and obsessed with forcing their victims to give up revolutionary ideas and their sense of national dignity. But as a noted critic put it, our countries want to cease being villages, kingdoms or trading stations of foreign capital in order to become sovereign nations. This is the common mood of the majority of Latin American authors today. The writer's purpose is not to photograph the visible, that which lies on the surface and can be seen by anyone, but to delve into the depth where the real meaning of history and a synthesis of it lie hidden.

The European reader is bound to be fascinated by Garcia Marquez' *A Hundred Years of Solitude*, by its seemingly exotic quality and amusing subject unfolded in a distant and unknown galaxy known as Latin America. What is this? Puppetry, circus stunts or literary clownery? No, it is rather that Latin American novelists really know the requirements of the general reader. Like Sophocles, they create literature based on myth but not shunning popular entertainment. Like Shakespeare, they reach both the upper and the lower strata. Like Dickens, they can be proud to be read at the kitchen table. In short, their style is anything but academic.

Revolutions confer on the intellectual a new place which he never held in society but which he must assume with proper modesty. He is by no means a chosen one. Garcia Marquez himself points out that the role of the intellectual, of the artist, in the revolutionary process is essentially the same as that of other working people — he must do his job well. "I think one of the duties of a revolutionary writer is to write well," he adds. "This should come next to his showing active solidarity with the revolutionary process in Latin America."¹⁷

It is held with good reason that neither one novel, nor all the novels put together can alter the world, whatever their impact on the readers' minds. Countries and societies change in the course of processes governed by highly complex objective and subjective laws. These processes involve the masses, their organized vanguard, persons expressing their interests. Account has to be taken of past experience, knowledge gained to date, lessons of the past, specifics of the present time, including what is a daydream of the people and of those who express the people's dreams — writers and artists — and are equal to translating them into reality, an ability marking the real revolutionary in politics, science and art.

Many literary productions of Latin America are, in effect, a revolt against the status quo, an

expression of their authors' critical stance and their desire for change. Marx wrote that religion is a fantastic reflection in people's minds of the material forces governing the world and at the same time "the sigh of the oppressed creature."¹⁸ Similarly, Latin American literature may be compared to a deep sigh at the sight of our peoples, who are suffering but refusing to lose hope and to whom, too, literature is a fantastic reflection of their everyday material reality.

Julio Cortazar remarks in this connection that "it is only in this way, by inventing, and only by starting from uncommon and vertiginous areas like Macondo, that we can reach and set foot in Guanahani,"¹⁹ the first land on which Columbus set foot. Thus we will begin a second, possibly the real, discovery of America and its new history without Spanish or other conquerors, so as to ensure that colonialism, which dominated our continent from the 16th to the 20th century, never recurs in a different form in the 21st century.

Reality is the father and mother of captivating fantasy. Garcia Marquez himself finds it necessary to repeat this. Literary critics know him as an author of the fantastic but he describes himself — jokingly, of course — as the least imaginative man on earth. "To be able to write," he says, "I had no choice but to watch ... everyday life with wide-open eyes in search of material to describe ... There is not one line in my books but was suggested by reality."²⁰

The meaning of the more noteworthy productions of contemporary Latin American literature lies chiefly in their being an expression of our identity. The Latin America which a pretentious critic in the 30s called a "novel without novelists" has become the homeland of a literary genre that is winning millions of readers on all continents and universal admiration. It should not be forgotten, however, that this upswing in our literature came after the victory of the revolution in Cuba, at a time when Latin America, a continent with a complex political, social and cultural structure

comprising both the universal and the uniquely national, took a decisive step toward the future. In other words, literature follows reality and history as one's shadow follows one, stretching, however, beyond the horizon and into the future.

New stages of reality and history. New novels. And new imperialist attacks, which are bound to be repulsed by the peoples, by poets, by makers of culture. New revolutions. Nicaragua is confirming the dialectics of history. It is living through something more than a period of political revolution and defense of a country threatened by enemies. It is also living through a real cultural revolution inseparable from radical changes in society. If culture is, in the words of one of our well-known authors, utilization of the human mind in the interest of society, then peoples making a revolution respond eagerly to a cultural awakening and create a new culture. In this turbulent process books, works of art, Latin American culture as a whole, must help our peoples quench their long-suppressed thirst for progress and advance toward a new life as they come to know themselves and their history.

1. French mathematician and philosopher (1717-1783) — Ed.

2. Roman poets — Ed.

3. See Volodia Teitelboim, "The Santa Fé Seducers," WMR, No. 1, 1982.

4. Alfred Dreyfus, a French army officer, was tried for spying in favor of Germany on a false charge preferred by the French reactionary military. — Ed.

5. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 317.

6. Luis Emilio Recabarren, founder of the Communist Party of Chile, a man of working class origin; Pablo Neruda, outstanding Chilean Communist poet. — Ed.

7. Renowned Chilean singer and composer atrociously murdered during the 1973 fascist putsch. — Ed.

8. Noted Argentine author who was kidnapped in 1976 and declared to be "missing." — Ed.

9. "Julio Cortazar y los problemas del socialismo", *Uno mas uno*, March 3, 1983.

10. *Granma*, Weekly Review, May 8, 1983.

11. *Ibid.*

12. "Discurso de Fidel Castro", *Granma*, July 28, 1983.

13. José Martí (1853-1895), national hero of Cuba, who inspired and took part in the liberation struggle against Spanish oppression. — Ed.

14. Augusto Cesar Sandino (1895-1934) led the Nicaraguans' national liberation struggle against U.S. occupation troops. — Ed.

15. *Granma*, January 23, 1982.

16. Ruben Dario (1867-1916), outstanding Nicaraguan poet who came out against imperialism. — Ed.

17. "El deber del escritor revolucionario es escribir bien," *Voz proletaria*, October 28, 1982.

18. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *On Religion*, Moscow, 1957, p. 42.

19. "Il mito e la prosa di Macondo", *Rinascita*, October 29, 1982.

20. "El deber del escritor revolucionario es escribir bien."

Détente and Anti-Communism

Y. Nalin

paper \$2.50

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.

Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6



Organized and organizing force

THE CHARACTER OF A COMMUNIST ORGANIZATION

In the course of two years, *WMR* has carried items in a series "The Character of a Communist Organization."¹ Authors from many countries reflected on the basic features of the contemporary communist party, on how the specific national conditions are mirrored in its activity, and on how the party organization is built and improved in the light of the changing circumstances and the novelty of the tasks put forward by life. In the course of a discussion, some of these problems were considered by a group of members of the *WMR* Editorial Council, who prepared the following report. Among those who took part in the discussion were Agamemnon Stavrou (Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus), Niall Farrell (CP Ireland), Semou Pathe Gueye (Senegal Party of Independence and Labor), Raja Collure (CP Sri Lanka), and Professor Boris Leibzon (Academy of Social Sciences under the CPSU CC, Soviet Union).

Different conditions, same substance

The number of communist parties tends to increase with every decade. They now work in nearly 100 countries of the world. In the zone of developed capitalism, the communist parties sprang from the working class movement, uniting its most revolutionary elements. In many of the liberated states, where the formation of the working class as a politically organized force began later, the communist parties grew mainly out of the national liberation movement. Communist organizations in various countries did not emerge simultaneously: a large part of them were formed in the early years after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, but nearly one-half have developed since the rout of fascism in the second World War. In the 1950s, the formation of communist parties was completed in the Latin American countries, and the 1960s and 1970s were marked by their spread in Africa.

In the socialist states, communist parties are in power. In some capitalist countries they are a mass force, and in others they are still small.

Some can act openly and take part in local organs of power and parliaments, and sometimes even in governments, but there are also many parties which still have to work in the underground. Emerging as they do on native soil, the parties naturally reflect the peculiar historical traditions in their countries and the unique features of their national culture.

In Senegal, for instance, Semou Pathe Gueye said, the Senegal Party of Independence and Labor (SPIL) has to work under constant pressure from diverse hostile ideologies. These form a highly checkered spectrum and a peculiar combination of patriarchal traditions, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideas, religious, mostly reactionary, views, eccentric revolutionist attitudes, and national-reformism, including "social-progressism," which is camouflaged with a Marxist phraseology.

In Senegal, the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia dominates political life either through its own class organizations or the political organizations of other social forces. It is a country where the popular masses virtually have no knowledge of the French language, although it is used for the spread of scientific and technical knowledge, the bulk of the political information and the propaganda of the proletariat's revolutionary ideology. Finally, it is a country which, in virtue of its geographical position and the regime's reactionary policies, has been turned into a bastion of the imperialist policy of oppressing the African peoples, and a base for aggression against the national liberation movement.

The successful building of an efficient fighting party in such conditions requires urgent and precise answers to a great many questions (in theory and in practice). How is the consciousness of the working class to be raised to a level that will enable it to understand correctly its historical mission? What are the forms and content of the proletariat's leading role in a society where democratic aspirations have been mainly fostered on the norms and categories of bourgeois democracy? How are the party's consistently revolutionary political orientation and the Leninist norms of its life and organization to be asserted in the unstable

and fluid conditions created by the domination of petty-bourgeois relations? How is the necessary internal struggle against the trends and distortions characteristic of petty bourgeoisie to be carried on, and how is the ideological and political cohesion of the communist ranks to be consolidated? How is a broad and democratic comparison of views to be ensured in the party, without converting it into a talking-shop for those who love hollow rhetoric? How is the basic principle of the rules concerning individual and voluntary membership in the party to be squared with the mores of a society where the husband insists on the right of speaking on behalf of his wife (or wives), and the father, on behalf of his children? How, finally, given the SPIL's scant resources, is it to unlock the ideological vice of imperialism seeking to stifle the voice of the communists? How is it to give the people a clearer understanding of our ideal in the full scope of its nobility and humanness? How is it to ensure an objective presentation of the great accomplishments of the socialist countries?

A great many problems, either similar to those mentioned above or very different from them, confront each party whether it is at the stage of formation or has already gained some experience. These problems are just as diverse as the conditions in which the communists have to work. In the face of the various tasks and situations, the participants in the discussion emphasized, the assessments of various phenomena and ideological problems may not, of course, be identical on every point. In a period before the working class movement had attained its present scope, Lenin remarked on this circumstance: "The international revolutionary movement of the proletariat does not and cannot develop evenly and in identical forms in different countries. . . . Every country contributes its own valuable and specific features to the common stream, but in each particular country the movement suffers from its own onesidedness, its own theoretical and practical shortcomings of the individual socialist parties."²

This diversity is a reflection of the objective reality. But is that not a source of our movement's weakness? Let us once again turn to Lenin and recall what he said during the struggle for a revolutionary party in Russia: "There will always be diversity in local conditions; there will always be differences in the conditions of the working class in one district as compared with those in another; and, lastly, there will always be the particular aspect in the points of view among the active local workers; this very diversity is evidence of the verity of

the movement and of its sound growth."³

Consequently, there is every ground to regard diversity not only as a law-governed phenomenon, but also as a prerequisite for the broad and comprehensive development of our movement. After all, the inevitable differences do not, as a rule, bear on the main and fundamental element, but on what is secondary and what has been determined by national or local peculiarities. At the same time, there is always the common element which goes to create the unique type of communist party that makes it so distinct from all the other parties.

Ideology and politics

The theoretical consciousness of the working class, its scientific world view is the ideology by which the parties are guided. It provides the foundation for political activity, and serves as the navigation instrument which keeps the party ship on course and helps it to discern clearly the ultimate goal in the kaleidoscope of current events. Ideological tenets and principles are realized and expressed in everyday struggle. Politics, in a sense, signals the need to correct this or that theoretical notion. Without practice, without verification of theoretical propositions by it, ideology could harden and linger in the state of "credo" without becoming a guide to action.

It was stressed in the course of the discussion that a pragmatic neglect of theory for the sake of political goals, the use of theory to justify taken steps instead of their preparation, is intolerable. But pragmatism has many faces. It is manifested not only in its assertion of "freedom" from ideology, but also in the glorification of ideology. Sheer pragmatism frequently co-exists with endless references to ideology. Let us recall Lenin's sharp criticism of those who "substitute for active political slogans . . . a mere pedantic repetition of the word 'class,' declined in all cases and genders."⁴

The urge to find solutions for any of the problems posed by life not by studying them but merely by relying on theoretical postulates also tends to distort the face of the party, participants in the discussion said. The communists oppose vulgar sociologizing, which tries to find answers to concrete problems through a purely logical application of some scientific proposition. Living reality is so diverse that what is going on can be comprehended only by making creative use of theory and historical experience. It is alien to the very spirit of revolutionary science to have its conclusions used as justification for turning a blind eye to actual processes.

The correctness and validity of a policy, said

Raja Collure, are not always brought out at once. In the short run, even an erroneous policy might gain a popular appeal. There have been instances in the life of the Communist Party of Sri Lanka when some forces put pressure on it in order to force it to conduct a definite political line only because it met the current popular mood, although its validity was in doubt. However, life has shown that in order to be the vanguard, there is a need to take the initiative. When policy is dictated by transient and short-term considerations, the party's actions could yield the opposite results: it could turn out to be incapable of correcting the erroneously chosen course and could lose touch with the people. The party either ceases to act as the defender of the working people's true interests, or takes, as Georgi Dimitrov put it, a stand of self-complacent sectarianism claiming to know all and believing it to be superfluous to learn from the masses, to learn the lessons of the working class movement. At some point, the principled line could become unpopular, but it always triumphs eventually. A party which departs from its principles in trying to make a short-term gain or to find an easy way out of complicated situations may at times make a momentary gain. But in the long run, when it reaches the dead-end of the wrong track along which it had trodden and desires to rectify its mistakes, it finds at least a part of its base already disoriented, thus putting the party back by several years. The other still worse possible consequence of such a deviation can be the erosion of its qualitative character to such a degree that it becomes undistinguishable from other parties.

Creative application of Lenin's fundamental ideas in differing circumstances, diverse tactics and swift response to the ongoing political, social, economic, scientific and technological changes in the world are — as our experience shows — all necessary for successfully leading the working people's struggle, *Collure* went on. However, deviation from the fundamental principles for the sake of "creativity" and "modernization" could do irreparable harm and slow down the party's advance. A party's claim of adhering to the Marxist-Leninist ideology does not in itself signify that in practice its strategy and tactics are developing correctly and objectively. Theory can help to shape policy, but it cannot provide ready-made recipes.

Abandonment of principles and underestimation of the role of ideology lead to revisionism, and an unwillingness to take a creative approach to theory in the light of the concrete realities of the struggle lead directly

into the doctrinaire impasse. The communists seek to avoid both dangers. They believe that the unity of revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice is the key requirement for the type of organization they set up. This applies equally to the well-seasoned parties, and to those who are just taking their first strides.

We have been convinced from experience — our own and collective, said *Semou Pathe Gueye*, that whenever a party tries to consolidate its position in a bourgeois society by making concessions to the bourgeoisie's views and abandoning its class approach to the questions of democracy, it not only fails to attain its goals, but always throws its ranks into theoretical, ideological and organizational confusion. For years, the SPIL had to work in the underground and was subjected to savage repression, but it has never deviated from its principled stand. It ultimately scored a major victory: the country's 1976 constitution recognizes the "communist trend" as a real component of national political life.

Loyalty to democratic centralism

Democratic centralism is the main principle on which communist parties are built, although their approach to it may differ. This principle, participants in the discussion said, is one of the greatest discoveries of the science of the party. What makes democratic centralism objectively necessary? It is the fact that it accords with the nature and character of the communist party, and organically blends democracy with explicit norms of discipline, subordination of the minority to the majority, and a centralized leadership.

It was said in the course of the discussion that party democracy should not be invested with notions relating to bourgeois parliamentarism. It is hopeless to try to assess the degree of democracy only from the standpoint of the possibility of taking part in voting within a fixed period and carrying on an electoral discussion, and also of having an opposition.

The concrete conditions in which a party has to work have an effect on how precisely it practises the principles of democratic centralism.

Niall Farrell spoke of the specific aspects of the Irish communists' struggle and considered the problem of the balance between the democratic and the centralist principles. The first of these, he said, is a necessary condition for voluntary cooperation among the members of the party. Without democratic interchange at all levels of the party it would not be possible to have a dialectical relationship between abstract ideas and concrete political practice. On top of that, the spirit of collectivism, which is inher-

ent in communist organization, helps to sum up practical experience and to secure mass support from the working class and its allies. The need for centralism is determined by the fact that the party has the task of defeating the adversary's centralized power. This can only be achieved if the party is one united force, rather than a collection of loose alliances. The leadership of the working class requires clarity and definiteness of policy, and this cannot be worked out without centralism, which enables the party to take decisions swiftly, in due time.

However, it must be pointed out that the relation between democracy and centralism depends on the concrete circumstances. The CP Ireland, flexibly guided by the basic organizational principles in a divided country, has adapted itself to the complicated situation by setting up its committees in two politically distinct areas and having them act together. Of special importance are meetings on the national level, primarily the sittings of the National Executive Committee, which provide opportunities for summing up information on experience from each of the areas, and examining it in the light of the overall situation. Of much importance for the CPI's educational work on the national level is also the organization of communist studies; comrades living in the relatively tranquil southern part of the country go to the party school in war-torn Belfast.

Party unity, which is guaranteed by democratic centralism, does not at all rule out differences of view, disagreements on various issues, and does not necessarily imply a consensus on the decisions taken, it was said in the discussion. However, the formation of factions with their group discipline, as opposed to the discipline of the whole party, is intolerable. Factionalism is not at all an attribute of democracy as our critics insist, but the erosion of the very foundations of the party spirit, which require of the communists united and well-organized action.

It is, of course, abnormal for a "majority" and a "minority" to exist within a party. Any differences are usually overcome in the process of practical work. But these can also be fundamental, when a minority insists on erroneous views or, conversely, takes a revolutionary stand, while the majority conducts an erroneous line. The requirement that the minority submit to the majority should not be interpreted as a ban on principled struggle against opportunism and opportunists.

There are instructive examples in history, *Boris Leibzon* said in this context, showing the ways in which party unity has been consolidated in the presence of a "minority" and a

"majority." Concerning the RSDLP rules, which were adopted by the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party at its third congress in 1905, Lenin wrote: "The minority now has the unconditional right, guaranteed by the party rules, to advocate its views and to carry on an ideological struggle, so long as the disputes and differences do not lead to disorganization ... and do not hinder the concerted struggle against the autocracy and the capitalists."⁵ The rights of the minority were guaranteed by the fact that all questions were decided democratically, on the basis of collective discussion, in which its opinion was taken into account, but not to perpetuate it within the party; this was done to create the conditions helping to overcome the disagreements and to reach an agreement on a principled revolutionary basis.

Now and again, Lenin and his followers were left in a minority. At the fourth (Unifying) congress of the RSDLP (1906), they made no secret of the fact that they did not support the adopted decisions, but they were prepared loyally to abide by them. Lenin wrote: "We declare to the whole party that we are opposed to a split of any kind. We stand for submission to the decisions of the congress."⁶ When Lenin was in the majority, he took a tolerant attitude to members of the minority, if they abided by the rules.

It was also stressed in the course of the exchange of views that democratic centralism rejects the practice of having a small group of activists or professional revolutionaries carry on all the work, while the rank-and-file communists are inactive. Participants in the discussion rejected the metaphysical antithesis between the "cadre" party and the mass party, because it is bound to lead to a Blanquist conception of revolutionary action. The mass character of a party is ensured by criteria of admission for new members that would allow the party to "assimilate" them, without running the danger of being converted into an ideologically and structurally amorphous organization, even if a more numerous one, which fails to withstand the first "gust of wind." Quantitative growth easily develops into a factor of weakness, where the rate of growth in the party ranks outruns its ideological education and efforts to involve the new contingent in practical work. But an excessive toughening up of the terms of admission creates the danger that sectarian trends could emerge, and threatens to disrupt the strong ties with the masses and lead to isolation.

When the problem of being a "cadre" party or a mass party faced some parties working in especially difficult circumstances, the ap-

proach was regarded as artificial and erroneous. Every party seeks to become a mass party. But this urge is fruitful only if it is realized not through artificial methods of recruitment, but through the involvement of the best members of the working class and other working people in vigorous social activity. There is, indeed, the need for a solid core of cadre capable of providing continuity in party work, however the situation may change. Without a steady influx of fresh forces one cannot hope for success in shaping one's cadre, and without a cadre nucleus it is impossible to ensure a growth of the party ranks. The gist of the problem, speakers in the discussion said, is that in present-day conditions there is, as a rule, a need not just for a cadre party or a mass party, but for a party of cadre and masses simultaneously.

Always in the midst of the masses

The constant strengthening of the party and perfection of its internal organization are not an end in itself. The party does not exist for itself, and its task is to work in the midst of the masses, to develop their class consciousness, and lead them in the struggle for attaining intermediate and ultimate goals. The party's ties with the working people and its ability to mobilize and unite them are the key criterion of its influence and capacity for revolutionary action.

The communists do not believe in the existence of forms of struggle fit for any situation, and they look to those of them which best of all meet the needs of the moment. The range of these forms is boundless and their diversity cannot be anticipated, because they are not "invented" but spring from the activity and initiative of the masses. This makes it clear how necessary it is to learn to switch swiftly from one form to another. The use of various forms, Lenin said, must be determined by "strictly defined ideological and organizational conditions."⁷ These conditions are above all that these forms of struggle should develop the working people's activity and consciousness, and should involve them in collective action, instead of keeping them on the sidelines.

It was said in the discussion that the growing danger of an all-annihilating thermonuclear conflict has produced altogether new forms of numerous social protest movements on an unprecedented scale (anti-war, environmental protection, civil initiatives, alternativists, and other movements). Some of them shy away from the working class movement and eye political organizations generally with distaste. Participants in the discussion held that in these conditions it is no longer enough to look only to

those who are "for us," and those who are "not against us." There is a need to learn to contact and cooperate with those who are "against us" for the time being, but who could become our allies in the struggle for peace.

Fraternal party congresses held in the recent period devoted much attention to ways of adding the strength of the working class movement to all the other progressive movements and to renewing in this context the practice and style of party work among the masses. It was emphasized that maximalist attitudes were inadmissible, and that it was important to take an attentive attitude to views which were not identical with our own. While holding to our own convictions and recognizing the full validity of Lenin's warning that "no practical alliances . . . can, or should, lead to compromises or concessions on matters of theory, program or banner,"⁸ the communists do not believe that everyone should think as they do. The point is not to shun any dialogue, the point is to explain rather than expose, to propose rather than criticize, to speak frankly but not sharply, to be able to put forward one's arguments, to hear out others, and to try to convince them. It is especially important for the party to be able to discern new real problems without delay and to show the ways of solving them.

Agamemnon Stavrou spoke of the interesting and fundamentally important experience of alliances gained by AKEL, the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus. It has reached the conclusion that in contemporary conditions (a sizable part of the country is under occupation by Turkish troops, British military bases are sited on its territory, and the revolutionary process is at the anti-imperialist, anti-occupation stage of the struggle) it is not realistic to set the attainment of socialist goals as the immediate task ahead. Resisting the Turkish occupation and the presence of British military bases on the island, the Cypriot communists have signed a minimum program of cooperation with the bourgeois Democratic Party (DIKO) and have some serious electoral successes to their credit. AKEL is not in the government but is, in fact, the backbone of a powerful popular movement. Together with the other patriotic forces, it has an important role to play in the struggle against those who prefer a strategy of concessions and want to lash Cyprus to the imperialist chariot.

Our enemies, Stavrou went on, keep slandering AKEL, claiming that its cooperation with DIKO is tantamount to a betrayal of the working class cause, because the minimum program approved by the parties says nothing about socialism in Cyprus. What are our counter-

arguments? Neglect of social uniformities and attempts to leap over objectively necessary stages in the struggle for social progress are fraught with grave consequences. Conscious of its responsibility for the people's destiny, AKEL rejects political adventurism. While working together with other forces in tackling democratic tasks and carrying on a struggle to raise the working people's living standards, we do not allow any concessions or compromises on the ideological front, and are doing our utmost to retain our own face. In agreeing to an alliance, the communists must have a clear notion of the nature of their participation in it, and should emphasize the independence of their own political line, while respecting jointly formulated goals.

The ability to arrange work among the masses in accordance with the concrete circumstances is closely connected with the problem of the party's vanguard role. It was said in the course of the discussion that the communists make no secret of their desire to be the working people's vanguard contingent. But that is not a claim to some kind of special status within the working class movement, to say nothing of its being a preliminary condition for alliance or contacts with other social or political forces. It is rather a commitment always to be in the forefront and resolutely and consistently to stand up for the people's interests. The intention to become the vanguard is a competitive one, it does not minimize the role of other participants in the movement and, in a sense, calls upon them to act just as vigorously and to raise the level of the struggle for the common cause.

Patriots and internationalists

The communist party springs from the urge of the front-ranking part of the working people to struggle for national liberation and social emancipation, to break the fetters of exploitation, oppression and injustice at home, and to give the creative forces of the masses scope for development. This shows that the party is deeply patriotic, and voices the will of the working class and the true national interest.

The unity of the democratic forces for which AKEL is working is a patriotic unity reflecting the genuine interests of the Cypriot people (Greeks and Turks). At the same time, the party believes that its duty is to win solid positions at the factories and plants, in the midst of all the working people, and so strives to direct the militant activity of the masses onto the way of conscious class struggle, and to assert the spirit of internationalism and understanding of the concrete tasks which stem from its truly internationalist positions.

No nation lives in an isolated world of its own, speakers in the discussion said, but in the wider world which is divided into two social systems, in a world in which there are also dozens of newly liberated states looking for ways of development. In these conditions, a revolutionary party whose interests do not go beyond the borders of its own country, risks being afflicted with national narrowmindedness. This kind of limitation is especially dangerous in our day, when global problems, above all the most crucial of these — the need to prevent a thermonuclear war — have become so vastly important for the destiny of humankind.

Many speakers suggested that the communists' patriotism is inseparable from consistent internationalism. After all, every nation's existence ultimately depends on the solution of the key world problems. Consequently, the struggle for peace and security of the nations, for fair international economic relations, against hunger, poverty and disease, and for social progress in every sphere constitutes the basic content of the communists' activity and determines the type of communist organization as the vanguard of the working class and of all the other working people.

* * *

Our parties are a developing force, it was stressed at the meeting. Today they are different in many ways from what they were 15-20 years ago. That is a natural process showing that the movement is viable and is capable of taking account of the constantly changing reality. New circumstances require that the forms of party organization and work should accord with them. The historical experience of Bolshevism shows, Lenin said, that the party organization, while "preserving its basic type, has been able to adapt its form to the changing conditions, has been able to vary that form to meet the requirements of the moment."⁹ This idea of Lenin's, it was noted in the course of the discussion, is also true of the contemporary communist movement, all of whose achievements are connected with the fundamental Marxist-Leninist ideas of building a revolutionary party and with their creative development.

1. See WMR, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 for 1982; and Nos. 2 and 8 for 1983.
2. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 187.
3. *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p. 321.
4. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 112.
5. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 434.
6. *Ibid.*, Vol. 10, p. 314.
7. *Ibid.*, Vol. 11, p. 222.
8. *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 331.
9. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 401.

The conditions for mass support

Anthony Harriot
Central Committee member,
Workers' Party of Jamaica (WPJ)

Our party is young, but in the five years of its existence it has undergone many trials, especially after the reactionary Labor government of Edward Seaga, Reagan's man in the Caribbean, unseated the national democratic regime led by Michael Manley in Jamaica in 1980. Touching on reaction's attempts to weaken the WPJ, General Secretary Trevor Munroe pointed out in the CC Report to the party's second congress (December 1981)¹: "Attempts from right-wing judges in the courts, attempts from the police, attempts from top officials and managers in the civil service and private sector. Harassment, victimization, court trials, fines, imprisonment, raids, lay-offs, transfers, demotions — all have had to be experienced by our baby party."

The situation has become even more adverse since these words were spoken, but despite all the persecution and harassment the WPJ continues to strengthen its ranks and positions: its numerical strength has increased, particularly among the industrial workers, and the party's mass influence has grown.

Our experience confirms the universality of Marxism-Leninism and the effectiveness of its creative application in the conditions of the liberation and revolutionary struggle of the Caribbean peoples.

In assessing the prospects of the anti-imperialist struggle in our country, the WPJ bears in mind that, as 27 per cent of the labor force, the working class is still relatively weak as an independent social force, and the oppressed peasantry is not sufficiently prepared to take revolutionary action. The numerous petty bourgeoisie and middle strata are infected with the ideology of reformism and liberalism, an ideology which has a strong influence on the population as a whole.

We neither underestimate nor overestimate the existing difficulties. Nicaragua is proof that pro-imperialist rule is far from stable. In comparison with those of the Central American states, the oligarchies in the English-speaking Caribbean are relatively weak, and the influence on people of the victorious revolutions in our region and the successes of socialist Cuba is growing constantly.

Fundamental changes are objectively re-

quired in Jamaica, where the effects of the economic crisis are particularly severe. Unemployment is approaching 30 per cent and is at its highest among the youth — 50 per cent. The country's foreign debt stands at 40 per cent of the gross domestic product. Jamaica is among the top four U.S. dependencies as far as per capita aid is concerned.

The principal political effect of the economic crisis is the development of symptoms of general decay in the bourgeois political system. It is the first time that such dramatic disillusionment with the policies of both leading parties, and primarily the ruling Jamaica Labor Party, has occurred within such a narrow time span, namely, since 1980. Religion, migration to North America and other "safety valves" are no longer a sure guarantee against social explosions and the deepening of the political crisis. The changes in the balance of class forces show that all the conditions exist for a rapid growth of the mass movement for social change.

A statement by Trevor Munroe on June 17, 1983, said: "It is now without doubt that the swing against the Seaga government among the majority of the people in the majority of the political constituencies in Jamaica is irreversible. Our own party assessments, our own party polls confirm the results of other polls being taken . . . that there is a definite swing in some constituencies approaching 20 per cent against the Seaga government, a swing which is based on the growing and intolerable hardship on the workers, the farmers and the youth, including supporters of the Jamaica Labor Party and those who voted in 1980 for this particular government."

Taking this into account, the WPJ demands the resignation of the present minority government and calls for the introduction of a caretaker administration representative of all parties and interests in the country to prepare the way for national elections. Such is the immediate objective toward which we are working while not budging an inch from the strategic perspective of radical transformation of society.

As regards the main opposition force, the People's National Party (PNP), there is a ten-

dency for the bourgeoisie to strengthen its position within it. That is why, if it is returned to power in the next elections, it will, in our view, not be able to resolve the urgent problems facing the people of Jamaica. Developments in the PNP confirm the conclusion of our second congress that a change in the balance of forces within the national liberation movement in favor of the working class and the all-round strengthening of that class's party is now a necessary condition for victory over imperialism.

We fully realize that the WPJ's central task is to bring class consciousness and organization into the daily life and struggles of the working people on the basis of close links with them and consistent defense of their interests. This requires a high level of discipline, collectivity, ideological maturity and political clarity in the party branches.

We are guided in our work by Lenin, who said that "the building of a fighting organization and the conduct of political agitation are essential under any 'drab, peaceful' circumstances, in any period, no matter how marked by a 'declining revolutionary spirit'; moreover, it is precisely in such periods and under such circumstances that work of this kind is particularly necessary, since it is too late to form the organization in times of explosion and outbursts..."²

The party sees as an indispensable condition for building its mass following and ensuring a growth in membership the waging of a consistent struggle around the concrete problems of concern to the population. The party's basic units have the task of attending not only to the working people's economic interests but also to their social and political rights, and recreational needs as well. To this end, the party branches are involved in resolving very varied political problems: they organize struggles against lay-offs in the factories and for sport facilities in communities, demand accountability regarding the spending of public funds, ensure that pensioners actually receive their pitance, and restrict police terrorism.

Thanks to this policy, the WPJ has become the leading force in a number of communities. This disproves the argument that the strength of the petty bourgeoisie and the ideological predominance of liberalism presently place the communists in an historically subordinate position in the country's political life.

However, it is not always that we pay sufficient attention to the population's pressing problems. Sometimes our work in the communities is restricted to particular social groups. These weaknesses are fortunately li-

imited and not general, but they could lead to loss of political influence and a drop in the party following. Sometimes people begin to see us only as an ideological vanguard: they still listen to the WPJ but they then form a practical political following for social democracy and see greater justification in strengthening its positions.

To correct this situation, the party initiated a big educational and organizing drive in 1982. It relies on the traditionally strong sympathy for socialism based on the impact of existing socialism, the Cuban revolution and the revolutionary movements in the region. Two to three years ago, even bourgeois pollsters estimated the pro-communist opinion at 20 per cent of the adult population and 40 per cent of young people.

The party can make more effective use of the favorable conditions in the social consciousness by improving its ideological and organizational work, and party building above all. The WPJ has a mass of active support and much depends on the party's ability to find effective forms of bringing together those who are with us. Efforts are presently geared at involving them primarily in party study groups, which are the first critical stage of party support groups and function as the party's organized political and ideological reserve.

The basis for this form of organizational work lies in the fact that as the party's mass influence and active following grow, people who are prepared to fight with the communists both to resolve particular concrete problems and to win power in the country are constantly being drawn to us. This includes those who are firm sympathizers and those who are members of mass organizations under the direction of the party.

The party study group is a training ground for party membership, a group which studies the party's organizational and ideological principles, and the methods of practical struggle. The need for such preparation is shown in the fact that from 1978 to 1981, twice as many persons as were in the party in 1980 applied for membership. The party would have grown by more than 200 per cent were the applications accepted, but less than 50 per cent met the standards. One factor in this was their insufficient preparation for party membership. The party study group is now playing this important role.

At the same time it should be noted that even advanced sympathizers of our party limit themselves to attending rallies and meetings, and carrying out specific tasks from time to time. This, in our view, is a manifestation of the

deep misconception that it is leaders and not the masses who make history. Organizationally this approach is expressed in political passivity. The study groups also help to get rid of such views and sentiments.

The problems of the struggle against imperialism's aggressive policy and for peace and security in our region and throughout the world is a constant theme of the study. In the study groups people become acquainted with the successes of socialist Cuba, understand the meaning of the profound socio-economic transformations in Nicaragua and Grenada, and learn the truth about the Reagan administration's actions to whip up tension and outrightly suppress the liberation struggle in the region. The group leaders also draw their listeners' attention to the dangerous situation caused by imperialism on the European continent and seek to bring home to them the significance of the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist states.

We try to link the study of the party program with the most topical political issues and the direct experience of the working people in particular sectors of the economy. As a result, the groups' popularity has been growing. They have been successful among the working class and the urban and rural poor. Our efforts to draw in the lower sections of the middle strata have also borne some fruit.

Special education seminars open to everyone are held for advanced workers. Comrade Munroe has been holding the Nelson Mandela Worker Education Seminar³ in Kingston, the country's capital, for over two years. At these seminars, the party constantly acquaints the audience with its proposals and demands. In the summer of 1983 a program of struggle against inflation and for jobs and higher wages was outlined, and the proposed measures to ensure a broadening of the working people's rights, worker participation in the running of production, and real democratization of the country's political life were explained.

The party support groups usually grow out of the study groups but differ from the latter in that they are directed toward concrete actions. They assist the primary party organizations in fund-raising, distribution of the party newspaper *Struggle*, and will play a major role in our election campaigns. During the last annual electoral constituency conferences of party members and party support groups, hundreds of supporters made useful suggestions aimed at advancing our work in the localities.

Experience has shown that the organization and strengthening of the support groups and their involvement and contribution to the

development of the plans of the primary organizations serve to raise the effectiveness of the party's work.

We consider it an important task to strengthen the party's organizational roots, in doing which we generally try to ensure four things.

First, we concentrate our efforts on the organized working class. Special importance is attached to ensuring that all party members have a clear idea of our policy's objectives. Many communists are thrust into positions of leadership because of their active defense of workers' rights and of trade union democracy. But at times these comrades lose sight of the fact that while their work in this area and also the activity of our factory committees are organizationally geared toward dealing with the trade unions, this effort must be ideologically and politically aimed at building the revolutionary vanguard of the working class.

Second, we try to link our organizational work with the basic aim of broadening the party's political influence. Where the party focuses attention on this and relies on the workers of the largest enterprises and on the trade unions, it is better able tactically to contend with the class collaborationist line of the petty bourgeoisie and its influence on the working people. The success of a task of such great importance for the party as the breaking of the monopoly hold of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties on the government is also dependent on the level of political support for the WPJ.

Third, it is necessary to ensure a correct approach to the problem of gaining power. A policy in this area which is not well-thought-out can lead to the loss of a realistic perspective and encourage adventurist tendencies, which also means a weakening of the party's influence among the masses. It is a grave and costly error to attempt to seize power in periods of consolidation of capitalist power, but equally grave is the missed chance at social revolution. It requires scientific prevision and organizational preparation to avoid both mistakes. In addition, we are not seeking to gain mass support at any cost since this eventually weakens the party.

Fourth and finally, the WPJ pays constant attention to the qualitative ideological and political upgrading of its membership, which is especially important in a period of reaction. The most important episodes in the class struggle are collectively assimilated. Documents assessing these struggles are precirculated for discussion. There is systematic ideological study related to the party's current tasks, which reduces the tendency of some comrades to be

pragmatic, ensures ideological unity and cohesion, and also stimulates creative application of the party's tactical line.

In a period of reaction, the parties, their principles, qualitative composition and organizational standards are severely tested. Our party has stood the test and strengthened its ranks and its ties with the people.

Experience shows that in our country and the territories of the Caribbean, the development of Marxist-Leninist parties is possible and necessary and that the further advance of the revolu-

tionary process requires that the vanguard of the working class and all popular forces be guided by the Leninist principles of party organization.

1. See Trevor Munroe, "When the Oligarchy Is in Power," WMR, No. 3, 1983, on the results of the WPJ's second congress and the political situation in Jamaica. — Ed.

2. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 18.

3. Named in honor of the well-known fighter against apartheid and racism, who is in prison in South Africa. — Ed.

Solidarity with the people of Grenada

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY DEMANDS THAT THE IMPERIALIST AGGRESSORS BE CALLED TO ACCOUNT

The world has witnessed a new crime of imperialism. On October 25, 1983, U.S. troops invaded independent Grenada — one of the tiniest states of the world, with a territory almost 30,000 times smaller than that of the United States — with the symbolic participation of Caribbean Pentagon puppet states. They blatantly violated its sovereignty, bringing destruction and death to the civilians, who rose up to defend their homeland, and occupied the is-

land. The aggression against this country, which has never posed a threat to anyone, was carried out in order to impose on its people a system which suits Washington and to intimidate the other freedom-loving peoples of Latin America.

Not only have the fundamental principles of international law and the UN Charter and the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act been violated, but the same "human rights," concern for which U.S. imperialism is hypocritically trying to use to justify its bloody action against Grenada, have been crudely trampled on.

Today — Grenada, Nicaragua and El Salvador; tomorrow — Cuba and the countries of other continents which do not suit Washington could be attacked. The logic of events shows how dangerous and disastrous for the cause of peace is the plunderous course of the present U.S. administration. It is easy to understand where such a policy could lead. Imperialism is irresponsibly playing with fire!

We, Latin Americans, categorically reject the view of the White House that the Caribbean, Central America and our entire continent are in its backyard, and express fraternal solidarity with the people of Grenada. Together with all the people of good will, we denounce the aggression and the occupation of the island.

U.S. imperialism must not be allowed to get away with its policy of militarism and aggression, which is fraught with danger not only for the independence and sovereignty of the peoples but also for humanity's very existence.

Donald Ramotar

CC Executive Committee member,
People's Progressive Party of Guyana

Rupert Lewis
CC member,

Workers' Party of Jamaica

This Publication is available in Microform.



University Microfilms International

Please send additional information

for World Marxist Review

(name of publication)

Name _____

Institution _____

Street _____

City _____

State _____

Zip _____

300 North Zeeb Road, Dept. P.R., Ann Arbor, Mi. 48106



Workers oppose missiles

The popular movement against the deployment of U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles has reached unparalleled proportions in the FRG. Even according to estimates of the Federal Ministry for the Interior, some 500 parties, organizations, committees, and groups speaking for 75 per cent of the republic's population who are against "arms build-up" plans are participating in anti-missile actions. They are conducting innumerable rallies, marches, demonstrations, and warning strikes, and picketing U.S. military bases. New forms of protest are appearing. These include initiative peace groups at factories and in administrative offices. The significance of this form of struggle cannot be overrated: it spells out the growing and increasingly more resolute participation in anti-missile actions of such a powerful and organized force as the working class.

The journal asked a number of activists of the FRG working class and trade union movement to describe the work of the initiative peace groups. The participants in the discussion were: Klaus Winkelhane, member of a factory council at the Mannesmann concern; Uwe Kaufrinder, student of a navigation school in Hamburg and member of the peace group of longshoremen and seamen; Ludwig Pohlig, chairman of the delegates' committee of the metalworkers union at the Mannesmann pipe factory; and Willi Hoffmeister, steelworker and member of a factory council at the Hoesch concern.

Following is a record of the exchange of views.

Q. *How did the peace initiative groups spring up at factories in the FRG? Do they not duplicate the work of trade unions?*

Willi Hoffmeister. The steel plant I represent employs 16,000 people. We produce virtually everything from steel sheets and channels to pipes. An important thing about the factory is that almost all the people employed by it are members of the metal-workers union. Compared with the total numerical strength of the staff the number of activists of the factory peace initiative group (about 80 persons) may seem to

be quite small, but the support they get from the other workers is growing from day to day.

The idea to form an initiative peace group at the factory was put forward about two years ago and acquired concrete shape after some 40 to 50 trade union delegates, members of factory councils, and workers said they were prepared to cooperate in such a group. All were guided by a sense of responsibility for their country and by their growing understanding that in the present critical situation those who want peace should act instead of waiting for something to happen.

After forming the peace initiative group we appointed our own representatives for liaison with the public and published a leaflet in which we said what we were out to achieve and stated specifically what we were acting against. True, we first had to clear up a matter that is quite acute in the FRG, namely, the attitude to joint action with the communists. But this did not prove to be very complicated because at our factory, in the trade union and in the factory council, people belonging to different parties cooperated very closely in the past as well. That is why the peace initiative group united people belonging to all the main parties and also non-party people. This is understandable because if a thermonuclear war breaks out nobody is going to worry about party sympathies or antipathies: the bomb will not look into party affiliation.

Another important matter that arose when the factory peace initiative group was formed was its relations with the trade unions. We clearly defined our stand: to become a member of the peace initiative group one does not necessarily have to belong to a trade union, but it is mandatory to subscribe to the decisions to defend peace adopted at many trade union congresses.

Uwe Kaufrinder. At factories in the FRG there are trade union delegates' committees and factory councils. These are often active in the struggle for peace, against the arms build-up. Some committees set up special trade union groups to handle questions related to peace and disarmament, to opposition to the plans to deploy Pershing-2 and Cruise missiles. Where

this work is already in progress there is, of course, no need for peace initiative groups. But these groups, which include elected trade union functionaries and factory council members, spring up at factories where the trade union organizers and councils give inadequate attention to the struggle for peace and disarmament. Most of the people in these groups belong to trade unions and take their cue from them. The factory peace initiative groups thus do not compete with trade unions. On the contrary, they support them in the struggle for peace.

As regards the peace initiative group in the port of Hamburg, the impetus to set it up was given by the NATO decision of December 1979 to deploy a new generation of nuclear missiles in Europe, including the FRG. About a year later came the Krefeld Appeal¹ and then, at the beginning of 1981, the Hamburg longshoremen gathered to consider what contribution they could make to ensure peace and the continuation of détente. With the Krefeld document as our model, we drew up our own appeal in conformity with the status of longshoremen and seamen. In it we touched on the question of East-West trade.

For us the preservation of peace is linked closely with the development of international commerce. In the port of Hamburg, for example, we load Mannesmann pipes destined for the Soviet Union. East-West trade accounts for 14 per cent of the commodity and freight turnover of Hamburg, and this provides jobs for approximately the same proportion of longshoremen, transport workers, personnel of shipping companies, and so on. Trade with socialist countries is of considerable importance to our city. We know and bring it home to others that trade and the port itself can prosper only under conditions of peace. War would destroy everything. This has been the bitter experience of Hamburg, Leningrad, Rotterdam, and other ports.

Klaus Winkelhane. We have a peace initiative group at the Mannesmann pipe factory in Duisburg. It includes practically the entire delegates' committee and the factory employees interested in defending peace, preserving employment, and promoting economic cooperation with the East. For us, as for the Hamburg longshoremen, the latter question is of special significance.

Mannesmann is the biggest pipe manufacturer in the Federal Republic, where every child knows that this firm is active in trade with the East and sells pipes to the USSR. But it is hard to promote that trade. For example, an order for 200,000 tons of output was recently

wrecked. If links with the socialist world are folded up we shall be deprived of the possibility of improving the employment situation at Mannesmann, Hoesch, and many other factories. Trade with the East cannot expand when the arms build-up in the Federal Republic absorbs more and more resources. Every working person in our country wants growing peaceful economic cooperation. These were not the least of the considerations that prompted the formation of the peace initiative group.

Ludwig Pohlig. One brief remark. I should like to underscore the big responsibility devolving on trade union delegates and on the factory councils. Their personal attitude and their activity are an important factor mobilizing factory and other workers in the struggle to preserve peace. The point is that on the basis of the factory law we have the possibility of daily discussing the most pressing issues with people directly at their workplaces. There may be factories where the council members encounter more difficulties, but at large steel plants participation in management usually gives elected representatives wide possibilities.

Q. What are the main areas of the work of the peace initiative group at your enterprise? What attention is given to the link between the struggle for peace and opposition to the policy of "social dismantling"?²

Ludwig Pohlig. The work of the peace initiative groups covers a wide spectrum of forms and orientations depending on the specific character of each enterprise. For instance, at the Mannesmann pipe factory we canvass for signatures under appeals urging the non-deployment of missiles and organize information displays. We try to enlist the factory personnel into the study circles run by the metalworkers' union and in winter classes are organized to analyze the political, economic and cultural conditions of life in different countries and discuss questions related to the peace movement. Moreover, once every three months the personnel of our and other factories in all districts of the city conduct peace actions during which leaflets are distributed. Further, we have taken part in many demonstrations and conducted work in residential neighborhoods to bring people out into the streets.

Extended sittings of trade union delegates, at which new initiatives are often put forward, are convened periodically. A meeting of the committee of trade union organizers was addressed by Oskar Lafontaine,³ who spoke of the peace movement, the situation in the Federal Republic, and of the insane NATO decision to turn our country into a powder keg. The trade

union organizers were outraged by the new information they got from Lafontaine, with the result that they passed a decision to proclaim the Mannesmann plants in the Duisburg-Huckingen region a nuclear-free zone. We sent the text of the decision to the Duisburg town authorities, all the parties, and the employees of the Krupp and Thyssen plants.

This action was successful: at first the employees of the Thyssen and Krupp enterprises followed our example, and six months later the Duisburg authorities declared the town a nuclear-free zone.

Uwe Kaufrinder. The peace initiative group in the Hamburg port concentrates on tying in two problems: to prevent the deployment of American missiles and to preserve our jobs.

Many ships from the Soviet Union, Poland, and the GDR put into our port. In the course of the eight-hour workday their crews are the work comrades of the Hamburg longshoremen, while during the rest of the day, the newspapers and television tell us, they are allegedly our enemies. That this is absurd is quite obvious. However, in real life things are much more complicated. We have to explain constantly to people that after their work shift their Soviet or Polish colleagues are people like the citizens of Hamburg and that they likewise do not want a war. This work is necessary as a means of fighting the anti-communist schizophrenia in people's consciousness.

As in the peace initiative groups at many other factories, we have heated discussions of questions related to the economic crisis and its escalation in capitalist countries as a consequence of the arms race. Studies show that a billion dollars invested in the war industry provide 76,000 jobs, while the same sum spent for civilian purposes makes it possible to create 86,000 jobs in mechanical engineering, 92,000 in the light and food industry, and 187,000 in the educational sphere. This means that the further channelling of money to the war industry dooms a growing number of people to unemployment.

There are other negative aspects to the arms race. If, for example, the Hamburg longshoremen load a tank onto a ship and the crew takes it, say, to Turkey it will at best stand and rust, while at worst it will fire at working people like us. If instead of a tank we were to send a machine-tool, people would be able to work on it, create values, and be happy to buy new equipment in the FRG. Money invested in the war industry is unproductive. It leads to a growth of inflation, a reduction of the number of jobs, a growth of the national debt, and the folding up of social programs.

Willi Hoffmeister. At the Hoesch factories many people are worried today about being put out of work. One can understand them: since 1975 the number of jobs in the Dortmund steel industry has decreased by 10,000. This is one of the reasons why with many West Germans the fear of unemployment pushes even anxiety about the world's future into the background. During discussions at munitions factories one can often hear people saying that if there were disarmament they would lose their jobs. To persuade them that this is not true we have to give them strong arguments containing an alternative to military production.

We are giving a lot of thought to ways and means of influencing large sections of public opinion, to what questions must be given priority, and to what to do in order to draw still more people into the struggle for peace. Effective forms of work are open meetings at which the subject under discussion and the speakers rouse live interest among our workers. Let me tell you about one of these meetings which made a particularly strong impression on me. We invited one of the initiators of the Krefeld Appeal, former general and now a Bundestag deputy from the Greens, Gert Bastian, the Marxist scholar Jorg Huffscheid, and the chairman of the factory council and Social Democrat Kurt Schrade. They formed the core of the presidium. Moreover, the meeting was attended by Bernd Schimmeyer, head of the committee of trade union organizers at the Phonix factory; Bruno Koneke, chairman of the city committee of the education workers' union; and Roland Gall, chief producer of the Dortmund Drama Theater. Actors are also having serious problems because of the expected reduction of the troupe, and their presence was very appropriate. More than 600 people came to the meeting. We needed more time than we were given to answer the many questions and for the debate. But despite this the meeting was successful. It adopted an Appeal to Working People, pointing out the link between the arms build-up and the reduction of jobs and calling for the formation of peace initiative groups throughout the country.

Klaus Winkelhane. I should like to somewhat broaden our discussion. The arms build-up is the most dangerous but not the only outcome of the escalation of the arms race. In the world there are countless numbers of people still suffering from hunger and poverty. It is terrible that we can do nothing to help them because the needed resources are devoured by the war industry. For that reason the peace initiative groups should not confine their struggle to trying to halt the arms build-up, however per-

nicious it may be. They must also reveal both the real state of affairs and the implications of the arms race.

Q. What prevents a large part of the FRG population, including workers, from playing a more active role in the peace movement?

Uwe Kaufrinder. We should look for the answer to this in German history, the period of fascism in the first place. Very few people ventured to resist Hitlerism vigorously. The most dedicated fighters found themselves in concentration camps, and the majority of these never returned. But there is another reason. The bulk of the population kept out of anti-fascist resistance for the most diverse reasons. Loyalty guaranteed survival. Regrettably, a considerable number of people still refuse to join actively in resistance to official government policy. To join in the struggle against the arms build-up means taking the road of resistance. This is one of the central reasons why it is hard to draw more people into demonstrations, the distribution of leaflets, and other forms of social protest.

Ludwig Pohlig. Also, one should not forget the socio-political situation in the FRG today. The mass media are controlled by the capitalists and the big political parties. No factory council member or trade union functionary would ever get time, say half an hour once a week, on television in order to speak about the condition of wage workers. How then is the working person who spends his or her evenings before the "box" to get unbiased information for forming an independent idea when he or she is swamped day in and day out with information that is far from being the truth, to put it mildly? For us, participants in the peace movement, it is not easy to persuade a person who is constantly bombarded with quite different ideas.

As has already been pointed out, fear of losing work is also a barrier to the struggle for peace. After all, there are 2,500,000 registered unemployed in our country. This influences people's thinking. They are apprehensive that rationalization of production will put them out of work and are afraid of "engaging in politics" and getting blacklisted.

Willi Hoffmeister. While, generally speaking, it may be said that the trade unions are joining the peace movement with growing determination, we, trade union activists, are worried that the number of workers and factories involved is still small. For instance, in Dortmund there are over 70 peace groups in the Peace Plenum but the number of factory peace initiative groups is still inadequate.

My colleagues have rightly pointed out the circumstance hindering the activation of people at factories: apathy to politics is deliberately cultivated among the citizens of the FRG. A newspaper like *Bild-Zeitung*, which specializes in bamboozling people, tells its readers every morning what their program for that day should be. Regrettably, the trade union newspapers are unable to counter this propaganda.

Moreover, some leaders play into the hands of the advocates of missiles by saying that in socialist countries there is no peace movement. Let us recall in this connection the meeting on a highway in Czechoslovakia with a group of soldiers setting up a transparency calling for a struggle for peace. But in the FRG I was a witness to Bundeswehr soldiers marching with me at the head of an Easter March across the Ruhr, after which they were punished.

Many other examples could be given that speak for themselves. I have visited the GDR frequently as a member of delegations. We had meetings with working people to discuss the struggle for peace. Once I got to thinking what if guests came to us from the GDR and we wanted to meet at some factory to discuss the problem of preserving peace? I think that in the present situation the factory owner would simply not let them through the gate. That is the attitude to the peace movement under the different social systems.

However, we are sure that despite all the obstacles our trade union and working class movement will become increasingly active in the struggle for peace. After all, the policy of deploying missiles, the arms race, and abolition of jobs, and the social dismantling are coming into ever greater conflict with the grievances of the working class.

* * *

As the participants in the exchange of views foresaw, the peace movement is gaining strength at factories and other enterprises in the FRG. It is now a matter of history that the first federal meeting of factory peace groups, which issued an appeal to all factory and office workers in the country, took place on September 11, 1983. There was a big response in the FRG to the Five-Minute Peace Watch — a strike that took place on October 5 in reply to the appeal of the Federation of German Trade Unions as a token of protest against the deployment of U.S. missiles. Lastly, factory and office workers took an active part in Action Week (from October 15 to 22) and Worker Resistance Day.

And one more fact. The number of peace initiative groups is steadily growing in the

FRG. At the close of October there were roughly 300 of these groups, and new ones continued to spring up every day, making a tangible contribution to linking the peace movement with the trade union and working class movement, which gives anti-missile actions ever greater breadth and width.

1. By October 1983 the Krefeld Appeal had been signed by five million people in the FRG. — Ed.

2. This is the name given in the FRG to the government policy of cutting back the working people's social gains. — Ed.

3. Among the West German Social Democrats Oskar Lafontaine, Chairman of the Saar organization of the SDP, is one of the consistent opponents of the NATO arms build-up decision. — Ed.

The French communists' research activity

Jacques Milhau
philosopher,
CC member, French Communist Party (FCP)

MARXISM A HUNDRED YEARS AFTER MARX

The viable forces of France are joining a long and large-scale battle, the battle of the national challenge to the crisis. The struggle for revolutionary transformations tends to produce many diverse problems, relating to a cognition of the realities produced by the contradictory course of the crisis. These are problems involving economic, social and political action by the working people and their organizations, action which helps to tilt the balance of forces in favor of the development in the country of a self-administered and democratic socialism.

It is more than a concurrence of circumstances that the French Communist Party, concerned with raising the level of its theoretical work to meet the requirements of the time, has now put forward the task of developing Marxism in accordance with the existing conditions, a task that is binding in many ways. Over the last quarter-century, the productive forces, the relations of production and all the other social relations in France have undergone a significant change. While extensively deploying material and human potentialities, the movement of capital has also produced — in accordance with the draconian demands of the law of profit — results which are disastrous for their free social development. The contradictory logic of state-monopoly capitalism, with its inherent super-accumulation and depreciation of capital, the progressive decline in the efficiency of production facilities and the multiplying waste of material and man-power resources has opened the floodgates of a structural crisis that is global and protracted. This crisis has deeply affected the system itself, which has capital for its supreme value. Accordingly, the multiform social pressure on the capitalist constraints has grown to such an

extent that, following a 20-year battle, the left-wing forces have won a political victory. This helps to carry on more effectively the struggle against the noxious influence of capitalism on technological growth and the development of social life.

Having adopted the new strategy of a democratic advance toward socialism by rallying for action all those who stand for change, the FCP had accordingly to reappraise its attitude to theory. Mindful of the fact that policy and theory have their own specifics, that each has its own ultimate goals, specific tasks and peculiar rhythms of development, our party has refused to accept any forms of subordination of policy or of theory in any sense whatsoever, or any temporary or constant direction of the one by the other, as that would be fatal for both. The FCP does not deduce policy from theory and does not use theory to justify policy as surety for it. Proceeding from such a view of theory and policy, it has set up the Institute of Marxist Studies (IRM) as an autonomous research body. That is not a beginning signifying the intention of translating into life some kind of instrumentalist conception of theory. Quite to the contrary: the more fully research accords with its ultimate goal — that of comprehending the truth without any distortions because of some kind of constraints — the greater is its capacity to feed the collective thinking of a workers' party and to favor political choice, without imposing it; this choice is always made by the party alone, but it is a better one when it is backed up with objective knowledge.

Although the IRM is not an official FCP institution, it is far from being neutral. It is original rather because the definition of its research priorities depends on the requirements of cognition which spring from a comprehension of the political line worked by the FCP. Indeed,

the party's strategy can be fed, developed, enriched and perfected only by a ceaseless interaction of newly acquired knowledge, efforts to specify the immediate tasks and perspectives of social transformation, and the achievements of social practice.

The current development of Marxism in France is also connected with the latest aspects of the social movement. The center of gravity is shifted to fundamental problems, something that is simultaneously vitally necessary and hard to effect. But their solution would do much in expanding our knowledge of the world through its cognition.

The singular case of France, which now finds itself at the crossroads of its historical destinies, requires the closest attention to the complexity of the on-going changes, to the new potentialities and also to the exacerbated contradictions. Economic growth based on a primacy of living labor, a mixed economy limiting the domination of big capital, new management — for the working people and by the working people themselves, hitherto unknown forms of governance of people and administration of things — those, we believe, are some of the problems which shorten the distance between theory and practice but which do not confuse them to the detriment of either the one or the other. The time has truly come for meaningful topical research!

In the light of the activity of Karl Marx, Frederick Engels and Vladimir Lenin, the concrete substance of Marxism implies a critical historical and searching approach to the multiplying social contradictions, the essential diversity of individual movements, and the logical unity of interdependent processes. That is why Marxism, which shuns all kinds of abstract theorizing, has to examine, according to the French philosopher Lucien Seve, "principles as results, laws as condensations of evolving relations, and concepts as moments of analysis." While not neglecting abstract concepts, and making use of the productive power of theoretical thinking, Marxism cannot but constantly connect the concrete study of any real movement with a practical and the most rational anticipation of its potentialities. It has to do so, in accordance with the well-known formula: to know in order to foresee and to be able.

But isn't that the main objective of scientific socialism? Now that socialism has ceased to be a remote prospect for many countries, the revolutionary passage beyond the pre-socialist society — capitalist or other — is a question formulated everywhere in a specific way for each country, whether it belongs to the capital-

ist sphere or to the highly heterogeneous Third World. Because we regard the existing ways of transition to socialism in the retrospect as specific, we do not give them a broader generalization; nor can they be transposed. The problems of transition have, one could say, a variable geometry, because in every case they are rooted in the national conditions and cannot be reduced to others. Each "historical environment"¹ is pregnant with original development, and the whole of socialism's further progress in the world tends to change the balance of forces, so favoring new forms of revolutionary transformations of the society.

In the context of 1983 France, scientific socialism cannot, we think, take for its model the known forms of transition; none of these, incidentally, claims to have the significance of a prototype, despite its relevance to other conditions.² Still less can we proceed from any speculative or utopian and abstract concept of the socialist ideal. It is important for us to understand how the French people will be able to master the ensemble of conditions in social reproduction — ranging from the economic to the cultural — at the given level of the specific state of the capitalist socio-economic formation in a crisis-ridden France.

Only with a thorough consideration of our national reality, which is inseparable from the ongoing world development, would it be possible to understand the specific character of the objectively possible transition to socialism through the democratic and peaceful process of a daily accumulation of forces, a transition ensured by a series of conscious and voluntary majority advances and a bitter class struggle against the domination of capital and the hegemony of the big monopoly bourgeoisie in various forms (other than armed force). Without such a consideration it is impossible to comprehend the relevance and timeliness of the perspective of a democratic and self-administered socialism, let alone clarifying for oneself the separation of political parties and the state which is necessary in our conditions, the need for ideological and political pluralism, the importance of decentralized and contractual planning, the role of self-administration and self-management at every level of national life, and also the task of free development for all, development which is both the goal and the instrument of social progress in various spheres of life.

What is more, recognizing that the French historical environment does not resemble others and cannot be reduced to them, we do not share views which are suitable in other conditions. For instance, we do not regard as

preliminary elements of a revolutionary transformation the actual winning of the whole of political power or the complete socialization from the outset of the large-scale means of production and exchange, the ideological monopoly of the state or a cultural revolution programmed from above.

Conscious of the specific nature of such an orientation — and the French communists have already got down to its historical verification in action — we naturally have no intention to propose some new model even to those countries whose socio-economic order has deep similarities with conditions in our country. Every people is the judge of its own history and is the sole heir, it is the legitimate successor to the material and spiritual legacy, which will be developed specifically in a situation depending on the concrete circumstances.

Science as a whole advances by correcting its concepts, delineating and separating its truths; these are subsequently constituted into a more complex and more general system of knowledge which acquires its own properties and frequently a more elaborate form owing to the discovery of new properties. Scientific socialism develops in a similar way. Its conceptual apparatus is transformed and reorganized with progress in the multifaceted study of specific, i.e., dissimilar realities.

The shifts in the conceptual apparatus also make it possible to connect the general movement with the concrete universalization which proceeds in various forms at accelerated although different rates. That which is nationally specific invests it with a definiteness which consists of organic elements and distinctive features. Through this broad movement, socialism is asserted in various forms, establishing a complex and more or less solid interdependence between various forms of the coherent and multifaceted process in the course of which the society takes over everything of which capitalism under its imperialist domination has deprived human beings on an international scale. This makes it clear that there is nothing like an incompatibility, but rather a mutual complementarity between the need to take a fresh look at the realities and once again to make a study of theoretical Marxist texts. The purpose of such study is not to borrow ready-made recipes, but to apply every possible effort to take that which is, directly or indirectly, consonant with our problems.

The formation of the FCP's strategy has had a reciprocal effect on historical science and on the mode in which the methods of research and explanation are applied. Having abandoned the stereotype use of the general concepts of

historical materialism as a universal instrument, communist historians have striven to take a creative approach to this conception, which, as a theory, is objectively based in the specific logic of history. They have abandoned the idea of using any models of social development, concentrating their attention on the constant study of the modes in which social formations not corresponding to any ideal notions — for instance, nations — pave for themselves different, constructive ways of development. Accordingly, communist historians seek to enrich the materialist historical science along two lines: an understanding of the historical movement which has its own specific uniformities, and also the results of thorough scientific research into the still unprobed past and present.

In the sphere of fundamental theory, our historical science has turned to the study of the dialectic connection between the productive forces and the relations of production, and also of the ties between the various modes of production with different levels of maturity within the framework of one and the same developing socio-economic formation. A critique of the mechanistic or structuralist conceptions according to which these relations were frequently seen as layers, tiers or articulations of forms, structures or levels delimited from each other led to the elaboration of a more rigorous and precise conceptual apparatus revealing the evolving interpenetration of numerous contradictory processes in history. A more thorough analysis of such a component part of the productive forces as people and of their relations with nature and the society has restored to the conceptual use of our historical science the category of class interest which is realized by means of domination over the social organization of labor and class hegemony in the processes of reproduction of social formations. This also means a hegemony effected in state, juridical and religious practices interacting in these processes.

Among the other re-instated categories are the greater or lesser degree of universality of modes of production, formal or real potentiality, abstract or concrete necessity, and non-linearity, unevenness of development. This has predetermined the depth of research into the specific socio-economic distinctions the conditions for whose maturing are to some extent typical. On the other hand, work has been done on historical analogies for the purpose of bringing out the forms of typization and establishing the substance of the processes whose initial conditions are always heterogeneous. This work has helped to formulate, in the context of

the problems in the periodization of history, more mature views of the modes of social universalization which are in one way or another limited in time and space.

With the abandonment of the hagiographical and utilitarian approach, important new aspects have also appeared in the study of the history of the French Communist Party. The urge is being asserted to regard the communist party as a social object and subject: it is influenced by the general movement of contradictions in our society, changes in the balance of forces, and the state of the international communist movement, while the party itself exerts an influence on these processes. Taking into account the changes in strategy, and their direct and indirect results is the leading hypothesis of the multifaceted research helping to analyze the various aspects of the actual state of the party (introduction of ideas, theoretical training and work, forms of organization, propaganda and activity, mastery of the situation, attitude to the society and its institutions, etc.). This also helps to evaluate the forms of its cohesion, its immediate, medium-term and long-term perspectives and the effectiveness of the concrete methods of its political practices at the various stages of history.

On the whole, the need is felt to have a method for bringing out the problems of party life with constant reliance on new information and documents; attention needs to be given to the internal and external contradictions in the party's development, in the course of whose solution the revolutionary way is asserted in periods of advance, delay or retreat. Such an approach expresses the rejection of any speculative view of the party as an abstractedly perceived model³ and gives scope for studying its social determinateness, and the potentialities and consequences of practical activity, a party such as it has been over a period of many years, a party which has gained a comprehension of its social role, without ceasing to improve itself under the impact of the changing situation with the diversity of its organizations and, accordingly, the conditions of their work.

The new aspect in the development of the theory of the individual — and it has to some extent shown itself — is connected not so much with strictly psychological research, as with the study of the socio-historical forms in which the individuality expresses itself, the modes in which the individual stands out in the societies. This research has ranged over the conditions of man's development as a social productive force and the mechanisms of the subjective (conscious or unconscious) percep-

tion by man of the forms of social consciousness, and also the more classical but inexhaustible problem of the individual's role in history.

But for the time being such studies are of limited importance, and the study of the influence exerted on the cognitive capacities and professional skills of students, their culture and world view by the whole system of education, which in France is now in a state of crisis, is just only being sketched out. The same applies to the study of social activity and professional work from the angle of man's aspirations and his acquired experience. Besides, changes in mentality, including the individual's behavior and social self-awareness, are a question that has not been studied at all.

In the light of the FCP strategy, the emphasis of research in political economy is being shifted from the crisis of state-monopoly capitalism to economic growth and the problems of management. We have entered upon a phase of in-depth elaboration of new criteria for the management of production; while being purely operational, they imply the working people's direct involvement in the struggle to force the class adversary to apply these criteria and, relying on the rights won, to secure the social use of the available added value marking a break with the logic of profit extraction. All of this is being studied within the framework of the perspective of the mixed economy and implies a prevalent, dynamic and leading role for the state industrial and banking sector, whose scale of nationalization now puts France in the front ranks of the non-socialist countries.

Changes in the economy which are of great importance for the future are inseparable from research into the concrete varieties of organization in self-administration at every level, forms of its legalization within the framework of administrative decentralization, and also the training of the masses for the management of production. This bears on the question of science and technology, but here French communist researchers are just going beyond the highly vague and general notions of science as a direct productive force. One could say that they are just moving toward a thorough and purposeful analysis of the relationships between the relations of production and the socially and politically determined autonomy of science and technology, and also toward research into the relations between materialized and living labor. Discussions about the various generations of the means of automation in production, control and communications help to find new ways of studying labor processes, requirements, the practical application of skills

and its limits, the logic behind the development of incentives for production from "below," and the scientific and technological perspectives opened up by the advance toward socialism.

In contrast to the past, the problem of the society's mastery of science and technology is no longer considered only in terms of the ideological and political struggle for hegemony, in isolation from socio-economic measurements. We are now examining the contradictory system of the integral reproduction of social life directed by the struggle of classes; its core is a nation-wide struggle at the enterprises for economic growth on a high scientific, technological and humanistic level, and for the steady development of self-management in production, social consciousness and practice.

The study of the development of the French society and its individual parts helps to fill a big gap in the field of sociology. This concerns many characteristics relating to the social structure, institutions and representative organs of power; this also includes the phenomena of regionalization, problems produced by the mass media, the development of collectives, etc.

In the course of concrete research into the composition of the working class and changes in its structure, much importance is attached to the question of the intricate formation and transformation of the class "in itself" into a class "for itself" through qualitative changes in labor, way of life, social activity and relations between the working class and other strata. This problem is being studied within the framework of the movement of capital in crisis. The perspective shown by the Marxists indicates that there is a multiplication of the real potentialities for an offensive by the class brimming with vital forces and representing the crucial, if not the only, force of our modern history; its condition, position and economic, social and political potential make it possible to embody social realities of our epoch in a multiplicity of diverse forms.

Important correctives have been made in the set of problems relating to the study of the state with an eye to the changes in the FCP's strategy. Contemporary French studies are not confined to listing the characteristics of the state, when it is identified with power and centralized apparatuses. Specific and old questions are additionally put forward: the formation of state power caused by the division of classes in so-called dependent modes of production; the intervention of the state in the organization, development and subordination of the human element of the productive forces; the role of the

state in forming the nation; the state's two-fold function: as an instrument of class domination and as an instrument ensuring social ties and reproducing them. A study is made of the dialectics underlying the development of the state apparatus and the representative system characteristic of bourgeois statehood, monopolistic and transnational trends toward supra-state integration, and also forms of popular control of republican institutions on the regional and local levels.

At the same time, new studies of the political characteristics of French society help to overcome the oversimplified, instrumentalist identification of state and political elements. The society's development, although it is ultimately determined by material production, always proceeds in forms and structures conditioned by political processes, depending on which its contours are constantly modified. Consequently, the society should be studied with equal consideration of diverse political practices: actions, contradictory political notions and conceptions, and the activity of diverse political organizations, bearing in mind that these maintain complex relations not only with this or that class or definite stratum, but also with the society as a whole, with its past, present and future, and with the state and its institutions.

Notable changes have occurred in the theory of ideology. One example is the attention which Marxists have been giving to the idea of human rights. It is determined both by the significance of winning new rights, which should provide an underpinning in the struggle for changes in the society, and by the need to rebuff the foul campaign mounted by Carter and Reagan. The idea of human rights, considered from the standpoint of their juridical formalization and the aspirations of the individual expressed in that idea, acquires an objective value as a social demand that is historically determined by changes in social relations. It is also significant as a form in which social gains are recognized and new relations between individuals and collectives are legitimated.

In this context, juridical ideology has appeared above all as a specific mode of appropriating the material and spiritual world, a praxeological form (stemming from a study of human activity and behavior) of the contradictory process in which circumstances are humanized depending on the balance of forces between individuals, classes, peoples and states.

The logic behind the changes in human rights runs from a right to some abstract, essentially bourgeois, freedom — toward social

rights safeguarding individual and collective requirements, and from there on to prerogative-rights which are inseparable from self-administration. This development accords with the spread of the basic rights of the private person to the basic rights of the social individual progressing as a result of the struggle; specific rights are extended to the universal rights of peoples in every sphere of national and world life. Human rights being a historical form of social consciousness, the "language of real life,"⁴ they attain the stage of their global indivisibility, and imply a materialist view of ideology. The latter is not a mirage, not pure ideality, but aspiration and so intellectual ferment for practical action through which people transform the conditions of their existence in accordance with their class interests.

In France, Marxist philosophy is coming to respond more fully to the requirements of epistemological and critical historical research into the origination, development and articulation of the categories of being, thought and action. These categories are simultaneously the cardinal questions of logic in the changing relations between thought and being as social practice is improved and objective cognition advanced. The progress of the Marxist philosophy has always depended on the state of the natural and the other sciences, which provide matter for the elaboration of materialist logic, the logic of the concrete substance of things in the contradictory process of their movement, functioning and historically relative universalization.

The origination of historical materialism put the antithesis of materialism and idealism in a new light. It proceeds from a philosophical comprehension of the objective relations between social practice, material reality and the process of cognition. This correction not only shattered the speculative symmetry of idealism and materialism, outside the context of social life. It also disqualified all ontology and rejected any subordination of historical materialism to such ontology. But the main thing is that this correction induces an ever greater accent on the theoretical delimitation of nature, society and thought. They must not be connected in an abstract way, but only to the extent to which this is made possible by the acquisition of experience and knowledge depending on practice.

This has also had some consequences for materialist dialectics. Indeed, if it is necessary to expel any inclination to a materialism that makes no distinction between nature, society and thought, a materialism which reduces motion to a uniformity, no general dialectics is

likewise philosophically conceivable without a constant effort to bring out the specifics of the concrete processes in nature, society and thought. Scientific research is fed by historical development itself, and it is continued in the diverse approaches to the concrete forms of motion. Consequently, the logic in the development of the substance of the object of cognition and of cognition itself can be brought out by means of a secondary philosophical abstraction, through an epistemological critique of categories and concepts.

On the whole, we treat the specifics of philosophy in the light of the perspectives of its critical historical development. The present practice of philosophical reflection operating in two registers — the general and the particular, the abstract and the concrete, the internal and the external — lays no claim either to being an encyclopaedia of the sciences, or a summing-up of the sciences in an all-embracing system, even if an open-ended one. It brings out, analyzes and concerts the logical relations on the strength of their own movement, in the cognition of the substance of things. It sums up the results of such cognition in the form of objective and subjective categorical connections. In this way we are working for the credibility of the Marxist epistemology in the face of reductionist conceptions of philosophy and its abusive identification with science. This struggle has nothing in common with efforts to convert the Marxist philosophy into a body of rigid doctrine.

Such are schematically the lines of the current development of Marxist studies in France carried on by communist scientists in various fields. These studies proceed in a social situation that has undergone more than a quantitative change, and so are designed to draw a clear line of demarcation between that which has ceased to be effective and that which is viable in the theoretical legacy, to upturn new soil by means of implements which are more in accord with the new tasks. That is the only way in which our communist scientists can respond to the requirements of cognition evoked by the FCP's bold policy which has a high civilizing significance and which accords with the spirit of the time. That is the only way in which they can best absorb Marx's legacy — in this anniversary year — that needs to be multiplied in the closing years of the 20th century.

1. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 156.

2. Concerning the role and importance of experience gained in the revolutions that have taken place for the search for new, unique and peculiar ways, see, for instance, J. Sarkar's article "Our View of the Specific Ways of

Revolution" in WMR, No. 11, 1981, and E. Wimmer's "Significance of Experience to Policy-Making" in No. 4, 1982. — Ed.

3. Concerning the study of the party as a living and developing political organism guided by an advanced

theory, see the discussion on "The Character of a Communist Organization" in WMR Nos. 1-12, 1982, the Nos. 1-8, 1983. — Ed.

4. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 36.

The peculiarities of anti-Marxism

Professor Eberhard Fromm
Academy of Social Sciences under the
Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SUPG) CC

This year, life has provided fresh and convincing evidence that Marxism-Leninism is the most powerful political and spiritual force of our time closely connected with the practice of existing socialism and the class and national liberation struggle. The communists' vigorous ideological activity all over the world, the numerous functions to mark the 165th anniversary of the birth of Karl Marx and the centenary of his death which were arranged by the most diverse social forces, and the publication of many new theoretical works in connection with these memorable dates — all showed very well that Karl Marx Year merely threw a brighter light on that which had already stood out in relief long ago, namely, the irresistible advance of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

"The last quarter of the 20th century vividly demonstrated that the ideas of Karl Marx and his comrade-in-arms Frederick Engels, who showed the way to a life without man's exploitation by man, to freedom and independence of nations, to peace and social progress, are now more viable than ever before. There is the most convincing confirmation that Marx's doctrine, as Vladimir Lenin, his great continuer said, is not a dogma, but a guide to action, that it is being constantly enriched with new conclusions and propositions arising as a result of its creative application in concrete conditions."¹ That is how SUPG CC General Secretary Erich Honecker characterized the actual significance of the scientific world view of the working class in the closing words of his speech which he delivered at the international scientific conference "Karl Marx and Our Day: the Struggle for Peace and Social Progress."

The advance of Marxism-Leninism — and that is something which has also been most clearly brought out over the last several months — is proceeding only in sustained ideological struggle against bourgeois views, in a global spiritual contest against reactionary ideas. It is proceeding in the atmosphere of the "crusade" against communism mounted by the ultra-reac-

tionary aggressive forces led by U.S. imperialism, the build-up of international tensions and the growth of the war danger. The pivotal issue in this ideological context is the issue of peace, the question of saving human civilization.

Nowadays, Marxism-Leninism is addressed ever more widely and intensively, as the central element in the contemporary ideological class struggle, whether these are efforts to comprehend it or, conversely, purposeful attacks against it and its deliberate distortion.

The advance of the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and the growing interest in them among new social groups and strata naturally constitute a complicated and multi-faceted process. It involves not only a movement toward the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism and comprehension of it, but also contention with and evasion of it; its comprehension at times runs in round-about ways, comes up against barriers, and even takes the form of misconceptions. That explains the breadth, the variety and the distinctive features of the process of addressing Marxism in our day. Considering that there is now not a single serious social force, not a single political movement that has not, in one way or another, determined its attitude to Marxism-Leninism, one will discover here the most diverse stands differing in content and form.

On the one hand, there is the purposeful comprehension of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine within the communist and workers' parties which is achieved through their theoretical, ideological and political activity, by means of extensive ideological-education work. In the socialist countries, this has an important place in the shaping of the working people's consistent socialist consciousness. The purposeful and profound mastery of the advanced theory is not an end in itself, but the crucial condition for working out the scientific principles of the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary, anti-imperialist struggle and the building of a developed socialist society. Past and present ex-

perience keeps reaffirming the importance of the ideological cohesion of the working class party on the positions of Marxism-Leninism.

On the other hand, Marxism-Leninism is now also being studied on a fairly large scale outside the communist and workers' parties. Here, for all the diversity and distinctions, two extensive and dissimilar spheres clearly stand out. To draw a clear distinction between them does not at all amount to preaching some kind of "polycentrism" or a "pluralization" of Marxism. This is rather an understanding of the fact that forces with their specific interests and markedly differing from each other are expressing their attitude to Marxism-Leninism. Such distinctions should not be glossed over, presenting a picture of some allegedly existing anti-Marxist "united front." What are these two spheres of manifest interest in our ideology outside the communist movement?

First of all, there are the forces which are approaching Marxism-Leninism step by step or partially in order to use it for their critical action with respect to capitalism, in the anti-imperialist struggle, in the consistent continuation of national liberation and social emancipation, in action against the most reactionary and aggressive circles of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Here, there is an ever more tangible urge to stand up for the interests of the workers and the other working people, and that is what, strictly speaking, explains this effort to address Marxism. Such tendencies, which are characteristic, for instance, of left-socialist or revolutionary-democratic movements and groupings, naturally express no more than a trend: it does not proceed without obstacles, its development may come to a standstill, or may even deviate to a revisionist track, etc. Even so, this tendency of turning toward Marxism-Leninism under the impact of the class struggle clearly differs from the other, bourgeois, effort to address Marxism. It is important to analyze it as a specific mode of perception of Marxism and to trace its subsequent development.

Furthermore, there is an extensive sphere of explicitly expressed bourgeois study of Marxism, whose purpose is, covertly or overtly, to subject Marxism-Leninism to criticism, to slander it, to weaken it, and to limit its influence. Such a critique of Marxism inherently rejects the developing Marxist-Leninist theory and is hostile to it. It is this bourgeois critique of Marxism and its present forms and content that are considered below.

Throughout the history of the origin, development and spread of Marxism-Leninism up to our own day, the response among its adversaries has been manifold. Attempts have

been made to hush it up, to suppress it bellicosely, to deny it openly and in a frontal attack, to dismember it, to falsify it overtly or to distort it covertly. But the aim has always been to resist the advance of Marxism-Leninism. Such is also the state of things today. What is more, the spiritual crisis of imperialism, which has become an important component part of the general crisis of capitalism,² has brought out in even bolder relief the exploitive system's defensive position in historical terms. As a result, in its overall ideological activity, the bourgeoisie is forced to devote ever more attention to the fight against Marxism-Leninism. It is the breadth of the current critique of Marxism that visually testifies to the crisis of bourgeois ideology. Nor is this breadth at all an expression of the spiritual sophistication or ideological productivity of its critics, but a reflection of the forced need to fight against the advance of the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

"In view of the irreconcilability of the class contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the theory of the working class originated and developed in conditions of struggle against the bourgeois ideology," it is said in the "Theses of the Central Committee of the SUPG. 1983 — Karl Marx Year." "That is why Marxism-Leninism has to face fierce resistance from bourgeois ideology, which keeps distorting and trying to discredit it. Its viability makes the bourgeoisie mount a succession of crusades against communism. History testifies that, for all the bourgeoisie's efforts, it has failed to prevent the conversion of Marxism-Leninism into the most influential trend of social thought in our day."³

Consequently, the critique of Marxism is not a line, not a trend within the bourgeois ideology, but an expression of the main stand of capital with respect to the working class, to the revolutionary working class movement and to existing socialism in the form of theoretical criticism of Marxism-Leninism.

The bourgeois ideology in every form is shot through with the critique of Marxism. It is a direct reflection of the fundamental antagonism between capital and the working class, but only in its bourgeois perception. The content and form of this criticism bear the imprint of the class interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Since the bourgeoisie is not a homogeneous class, and since the differences between its various parts are substantial, this is reflected in the most diverse forms of ideology, including the bourgeois critique of Marxism. Without dwelling on all these varieties which will be found in history and in the present period, let

us identify within the bourgeois ideology of our day some of the important and relatively stable forms of such criticism which have been recurring over a fairly long time. Among these are, above all, the categorical and complete denial of Marxism-Leninism, diverse attempts to dismember it, efforts to "curtail" it, and to subject it to revisions of every possible kind.

The categorical and complete denial of the Marxist-Leninist theory has always been the hallmark of the most reactionary and aggressive forces of the imperialist bourgeoisie. They are those whose open hostility for the revolutionary working class movement and existing socialism, hostility for all the proponents of social progress has been expressed through outright apologetics of capitalist exploitation, and from a position of bellicose anti-communism. This holds true even today, especially for the United States, where the most aggressive circles of the imperialist bourgeoisie are most intimately connected with the military-industrial complex. In politico-ideological terms, they are guided by conservatism directing a frontal critique of Marxism-Leninism. That is Reagan's spiritual stand. For him, communism is not a normal way of life for the human being. Without beating about the bush, he declares that the Western world will not just contain communism, but will survive it. It will not be content merely to pillory it, it will get rid of it.⁴

Such is the language of the forces intent on substituting psychological warfare for spiritual contest, and crude lies for weighty argument. The imperialist dreams of the disappearance of Marxism and socialism have gone hand in hand with a falsification of Marxism-Leninism and attempts to present it as the "religion of world revolution";⁵ in typically anti-communist style, this is followed by attempts to put the blame on it for all the tensions in the world. Simultaneously, the scientific world view of the working class — a philosophy of peace and humanism — is converted into its very opposite and presented as a "doctrine of power" and an "ideology of war." All of this is designed to provide the anti-communist lies about some "Soviet threat" with a theoretical justification and substantiation.

In their hatred for the Marxist-Leninist theory, the conservative ideologists seek to galvanize the arsenal of their old falsification of Marxism. It is not surprising, therefore, that diverse lying inventions, distortions and frauds used at various times in the past have now reappeared on the surface: 1983 — Karl Marx Year — shows that Marx's bourgeois "grave-diggers" do not have all that many original ideas; they have to keep brushing the dust off

those which have long since been refuted.

What makes the conservative bourgeois critique of Marxism different from its other forms is the complete denial of the whole of Marxism-Leninism, from Marx, even from the origins of Marxism, to Lenin and all the way to the Marxism-Leninism of our day. Here it transpires that the attacks are centered on the continuity in the development of Marxism-Leninism. It is obvious, therefore, that overt theoretical hostility to our doctrine is inseparable from imperialist ideas and the policy of confrontation being preached by the most reactionary forces.

The various attempts to dismember Marxism-Leninism relate to the earliest forms of its bourgeois criticism, and have not ceased to this day. Their purpose is to make the Marxist-Leninist theory ineffective by claiming that it is either no more than a philosophical doctrine — for instance, a "philosophy of man" or a "philosophy of alienation" — or no more than an economic theory which allegedly most of all criticizes 19th-century capitalism, or a "critical theory" whose greatest value lies above all in the methods of social analysis. It is frequently asserted that Marxism-Leninism has allegedly undergone a dissolution: its most significant and scientific elements have been "borrowed" by contemporary sociology, philosophy, etc., while all its ideological and philosophical elements have been "overcome." This version of the bourgeois critique of Marxism is characteristic of many of those who now work in the humanitarian and social sciences and who are themselves forced to admit that they cannot ignore Karl Marx and his works. Marx's French Catholic biographer Jean-Yves Calvez asked this question back in the 1960s: "Is there anyone among our contemporaries who does not see Marxism as a challenge, whom Marxism has not asked any questions?"⁶

The dismemberment of Marxism-Leninism, the withdrawal from it of some of its components and partial use of them are ultimately designed to invalidate the new quality of this doctrine, which makes it different from any bourgeois theory or world view. This is an attempt to convert Marxism into one of many social theories which can be recognized (along with the others) and from which some propositions could be drawn (as they can also be from others). In short, Marxism-Leninism is being "worked up" to adapt it to the ideological requirements of the bourgeoisie. However, this implies the killing of its revolutionary content. This kind of critique of Marxism frequently also involves its division into, on the one hand, what is allegedly the only "original" Marxian

doctrine (which the bourgeois ideologists present as a general humanistic doctrine of liberation) and, on the other, development of this doctrine "falsified" by Engels and especially Lenin (whom these ideologists are allegedly fighting) in a pseudo-scientific and positivist way. This also includes the high-flown talk about the "split-up" of Marxism-Leninism into three branches, and about its alleged "pluralization." The suggestion is that our doctrine allegedly exists in the form of Marxism, Leninism and various forms of present-day revisionism.

With the attempts to dismember Marxism-Leninism is closely connected the effort to reduce it to a theory of social evolution. This frequently serves as ground for the conception of "democratic socialism" advocated by social democratic theorists. This version of the critique of Marxism, which is preferred mostly by the theorists of social-reformism, avoids any direct or open denial of Marx's ideas. On the contrary, they start by determining what belongs to Marx — strictly distancing him from Lenin — and then go on to use the component parts of Marxism which they think could be fitted into the evolutionary conception of reformist social change. These attempts bring out the distinctions between the right-wing social-reformist circles, most of whom are solidly integrated with the capitalist system, and the forces within social democracy which are to a greater extent oriented toward the interests of the workers and are engaged in a search for democratic alternatives. But at the present time both tendencies are characterized (though, of course, for different motives) by the view that "social democracy cannot allow itself simply to oust Marx and will not allow this to be done."⁷ This is even more explicitly stated by left-wing social democrats: "A hundred years after the death of Karl Marx the whole of social democracy must recall his doctrine. Marx has become necessary for the SPD."⁸

Finally, among the typical expressions of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois critique of Marxism are the various attempts to revise Marxism-Leninism. Spokesmen for right and "left" revisionism lay claims to some "original" or even "creative" Marxism. By that kind of Marxism they mean a mixture of its parts, as a rule, without Leninism, and other, non-Marxist conceptions. All of this is then presented as a "modernization" of Marxism. Beginning with Bernstein, revisionists of every stripe usually insist that they remain strictly within the framework of Marxist thought, and that no more is allegedly involved than an effort to overcome the "crisis of Marxism." In our own

day, the slogan about an imaginary "crisis" of Marxism is highly rated in such circles. It serves as justification for the attacks on the unity and intrinsic theoretical coherence of Marxism-Leninism, and also on the close connection between the Marxist-Leninist theory and socialist practice.

These various versions of the critique of Marxism show that the bourgeoisie's attitude to the scientific world view of the working class is dissimilar and clearly differentiated. In the ideological confrontation, it is important to take into account the various groupings of forces within the bourgeoisie. But then these differences should not be overestimated either, because such criticism, for all its diversity, ultimately reflects the bourgeois class position with respect to the theory and practice of scientific socialism.

A comparison of the various grounds and arguments used by the bourgeois critique of Marxism to prop up its positions more or less clearly brings out a number of features which are common to all its trends. It is true that these features tend to be modified: different common aspects may be brought out at the various stages in the bourgeois critique of Marxism. For instance, following the publication of Marx's *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* in the early 1930s, there was a real tide of orientations toward the "humanistic" Marx and contrast between the "young" and the "mature" Marx. Its effect was felt right up to the 1960s. Today, this tendency has markedly weakened. From the late 1960s, bourgeois critics concentrated mainly on the economic works — *Capital* and the *Critique of Political Economy* (Rough Outline of 1857-1858) — but now there is evidence of a heightened attention to ideology, above all to the main questions of historical materialism.

Denial of the new quality of Marxism-Leninism, as compared with the whole of earlier social science and philosophy, is certainly one of the definitive features which are common to the whole bourgeois critique of Marxism. This denial is combined with an attack on the scientific nature of the Marxist-Leninist theory and an incomprehension of its open and consistent party spirit. The scientific nature of Marxism-Leninism is rejected always, be it in a frontal offensive against it, in the borrowing of its individual parts, or in efforts to use our doctrine in a revised form. What is especially contested is that Marxism-Leninism is the scientific world view of the working class, an idea which flings open the floodgates of slander and falsification.

This reveals the class limitations of the bourgeois ideologists' thinking, since, in the light of

the experience of their — capitalist — ideology, world view and science, the party spirit and the scientific spirit constantly appear as being hostile and irreconcilable opposites. The rejection of these truths is simultaneously an expression of the bourgeoisie's fear in face of the combination of scientific theory and revolutionary movement, the fear that has been whipping up its ideology since the mid-19th century and inducing it to a heightened activity. Since it has proved impossible so to smear Marxism-Leninism as to make it lose its effectiveness, let it then remain no more than a moral call or a quasi-religion, but never a scientific theory of the revolutionary transformation of the reality.

Today this means that the main strike is being directed primarily at the integrity of Marxism-Leninism. The struggle by the class adversary against the meaningfulness and viability of Lenin's propositions is being carried on at such a stepped-up pace that it is no exaggeration to say: the whole bourgeois critique of Marxism today, whether overt or camouflaged, is a critique of Leninism in the first place. It looks as though the opponents of Marxism-Leninism are not at all dismayed by the fact that contradictory and diametrically opposite arguments are being put forward against Lenin. Some assert that he had adopted and realized Marx's ideas of "totalitarianism." Others reproach him for having falsified or "Russified" Marxism. Some ascribe to him subjectivism and voluntarism. Others regard him as an adherent of "orthodoxy." In short, they seem to think that in the polemics within Leninism every trick will do. The reason for the attacks on Leninism is naturally the indissoluble connection between Lenin's ideas and the practice of socialism. The bourgeois critics' intensive attacks against Leninism go beyond the framework of theoretical tasks as such, each seeking to make a specific contribution to direct confrontation with existing socialism.

Anti-Leninism turns out to be a kind of sharp-edged theoretical anti-communism. It is the bourgeoisie's ideological reaction to Lenin's defense of Marxism against any kind of falsification and distortion, its response to the creative application of the Marxist doctrine in the socialist revolution and the building of the socialist society, and also to the further development of theory carried out in the process.

The fact that different lines of the bourgeois critique of Marxism have common features is due to the identity of the class interests of all the strata of the bourgeoisie. But nowadays it depends on Marx's professional critics what kind

of concrete forms this common element assumes in life, how it is reflected in propaganda. The number of these critics has so increased over the past hundred years that there is every reason to speak of an independent branch of ideological activity. "Marxologists" are bourgeois theorists of various ideological stripes whose task it is to "process" Marxism-Leninism by interpreting, analyzing, criticizing and falsifying it, and performing various other exercises.

The bourgeois critique of Marxism originated as an independent discipline and assumed institutional outlines in the late 19th century. Following the start of "studies of communism" by the imperialist centers, since 1917 it has rapidly acquired wide scope and influence in these "studies." Nowadays, professional critics of Marxism will be found at various institutes, they have created their own establishments, periodicals and other organizational forms. Concerning the place which is assigned to such critique of Marxism by, say, the entrepreneurs of the FRG, here is a characteristic opinion which has appeared in their organ *Der Arbeitgeber*: "In the rigorous contest over the interpretations of social relations, one can no longer be reconciled with the fact that at academic institutions social system criticism boils down almost exclusively to a critique of capitalism. Especially in the higher institutions of learning, opportunities must be opened up for intensified scientific struggle against Marxism. This does not imply, of course, the establishment of special critique-of-Marxism departments, but purposeful concern to have more place given to the critique of Marxism."⁹

That shows why and what kind of critique of Marxism is required by capital. Let us add that the most important function of the institutionalized critique of Marxism in bourgeois spiritual life consists in ensuring a single line and orienting all the studies connected with Marxism. We have here evidence of an urge to fit any type of work on Marxism-Leninism into the ideological norms of "Marxology." With that end in view, a history of the critique of Marxism is being worked out, and all the conservative, reformist and revisionist positions on Marxism-Leninism are being consolidated. Accordingly, the now available interpretations of Marxism — its criticism and falsification — are being kept in a state of constant readiness for use. One could say that the institutionalized forms of the bourgeois critique of Marxism are having a normative effect on everyone who engages in the study of Marxism from the position of capital, and integrate and orient them.

Since this kind of influence ultimately produces a distorted interpretation of Marxism, this critique tends to implant in the various social strata a twisted understanding of Marxism resulting from manipulation. Those are the long-term conceptual tasks of this discipline, and that is why it has become so necessary to our class adversary in the ideological struggle.

That is precisely why criticism, exposure and refutation of the positions represented by the bourgeois opponents of Marxism are of much importance in the further advance of the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and also in the struggle against anti-communism. The point is to expose the falsifications of the Marxist-Leninist theory, to refute the anti-communist positions which are allegedly derived from Marxism-Leninism, to criticize reformist and revisionist interpretations, and simultaneously constantly to carry on the propaganda of the truly original, vibrant and creative Marxism-Leninism. A drive against all these forms of the bourgeois critique of Marxism is the prerequisite for preventing the spread of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism in a falsified form, and the social forces seeking progressive social alternatives from being disoriented by diverse distortions of the Marxist doctrine. It is not some kind of secondary or subordinate matters, but the principal and central ideological problems that are invariably the object of the confrontation.

The history of the whole critique of Marxism is one of defeat for the critics. Nor will it be any different from here on. The illusion of a favorable outlook in the bourgeois critique of Marxism in connection with the anniversaries of 1983 does nothing to change the situation. A critical survey of the mass of articles, books, radio programs and TV discussions which have appeared over the past several months will show that the "business" of all those who have devoted themselves to the critique of Marxism is a hard business and frequently also a pathetic one. Their intellectual level is often very low. Marx's "grave-diggers" — and they are now once again held in great honor by capital — do not shun even the primitive personal attacks against Marx and the shameless spread of the foulest slanders. Such massive attacks are, of course, also aimed to smear what he created, and put one in mind of Engels' sharp rebuff to one such falsificator soon after Marx's death, when he said: "You are free to subject his doctrine to the sternest criticism and even to twist it in your interpretations; you are free to write the biography of Marx as a pure figment of the imagination. But what you dare not do and

what I will not allow anyone to do is to slander my late friend."¹⁰

Other opponents have tried to maintain some semblance of theoretical polemics, covering up the futility of their criticism with complaints about the "fascination" of Marxism. This has become something of a buzz word among the bourgeois opponents of our doctrine. They claim that Marxism "fascinates" because it is a comprehensive world view, but add that this is a "delusion" produced by the "magic" of Marxism. In this way, bourgeois ideologists hope to sidestep the substance of the controversy. But this line of "argument" testifies merely to the helplessness of the contemporary critics of Marxism. To what extent the phenomenon of the influence of Marxism-Leninism on the masses passes their understanding is evidenced by the following exclamation: "It is more than surprising that even a hundred years after Marx, Marxism has no intention of dying."¹¹

The dilemma facing the bourgeois ideologists springs from the fact that they are fighting against a theory whose effectiveness has been growing from decade to decade, a theory providing scientifically grounded answers to the basic questions of our epoch, a theory expressing the vital interests of the working class and all the other working people. Moreover, the dilemma is being further compounded by the fact that the Marxist theory has successfully stood the trial by social practice.

Consequently, the critics of Marxism of every stripe have lost positions. Without minimizing the dangers in the activity of these critics in the ideological struggle, one could predict that they will share the lot of all their numerous predecessors: they will fail to halt the advance of Marxism-Leninism, while they themselves will go down to oblivion.

1. Erich Honecker, *Rede und Schlusswort auf der Internationalen Wissenschaftlichen Konferenz des Zentralkomitees des SED "Karl Marx und unsere Zeit — der Kampf um Frieden und sozialen Fortschritt,"* Berlin, 1983, pp. 28-29.

2. See *Denken gegen die Zeit. Die geistige Krise des Imperialismus*, Berlin, 1981.

3. *Thesen des Zentralkomitees der SED zum Karl-Marx-Jahr 1983*, Berlin, 1982, pp. 9, 10.

4. Quoted in: *Der Plan Euroshima, Aus Reden und Schriften von R. Reagan, A. Haig, C. Weinberger u.a.*, Cologne, 1982, pp. 19-20.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 100.

6. Jean-Yves Calvez, *Karl Marx — Darstellung und Kritik seines Denkens*, Olten/Freiburg, 1964, p. 15.

7. *Die Neue Gesellschaft*, 3, 1983, p. 125.

8. *Zeitschrift für sozialistische Politik und Wirtschaft*, June 1983, p. 218.

9. *Der Arbeitgeber*, February 9, 1979.

10. Engels an Achille Loria. In: K. Marx, F. Engels, *Werke*, Vol. 36, p. 19.

11. *Welt am Sonntag*, March 20, 1983.



Do everything possible for disarmament and peaceful development

Kalevi Sorsa

Chairman, Social Democratic Party of Finland,
Vice-President, Socialist International,
Chairman, International Advisory Council on Disarmament,
Socialist International

Unity of anti-war action of the working class and other working people, of their political and professional organizations, is a most important condition of success in the struggle against the nuclear threat to the very existence of humanity. It implies primarily cooperation between the communists and social democrats — two political currents playing so big a role in contemporary society — with the aim of defending peace. In spite of distinctions in ideological and other attitudes, there are real opportunities now for such cooperation and for its promotion. This is also evident in the following answers which Kalevi Sorsa, noted social democratic leader, has given to questions put by *World Marxist Review*.

Q. In the spring of 1972 you contributed an article to our journal analyzing the international situation of the time and commenting on the early gains in détente. What is your opinion of the world situation today? Does it warrant optimistic forecasts?

A. By the time my article was published, three years had passed since the Finnish government took the initiative of actual preparations for the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. But despite negotiations over a long period, that problem, like many other problems of East-West relations, was still awaiting solution. There were many indications that time was running out. Nevertheless, I was hopeful.

Developments showed my optimism to be justified. The FRG concluded the so-called Eastern treaties. * SALT-1 was signed. The four powers (Britain, the Soviet Union, the USA and France. — Ed.) reached agreement on West Berlin. It was decided to start talks in Vienna (on the mutual reduction of armed forces and

armaments in Central Europe. — Ed.). In Helsinki multilateral preparations were begun for the European Conference. All this culminated, as it were, in a treaty between the two German states establishing the principles of their mutual relations. It was probably the first time that so many positive changes had come about in East-West relations in so short a period.

Currently I cannot bring myself to expect an equally positive trend. Negotiations today are going on in a much colder atmosphere than 11 years ago. However, an argument in favor of agreement is, now as in the past, the fact that détente and efforts toward preventing nuclear war and furthering cooperation meet the lasting interests of European nations and the whole of humankind. An indication of awareness of this was the fruitful completion of the Madrid meeting (of the participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. — Ed.), international tension notwithstanding. It is to be hoped that this success will also prove valuable in terms of further prospects.

Q. As a noted leader of the Socialist International and Chairman of its Advisory Council on Disarmament, you have been taking a very active part in the shaping of the social democrats' strategy and tactics in this sphere of vast importance for the destiny of humankind. How would you describe the main trends of the Socialist International's policy toward discontinuance of the arms race, primarily in nuclear missiles, and toward disarmament? What is the socialist view of the significance and prospects of the current talks on the problem?

A. The congresses of the Socialist International held in Spain in 1980 and in Portugal this year both adopted an extensive action program for disarmament. In line with a recommendation of the congress, the International and its member parties published on May 1, 1981 a declaration calling emphatically for effort to bring about disarmament. All these decisions were based on the reports and recommendations submitted by our standing Advisory Council set up in 1978.

*Treaties with the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the GDR based on the principles of peaceful coexistence and recognizing the inviolability of European frontiers. — Ed.

The decisions of the Socialist International devoted special attention to measures of the greatest importance for a healthier international climate and an end to the arms race. These measures included, first and foremost, the prevention of nuclear war and an end to the qualitative race in nuclear arms as well as a gradual reduction of existing arsenals. Besides, we stressed the need to limit conventional armaments, bring about regional disarmament and utilize for the solution of world development problems the intellectual and material resources to be released by curbing military preparations.

Needless to say, the Socialist International gives special attention to the problem of limiting medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. Ever since 1979, it has repeatedly appealed to all the parties concerned to immediately begin talks and avoid while the talks are under way any action likely to make the achievement of positive results difficult. This appeal is still relevant.

Your journal is interviewing me at a most crucial moment. * A decisive round of talks (on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe. — Ed.) has just begun in Geneva. Their eventual failure would evidently have a very serious

*Kalevi Sorsa answered the journal's questions in the middle of September 1983. — Ed.

Disarmament: Who's Against?

**from the Military
Publishing House,
Moscow —
publishers of
"Whence the Threat to Peace"**

pamphlet 63 pp \$2.00

**PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst St.
Toronto M5V 2P6**

impact on both European security and the international climate as a whole. No new nuclear weapons can add to security. The way to security leads through the scrapping of existing stockpiles.

The Socialist International has no power to adopt decisions on arms reduction. All it can do is to make recommendations to its member parties. However, the majority of socialist and social democratic parties play an important role in their countries and a joint appeal from them could certainly not be disregarded. An indication of the prestige of the International is the welcome which our Advisory Council on Disarmament has repeatedly been given in Moscow, Washington and the UN as well as at meetings with representatives of non-aligned countries.

Q. Much credit is due to your party and yourself for the establishment and extension of contacts between the Socialist International and the communist parties of socialist countries. What is your opinion of further possibilities of promoting these contacts? What role in general could cooperation among diverse social forces play in safeguarding peace?

A. Indeed, the Social Democratic Party of Finland pioneered cooperation with the leading parties of socialist countries long ago. Specifically, it established inter-party relations with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as far back as the 60s. It is only natural, therefore, that the first direct contact between the International and the CPSU was made in Helsinki. Boris Ponomarev, alternate member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CC CPSU, was invited to the first conference of the Socialist International on disarmament convened by the Social Democratic Party of Finland in 1978 and presented a report.

In February 1980, when international tension reached a very high degree, party leaders of the Socialist International adopted at a meeting a recommendation of fundamental importance. They came to the conclusion that every opportunity must be used to initiate an international dialogue. They expressed the view that the socialists and social democrats could make a substantial contribution to the effort to promote ties between parties. We can put it on record that many socialist and social democratic parties, including all the social democratic parties of the Nordic countries, have been active in this sense in recent years. I am convinced that there are still many potentialities in this respect. Social forces realizing their responsibility should do all in their power for disarmament and peaceful development.

Socialism: unity of theory and practice

The distinctive feature of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and the source of its strength and effectiveness is the close connection between theory and policy, and between knowledge and revolutionary practice. "The irresistible attraction of this theory," Lenin wrote on Marxism, "which draws to itself the socialists of all countries lies precisely in the fact that it combines the quality of being strictly and supremely scientific (being the last word in social science) with that of being revolutionary, it does not combine them accidentally and not only because the founder of the doctrine combined in his own person the qualities of a scientist and a revolutionary, but does so intrinsically and inseparably."¹ It is, therefore, an alloy of the scientific and the revolutionary within the theory itself, a deep penetration into the internal springs of the social mechanism with a thorough substantiation of the ways and means of practical activity.

Guided by their revolutionary theory, the communist parties are leading the working masses in the struggle for transition from capitalism to socialism, and are organizing and guiding the construction of a new society whose main features were described and substantiated by the founders of Marxism-Leninism. This gives a fresh impetus to the creative development and enrichment of theory and makes it a most important factor in the revolutionary transformation of the world.

However, there should be no oversimplification of the significance of the practical orientation of theoretical projects. This does not at all imply preparation of recommendations on particular matters: cognition and analysis of objective laws are designed to equip the party and all the working people with knowledge for creative effort, for making use of the ample potentialities and advantages of the new system, and for formulating the most general, strategic lines of policy.

In a series of articles on "Socialism: Unity of Theory and Practice" of which the first is published below, *WMR* intends to examine how such unity is realized at the present stage in tackling important problems bearing on the main lines of the activity of the fraternal parties in the socialist world. This relates to economic, social development, ideology and communist education, consolidation of

socialist economic integration and foreign policy relations.

The first article was written by three professors of the Karl Marx Higher Economic Institute in Sofia, Bulgaria, who analyze an important aspect of their country's current economic development: perfection of socialist property relations, their dynamic and the principles on which these relations are administered. In their analysis of the problem they are guided by the general uniformities of socialism, but proceed from their country's specific features.

THE WHOLE PEOPLE'S PROPERTY. WAYS OF CONTEMPORARY DEVELOPMENT

Professor *Delcho Poryazov*,
Professor *Jacques Aroyo*,
Professor *Tacho Pachev*
Karl Marx Higher Economic Institute (Bulgaria)

Social property in the means of production is the basis of the socialist economic system. In its historical development, socialist property in Bulgaria has assumed two main forms: state and cooperative property. The substance of the socialization of the means of production is expressed to a greater degree by state property, ensuring a full and consistent manifestation of the relations of production under socialism, in which the means of production are the object, and the society, as personified by the state, is the subject.

The existence of cooperative property is determined by a lower level of development of the productive forces in some sectors of the national economy. The means of production are also its object, but the cooperative peasants united for joint economic activity are its subject.

In our country, socialist property has gone through *three stages*. The first covers nearly 15 years (1944-1958) and includes the victory of the socialist revolution, the completion of the process of nationalization in 1947, and the further consolidation of the people's power. That stage is characterized by the emergence of state and cooperative property, the consistent limitation of the capitalist sector, and a gradual increase in the share of state property. At the same time, it is a period in which agriculture

was restructured on socialist lines. Consequently, social production in that period was based on two forms of property — state and cooperative — and this was of primary importance for developing the system of socialist economic relations, which by the end of that period attained a relatively high level of maturity.

During the second stage (1958-1970) both forms of social property were improved at an ever faster pace. Substantial changes took place both in the object of these forms, and in their subject: the state and the cooperative organizations. The development of the forms of property was expressed mainly in the ever deeper socialization of production, and this was most visually manifested in the enlargement of the agricultural labor cooperatives (ALC).

The third stage began in the 1970s and is still on. The 10th congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party (April 1971) set the task of building a developed socialist society. Highly indicative of the present period is the interpenetration of the two main forms of socialist property and the further formation of one property of the whole people. The concentration of production and its amalgamation, specialization and cooperation have had an important role to play in this process, but horizontal and vertical integration in agriculture have undoubtedly been of the greatest significance. It was expressed above all in the merger of the ALCs with state agricultural farms (SAF), and their subsequent association with enterprises processing their produce, and the formation, on that basis, of agro-industrial complexes (AIC), which constitute the National Agro-Industrial Union.

In 1971, we already had 170 AICs, concentrating almost 94 per cent of the socialized farmland, 80 per cent of the labor force employed in agriculture, and 74 per cent of the fixed assets in the sector.

The program of the Bulgarian Communist Party (BCP)² envisaged a profound and intricate shift in the economy and the society as a whole, as a result of which cooperative property in agriculture eventually outlived itself in economic terms. Todor Zhivkov, General Secretary of the BCP CC and Chairman of the Bulgarian State Council, said at the party's 12th congress (1981) that "the two main forms of socialist property — state and cooperative — are moving toward each other at an accelerated pace, merging into the property of the whole people."³

The socialist reality itself provides the grounds for this theoretical conclusion. The methods of production in industry and in agri-

culture have been largely unified, especially since the establishment of the AICs. State organs plan production at enterprises in both sectors on the strength of similar principles, and both operate on the basis of economic calculus and have to pay their own way. The questions of financing, crediting and the formation and distribution of incomes are decided similarly.

Finally, the rapid development of the productive forces and the perfection of the relations of production throughout the whole course of socialist construction have been an effort aimed to have the material and spiritual values belong to their creators, the working people. It is emphasized in the BCP program that concern for man is the essence of social policy, one of whose law-governed elements is providing the same set of conditions for the social security of industrial and office workers and of peasants. This relates above all to vacations, pensions, sickness, pregnancy and child benefits, free textbooks for schoolchildren, meals, grants, etc.

The character of cooperative property has been radically altered by the deepening of social ties and relations between participants in production, and enhancement of the social character of the labor put into production. Despite some of the specific features which it still inherently preserves, it has in the main become the whole people's property.

The owner of property: the state

Socialist property removes the social impediments to the progress of the productive forces. But that does not at all mean that from then on everything proceeds of itself. The relevant prerequisites need to be created for their successful development (and now more so than at any time in the past). It is not enough simply to nationalize capitalist private property, Lenin said, for production needs to be socialized in fact. Solving this problem entails the setting up of an "extremely intricate and delicate system of new organizational relationships extending to the planned production and distribution of goods."⁴

The connection between property and the productive forces is mediated by economic organization relations. On the way these are arranged, on the extent to which they accord with the level in the development of the productive forces crucially depends the realization of the potentialities latent in the socialist property.

Even today, the state and cooperative forms of property are intensively moving closer to and merging with each other. For all practical purposes, it is the socialist state, drawing its

prerogatives from the people, which is the actual owner of the two forms of property in both sectors of the national economy. The typical features of the emerging single-type property and of its single subject constitute the content of the state, the owner of the whole people's means of production.

The formation of the whole people's property has a number of important distinctions. First of all there is the fact that it belongs to the whole people. No member of the society can individually own social means of production, but at the same time every individual is their owner realizing his right in property through the state. In other words, the whole people has possession of the means of production only jointly, as a "body," and does not "fragment" them into parts.

Another indicative feature is that the socialist state transfers the necessary means of production for use by enterprises, organizations and economic units, but these do not become the property of the work collective. Socialist property, Todor Zhivkov says, is not "the group property of those who use it. It is not farmed out to them. That is something we cannot allow. The state cannot give up one of its principal functions: to exercise the right in property as the representative of the whole people."⁵

From this follows another fundamental feature: socialist property is not only the property of the whole people, but it is indivisible and inviolable. The state is its sole owner and administrator. The enterprises and organizations are no more than managers of the means of production using them for their own interests and for the interests of the society as a whole.

Having become the sole owner of the means of production, the popularly-empowered socialist state is vested with the relevant rights and duties, which are a component part of its functions. In accordance with BCP decisions, our state shapes the national-economic proportions in a balanced and purposeful manner, allocates the necessary capital investments for the creation of new production capacities, and lays down the guidelines for the economy's development for the short and long term.

While steadily perfecting the structure of the national economy, the state constitutes the required governing bodies. It exercises centralized and planned administration of the economy, with centralism, purged of bureaucratic practices and petty tutelage over enterprises, being asserted as the initial and leading principle in administration. Todor Zhivkov has emphasized that "our society's main advantage is centralized and planned administration by the

state on the basis of socialist property."⁶

Among the functions of the state are also creation and improvement of the normative basis of national-economic administration and establishment of a corresponding mechanism for the use of economic instruments: taxes, deductions to the budget, money funds of economic organizations, pricing policy, income distribution, etc. Finally, it controls the use of the whole people's resources, which are put at the disposal of economic organizations, and seeks to have these resources yield the greatest returns.

Consequently, the socialist state operates as the owner of the whole people's property, while its concrete, flexible and efficient use is the prerogative of the work collectives, which manage the means of production.

The master of property: the work collective

The use of the means of production reflects the economic, social, organizational, administrative and other diverse social relations. Socialist property in the means of production ensures their use in accordance with its socio-economic nature. That is why balanced and close connection between material factors and human factors in the labor process is of exceptional importance.

Let us note at this point that every stage in the development of the socialist society has its own mode of economic administration and management which is closely bound up both with the changes in the material content of property and with the degree of its social and economic maturity. The present stage in our country is characterized, in particular, by the overcoming of the main distinctions between state and cooperative property, as a result of which the state has become the owner of all the means of production. This has brought about a change in the mode of economic administration and management.

At the same time, the documents of the BCP's 12th congress and other party documents say that the state, having become the sole owner of the whole people's means of production, does not exercise its economic activity directly (it eschews bureaucratic forms of administering developed socialist property), but through the work collectives, so that the latter are the true masters of the means of production.

In socio-economic content, work collectives are entities of men and women fulfilling common tasks and interacting in the process of labor. Definite relations have taken shape between them (as masters and managers) and the socialist state (as the owner of the means of production). These relations are based on co-

operation, mutual assistance, and the pursuit of common goals and action. The work collective is inconceivable without its members, just as the state cannot exist without the work collectives.

The collective, the direct master of the means of production, is vested with definite rights and duties with respect to the state, the economic organization and its own members. The demarcation of rights and duties should not, of course, be absolutized, but then it should not be underestimated either, because in definite conditions either extreme could become a source of contradictions. In such situations, normal relations between the owner and the master tend to be distorted. "Contradictions could also arise when the work collective fails to exercise its rights and duties in their dialectical connection, avoids its responsibility, and does not make enough effort for the most efficient use of the means of production."⁷

The rights and duties of the collective with respect to the state are determined by how the property is used and to what extent. These could be outlined as follows:

First, the collective must use the means of production placed at its disposal with the utmost efficiency. Historical experience shows that when the owner and the master are not one and the same person, economic management should be so conducted as to have the interests of both realized to the greatest possible extent, and in this respect socialist economic management is no exception. Indeed, the greater the work collective's contribution to the fulfillment of state-wide tasks, the more fully its interests are satisfied.

Second, the collective must safeguard and multiply the property. In his works, Lenin said that socialist property is sacred and inviolable, and should be safeguarded and cherished as the apple of one's eye.⁸ This idea of Lenin's is fully valid in our own day, when the working people are the masters of property. At the earlier stages of the socialist construction, educational measures were used to prompt a thrifty attitude to the means of production, to their development and improvement. Today, economic levers and incentives are the most effective means for inducing the utmost use of the instruments of labor and resources. On the ability to wield this means directly depends the material condition of every economic organization and the extent to which the requirements of the members of the work collective are satisfied.

Third, the work collective plans its economic and social development. As the master of the means of production, it becomes the actual sub-

ject of planning. Here again, the dialectical connection between right and duty dictates that the formulated program should duly ensure fulfillment of the plan targets set by the state.

The 12th congress of the BCP said most explicitly that the plans of economic organizations submitted for examination should not be approved unless they have been discussed beforehand at working people's meetings and have been endorsed by the enterprise economic councils.

The more active a work collective is in drawing up its plan, the more fully it acts as the master of the property. The working people's participation in discussing and taking decisions on matters of planning is yet another expression of people's power. This enlarges the mental horizon of the masses, teaches them to analyze the various problems from the standpoint of the national economy, stimulates social and labor activity, etc. The attainment of an optimal balance between centralism and decentralism eventually promotes the further development of democratic principles and traditions in the socialist society.

Economic organization is the connecting link between the state and the work collective, and the latter also has definite rights and duties with respect to it. The work collective directly organizes the labor process by making use of the means of production and its ties with the primary cells and their members. With the productive forces at their present level, collective forms of labor organization are most efficient both in economic and in social terms. Such forms help to ensure coordination within the system of economic interests, and to make advantageous for every collective and individual worker that which in the concrete conditions accords with the interests of society as a whole. The collective organization of labor most fully accords "with our view that the work collective is the master of socialist property, of its works, and has a vital stake in its development."⁹

Active participation in distributing the residual payroll-fund balance,¹⁰ and the social and everyday and cultural measures fund, and also in working out normatives, ratios and concrete amounts of labor remuneration is another line of the collective's activity. In accordance with the economic mechanism now in operation, the collective discusses and approves the upwardly-adjusted plan, on whose successful fulfillment largely depends the size of the material incentives fund. Plan adjustment gives the working people great scope for initiative and creative quest.

Material and moral incentives for efficient

labor constitute a dialectical unity. The collective sends its representatives to various control bodies, makes active use of social organizations, and also reckons with employees' opinion both for rewarding those who have worked well, and for applying penalties to those who are in breach of labor discipline, turn out shoddy goods, etc.

That is why enhancement of the role of the collective organs of management — general meeting, economic council, meeting of authorized representatives — eventually helps to raise the quality of decisions taken by the working people and to consolidate their juridical guarantees. The will of the collective becomes the will of the organization itself. Making use of the organs of management within the ambit of its competence, it takes decisions that are binding on the organization. Such is the distinctive feature of our work collectives which has been gradually enacted in legislation and is being ever more widely introduced into practice.

The collective also has definite rights and duties with respect to its members. It must, above all, make the most efficient use of each worker's labor potentialities, regulate personnel matters, tighten up discipline and improve its inner relations. All of this is done on the principles of voluntary mutual assistance, initiative, mutual exactingness and tact. In practice, such relations are to be found at all structural levels, because our society is becoming socially ever more homogeneous, coherent and united, and is increasingly permeated with collectiveness.

The rights and duties of the work collective reflect the content of its functions and bring out the law-governed tendency toward its ever greater assertion as the master of socialist property. At the same time, a sizable part of the collective's functions is in practice exercised through the economic organization.

The role of the economic organization

The propositions formulated by the Bulgarian Communist Party concerning the state, as the owner of the means of production, and the collective of working people, as their master, have also helped to clarify the substance, place and functions of economic organizations, the form in which work collectives exist. They are the ones which determine the concrete content of economic organizations. The latter have their own peculiar features: economic, technical, technological and social. The collective and the organization are not at all identical with each other.

Within the structure of the national economy and the functioning of the mechanism of

socialist property, the economic organization operates as an independent and relatively separate production unit set up by the state with the whole people's funds. Whereas one of the tasks of the state is to conduct the economic policy formulated by the party, the basic goal of the economic organization is to effect the practical arrangement of the production process and to exercise the relevant and diverse functions: supply and sales, research and development, contractual and juridical, marketing, etc. Consequently, the economic organization works to ensure the direct combination of all the elements of the process of reproduction.

Commodity-money relations and effective economic instruments are an essential factor which determines the place and role of the economic organization. They require the use of material (in this case, commodity-money) forms in regulating social production. Correct fulfillment of this task helps constantly to develop and enhance its efficiency and to turn out the goods the society needs.

The economic organization is not only an independent and separate unit, but also a necessary link in the social structure based on state and social principles. These specific features determine the system of management of the organization, which is headed by a director who expresses the state and the whole people's interests. His duty is to conduct the state policy and ensure unconditional fulfillment of plan targets. At the same time, the director represents the organization in all juridical acts; he is directly responsible for the fulfillment of obligations, of instructions from superior bodies, etc.

On the other hand, the work collective, as represented by its general meeting, or its elected representatives, also takes an active part in managing the organization. Both theoretical and the practical experience make it clear that optimal efficiency in production is attained in organic combination of individual and collective management. It is alien to the ideals of socialism to have mindless robots, even if these are capable of attaining the highest labor productivity. Man and his all-round development has always been central to social progress.

The concrete functions, rights and duties of economic organizations are determined in accordance with these propositions at the present stage. The main attention is being given to enhancing their independence, raising the quality of planning work and the efficiency of all their activity. Special importance is attached to the independent formulation of the economic-production plan, orientation of all the units toward the attainment of the highest

ultimate results, and finally, toward an integral approach to the implementation of economic policy. Apart from the organization of production, this also includes market research, building for the organization's own needs, transport, marketing, etc.

The recently adopted new Statute on the Economic Mechanism regulates relations between the state and economic organizations and allows the latter the necessary freedom of action. At one time in the past, state agencies had at their disposal the incomes of organizations, withdrew their "surpluses," and arbitrarily modified some plan targets and normatives. Such practices tended to encroach on their independence and produced some uncertainty in their work. The greater independence of organizations within the framework of centralized planning and administration, as reflected in the new Statute, testifies to a higher level in the social character of the productive forces and to a greater degree of maturity of the relations of production.

The new economic approach

The economic approach to the administration of the national economy adopted by the BCP, Todor Zhivkov said, is "an integral system of economic methods, means of influence, regulation and forms of organization, a system covering production, distribution and management."¹¹

The main — and simultaneously new — element in the economic approach as compared to the methods used in the recent past consists in an apt combination of centralized planning and organization independence, in the management of economic-production processes with the use of ways and means involving material incentives for work collectives and every individual worker.

The task in formulating and clarifying the substance of the new approach was to lay down definitive principles and methods which have become the basis of the economic mechanism in the functioning of the national economy. The new aspects relate above all to the technology of planning, providing an answer to the basic question: how is it to run — from top to bottom, that is, from the center, from the state — the owner of the means of production, down to the economic organizations and work collectives, which make use of these means of production, or from the bottom up, that is, from the enterprises and organizations to the state.

Practice has confirmed that in planning it is necessary to reckon fully with the functions of the state as the owner. This calls for the elaboration of a state plan that is binding on all the

organizations from top to bottom. That is the only way to ensure the proportionality of the national economy, expanded reproduction, efficient implementation of scientific, technical and external economic policy, and ultimately achievement of the main goals facing the socialist society.

At the same time, available experience says that in planning it is necessary to reckon with the economic independence of the enterprises, the masters of the whole people's means of production placed at their disposal. In that capacity, the organizations have the right and the duty to work out their own adjusted plans by which they are guided in tackling the tasks set from "above." Plan adjustment, and its subsequent coordination with the national economic plan, proceeds from the bottom up.

The organs at the two levels — state and economic organization — coordinate the plan targets with each other and specify them. The enterprise's adjusted plan is drawn up on the basis of the targets handed down in a centralized manner for adapting to the conditions of the economic organization by bringing out its reserves. But that is more than a mere concretization of national-economic tasks. The plan of the enterprise reveals its potentialities and reflects its own goals and concerns in meeting higher targets. Planning provides for the supply of all the necessary resources and the sale of all the goods produced on a contractual basis. That is the basis on which the enterprise pays its way. The upwardly-adjusted plan is formulated with the active participation of the work collective and is approved by it.

The system of centralized active influence on the economic organization by means of economic instruments involving commodity-money relations is of substantial significance in the administration of the national economy. This means, in particular, profit, prices, taxes, credit, loan interest, etc. All of these constitute, one could say, a set of instruments by means of which the organs of state administration regulate the economic-production activity of socialist organizations in an economic way.

Commodity-money categories have been used in the past as well. The new aspect of the economic approach today is the special emphasis on their influence in regulating production, economic coercion and control of the producers. Among the numerous value categories, much importance is attached to profit and price, because they have the greatest effect on the economic organization of production.

The new approach is also characterized by the wide use of the market. The main demand

on it is to create the prerequisites for direct ties between consumers and producers, with the latter having a realistic possibility of reaching the consumer so as to get a feel of his needs and to take them into account. Our party has substantiated the need for the producer's direct "confrontation" with the market, both internal and international. The task now is to do away with the unnecessary middle-men units hampering a constant and flexible consideration of consumer demand. This obviously requires the concentration of supply and marketing functions in the hands of the economic organizations themselves. That is when the market will become a factor of economic influence and regulation of production in accordance with the requirements of the national economic plan.

Economic calculus, which most fully expresses the functions of the organization as the master of the means of production, has an essential place in our country's economic mechanism. The idea of economic calculus is not a new one, but there are some new aspects in the use of this method of socialist economic management. First of all there is the categorical requirement that the enterprise should recoup its costs solely from the income which it receives from the sale of its products, and that its funds — primarily the payroll fund — should be formed with a residual balance, as has been said above.

The complex development of economic calculus, ranging over every level of the organizational structure of the national economy and every sphere of its activity, both production and non-production, will mark a new stride in its improvement, with special emphasis on the importance of team economic calculus. In our conditions, it is regarded as a necessary component in the application of general economic calculus, and so also of the economic approach to the management of economic organizations. This involves the formation of a new type of complex teams which are masters of the means of production. Their relative separateness and independence make it possible to take account precisely of production inputs and to compare them with the achieved outputs.

This approach to the management and assessment of the activity of economic organizations leads to changes in the system of distribution. The task now is to assert fully the principle that organizations must pay their way, that is, to link this basic principle and the

potentialities for their further development with the end results of their activity. In more concrete terms, one could point, for instance, to the formation of the accumulation and consumption funds producing a residual balance and depending on the income received by the economic organization. Not very long ago, its funds, including the industrial and office workers' payroll fund, were determined in advance and guaranteed, while payments to the state were formalized as having a residual-balance character. The converse approach is now taken: first the payments to the state are guaranteed, whereupon the funds are regarded as having a residual balance.

* * *

Consequently, the party's new economic approach to economic administration and management creates additional potentialities for developing the initiatives of work collectives, economic organizations, and all industrial and office workers and peasants in Bulgaria; their rights are substantially extended, and the dependence of economic incentives on the results of labor activity increased. In-depth elaboration of theoretical problems, the strengthening of links between theory and practice, including and above all in the sphere of developing production, enhancing its efficiency and fulfilling social tasks, are a necessary condition for perfecting the socialist society.

1. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 327.
2. *Program of the Bulgarian Communist Party*, Sofia, 1971, pp. 43-44, 57-60 (in Bulgarian).
3. Todor Zhivkov, *BCP CC Report to the 12th Congress and the Tasks Facing the Party*, Sofia, 1981, p. 14 (in Bulgarian).
4. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 241.
5. Todor Zhivkov, *The BCP's Economic Policy*, Vol. 3, Sofia, 1982, p. 554 (in Bulgarian).
6. *Rabotnichesko delo*, January 24, 1982.
7. Todor Zhivkov, *The Development of Socio-Economic Relations and the Administration of the National Economy*, Sofia, 1983, p. 15 (in Bulgarian).
8. See V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, pp. 197-198; 407-408.
9. Todor Zhivkov, *BCP CC Report to the 12th Congress and the Tasks Facing the Party*, p. 38.
10. The income of the enterprise left to it after the recoupment of material inputs, payment of debts to credit institutions, payment of taxes and mandatory deductions to other funds. — Ed.
11. Todor Zhivkov, *The Development of Socio-Economic Relations and the Administration of the National Economy*, p. 23.

On the national question in Canada

Samuel Walsh

Central Executive Committee member,
Communist Party of Canada,
President, Communist Party of Quebec

In Canada, as in many other bourgeois countries, the national question has not been resolved and remains in the center of political life. This has been re-demonstrated quite recently (June 1983) in the race for the election of a new leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, which has, since before the turn of the century, been considered the major party most impregnated with Anglo-Canadian, chauvinism.

But on this occasion a major issue for the three leading candidates to this post was their attitude to Quebec, of whose population nearly 85 per cent are French Canadians. The race was won by Brian Mulroney, who never failed to mention that he was born in a small town in Quebec, with a working-class father, spoke French fluently and could communicate with 30 per cent of the population of Canada in their language. Another of the leading candidates learned French and while campaigning in Quebec took pains to introduce at least some words in French. The candidates thus had to reckon with the fact that it is impossible to govern Canada without support from Quebec. Hence their linguistic theatrics.

Road from a colony to present-day Quebec

The struggle for national survival in Quebec has been marked by different emphases according to the pressures exerted on the French Canadians at different times since the British conquest in 1759-1760.

At first the pressure was for total and forcible assimilation. The British took over most of the manufacturing which had developed in the fissures of the neofeudal regime implanted by the former colonial French rulers. The former ruling classes — the seigneurs (feudal landlords) and bourgeois — for the most part abandoned the struggle, sold their land to the English, and returned to France. But a part of them remained and some joined the popular forces in the struggle against forcible assimilation and British colonial rule.

In 1774, on the eve of the American Revolution of the 13 colonies to the south, the British signed the Quebec Act, guaranteeing freedom

of religion for Roman Catholicism (i.e., for the French). The Church in Quebec was given control of the education system. This ensured loyalty of the Church hierarchy and hence of the majority of the population during the American Revolution and during the Rebellion of 1837-1838 in Quebec for national self-determination against British domination.

The Act of Union with Upper Canada (Ontario), imposed on Quebec in February 1841, was designed to ensure the ascendancy of the "British element" within the Canadas. The British Colonial Office declared: "It is laid down as a fundamental principle that the French must not be reinstated in power in Lower Canada." All official documents of the Legislative Council and Assembly "shall be in the English language only."

In 1851 the English-speaking population of Canada surpassed the French-speaking population because of massive immigration from the USA and more particularly from Ireland as a result of the "potato famine" in that country. The Church hierarchy called on French Canadians to pursue the "revenge of the cradle." But despite the very large families which were typical, especially in rural areas, right up to the middle of the 20th century, the cradles were unable to compete with the flow of immigrants.

Capitalist development in British North America, of which railway building and early factory production were the dynamo, induced the Anglo-Canadian bourgeoisie to unify the British colonies.

But, together with regional interests, the existence of two distinct national communities — one French-speaking and preponderant in Quebec and the other English-speaking and preponderant in British North America — made the unitary state impossible to achieve.

The Anglo-Canadian bourgeoisie (centered in Toronto and Montreal) formed an alliance in June 1864 on colonial unification with the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church and the numerically small French Canadian business élite, as well as with Maritime (eastern) business and political leaders. Three years later a "confederation" was formed on the basis of an

act passed by the British parliament, the British North America Act.

Quebec became a province with its own legislature and a certain degree of autonomy. Religious control of education was reaffirmed. For these reasons, all this had the support of the political, economic and religious élite of Quebec.

The mass, popular movement for national self-determination, which reached its apex in the abortive Rebellion of 1837-1838, disappeared. Bourgeois-clerical nationalism held sway, becoming more and more reactionary as Canada entered the imperialist stage of its development and particularly with the rise of fascism in Italy and then Germany and Spain.

Reactionary nationalist forces, of whom Quebec Premier Maurice Duplessis was the main political spokesman, very strongly resisted all social reforms introduced by the federal government under popular pressure.

The reactionary, obscurantist policies pursued by Duplessis impeded the "normal" development of state-monopoly capitalism in Quebec. His government supported private hydro-electric companies with the result that the cost of electric power was much higher than in neighboring Ontario, which had nationalized electric power in 1922. The preservation of clerical control of education reduced to a very small number the young French Canadian cadre educated in commerce, engineering and management and obstructed the training of personnel for modernizing the capitalist economy. All this resulted in a growing determination on the part of the French Canadian big and petty bourgeoisie to rid Quebec of the stultifying influence of Duplessism.

In the post-war period there was a growing migration from non-profitable farms to the cities, and this narrowed the social base of the party of Maurice Duplessis (Union Nationale) and of the clergy.

In 1960, after the death of Duplessis, the Quebec Liberal Party, headed by Jean Lesage and representing the interests of the big bourgeoisie, succeeded in attaching to itself prominent representatives of the reformist, nationalist petty bourgeoisie, and with considerable support from the working class managed to defeat the Union Nationale in a general provincial election. This marked the end of the long period known as the "Duplessis darkness."

The next four years became known as the "Quiet Revolution." Greater state intervention in the economy had the aim of strengthening the relatively weak French Canadian

bourgeoisie, amalgamating efficient small and middle-sized industrial enterprises, and converting them from family-owned operations into mixed state-joint stock monopolies. A major lever for influencing the economy was the nationalization of the hydro-electric companies financed by a huge loan granted by New York bankers. This period saw a radical reshaping of the education system. The establishment of a Ministry of Education made it possible to take most of the control of education from the Church. There was also a major restructuring of secondary and post-secondary education. These reforms awakened national pride, stimulated by the government slogans, "Let's Be Masters in Our Own House" and "Quebec Knows How to Do Things."

All this fostered a growth of democratic actions, finding expression in mass demonstrations in the streets, with thousands of students and workers participating. The nationalist, anti-English-speaking tone given to some of these demonstrations by petty-bourgeois and anarchistic intellectuals added to the determination of Big Business to call a complete halt to the "Quiet Revolution." They ordered the Liberal government to discourage these mass demonstrations, to stamp out separatist organizations, to take a harder line with labor, and to push René Lévesque, Minister of Energy and Resources, and other petty-bourgeois nationalist reformists in the cabinet, to the background. The Liberal government immediately adopted measures in line with all these demands and it soon became evident that the "Quiet Revolution" had in fact come to a complete halt. The door was thus opened for the return to power of the Union Nationale in 1966.

This led to the virtual expulsion of René Lévesque and several of his colleagues from the Liberal Party and prepared the ground for the formation of the petty-bourgeois nationalist-separatist Parti Québécois led by René Lévesque, with a left-of-center social program.

As for the Union Nationale, a split left it in a severely weakened condition, from which it has not recovered.

Zigzags of an unprincipled policy

At the 1976 elections the Parti Québécois won the majority of the seats in the Quebec National Assembly. In its election campaign it put the question of the independence of Quebec "on the back burner," promising good government as opposed to the corrupt Quebec Liberal government. In addition, the PQ leadership promised some reforms to the Labor Code and other social legislation with the argument that it had "a favorable prejudice toward labor," as

opposed to the strong anti-labor positions of the bourgeois Liberal Party.

The Communist Party of Quebec (PCQ — an integral part of the Communist Party of Canada established in 1965 by decision of the National Committee* of the CPC as a distinct entity within the CPC) welcomed the election of the PQ government. For the first time the party in power was a direct representative not of the big bourgeoisie, but rather of the nationalist, reformist petty bourgeoisie and had the support of a considerable section of the working class.

At the same time, the PCQ warned that the PQ government would be faced with two principal contradictions. First, the people of Quebec were overwhelmingly for national equality and the right to self-determination, but had no reason to support independence, which was the PQ's *raison d'être*. Proponents of this plank tried to make it palatable, having had to proclaim it within the party because it was the only concept that could unite this very heterogeneous, petty-bourgeois party.

Secondly, in the absence of a mass federated party of the working people, such as proposed by the PCQ and which would be able to put powerful pressure on the PQ, the latter's "favorable prejudice toward labor" would melt under pressure from the transnationals and the monopolies.

The first policy speech that Premier René Lévesque made after the election was to the most powerful representatives of the transnationals and banks in New York. He promised that their investments in Quebec would be safe from nationalization and that he would have removed from the PQ program the clause calling for Canada's withdrawal from NATO and NORAD. This effort to play the American card, in fact to become even more dependent on the USA in order to achieve Quebec independence from Canada, later became much more important in the policy of the PQ.

In 1980 the PQ government organized a referendum seeking a mandate to negotiate "sovereignty-association" (meaning political independence from, accompanied by a common market with Canada), the results of the negotiations to be submitted to the people of Quebec in a second referendum before implementation. The big bourgeoisie and their media all campaigned for a negative vote, while the bulk of the Quebec trade unions and the Communist Party of Quebec (supported by the Communist Party of Canada) called for a "critical Yes." It was felt that a majority of nega-

tive votes would strengthen the hand of the forces opposed to the right to self-determination for Quebec.

Forty per cent of the votes were "Yes," of which at least half were opposed to separation. This was a major defeat for the PQ government.

The Prime Minister of Canada, Pierre Elliot Trudeau, soon followed up this victory for the "federalist" forces by convening a conference of the federal and provincial first ministers to seek agreement on "patriation" of the constitution (basically, the BNA Act, with certain proposed amendments, including a Bill of Rights). René Lévesque, discouraged by the defeat in the referendum, made no effort to seek the inclusion of the right to self-determination for Quebec in what was to become Canada's new constitution. Instead he made a "deal" with the mostly conservative provincial premiers, and most particularly with those of Western Canada, the most chauvinist anti-French ones, who are the political representatives of the transnationals fattening on Canada's western energy resources, notably petroleum, natural gas, coal and hydro-electric power. In exchange for their support against any amendments to the BNA Act which would infringe on the rights of Quebec inscribed therein, Lévesque agreed to support more provincial rights and, in particular, more provincial control of the price of energy resources sold outside the producing province. He went so far as to state publicly that Quebec would be prepared to give up its traditional veto right on amendments to the constitution in exchange for the right of Quebec to "opt out" of any amendment to the new constitution that involved federal expenditures in the provinces in exchange for full financial compensation.

But in a secret meeting the provincial and federal representatives, without Quebec, agreed to accept Quebec's abandonment of the veto without compensation except in matters concerning culture and education. Further, it was agreed that the federal and provincial governments had the right to set aside most provisions of the Bill of Rights (except those guaranteeing English-speaking rights in Quebec). It was in this form that the Parliament of Canada, with some nuances dealing with the rights of the native peoples and of women, but with no changes dealing with the reduced rights of Quebec, adopted the Canada Act. Quebec, of course, refused to signify approval of this constitution.

René Lévesque's vacillating, unprincipled position served to sharpen the contradictions within the PQ. But at the general provincial elections of 1981 the PQ was re-elected. In

*The National Committee was renamed Central Committee. — Ed.

preparation for these elections the PQ leadership made certain indirect proposals to the PCQ for rather intensive cooperation in order to defeat the party of Big Business, the Liberals. But as the elections approached the anti-labor stand of the PQ leadership grew increasingly more pronounced, especially after the election of the Reagan administration in the USA and the onset of the economic crisis. This caused the PCQ to reduce cooperation to understandings with the small left wing in the PQ which was critical of the PQ leadership.

The course steered by the new government confirmed that the PQ leadership had decided to move to the right, to make the working people bear the brunt of the economic crisis. Budgets for health, education and welfare services, as well as salaries for workers in the public service, were cut. Hospitals began to be closed and thousands of health workers were laid off. The government then set out to do likewise in the field of education. It repudiated the collective bargaining agreements it had itself signed, slashed wages by almost 500 million dollars, and decreed the lay-off of several thousand teachers and other public employees.

Furthermore, it adopted legislation setting aside the Canadian Bill of Rights as well as the Quebec Bill of Rights for all those accused of taking part in a strike made illegal by special government decree. Summonses were issued to more than 28,000 persons whom the government charged with participating in illegal strikes. This legislation went much farther in repressive, anti-labor and anti-democratic action than even the old Duplessis regime had gone. It was condemned by wide sections of the population both in Quebec and in English Canada.

This policy of the government together with its ineptitude and unprincipledness in the defense of the right to self-determination for Quebec soon found expression in the loss of three by-elections, in seats all formerly held with comfortable majorities by PQ cabinet ministers, as well as in the loss of tens of thousands of members.

The new Minister of Inter-Governmental Affairs, Jacques-Yvan Morin, has been stressing Quebec's interest in and sympathy for the United States. Bernard Landry has been named Minister of External Trade (a new post). He soon suggested that an independent Quebec would seek economic association (a common market) with the United States, rather than with Canada. Morin toured the United States saying that the Quebec government stood "for a more liberal, less bureaucratic foreign investment policy than that which now exists in Canada,"

having in mind the federal government's national energy policy and its Foreign Investment Review Agency.

These fawning overtures to the U.S. imperialists and transnationals in fact signified an invitation to take over more complete control of Quebec as a counterweight to the federal government, which, however feebly, is trying to maintain some degree of the country's independence.

The communist response

Ever since its foundation in 1921 the Communist Party of Canada has been adhering to the principle of working class unity, regardless of national origin, in the fight against the capitalist class. But the national question and its particular expression in Canada was not fully understood by the party in its early years, and the party gave it little attention.

In the spring of 1934 a contributor to the party's underground theoretical journal, *Review*, pointed out that French Canadians formed a nation and therefore had the right to self-determination up to and including separation. But this theoretical conclusion was still at the time not a part of the CPC's policy on the national question.

During the years of the Great Depression, when the party had begun to do mass work among the French Canadians, it soon realized that the French Canadian working people were suffering economically and socially even more severely than were English-speaking Canadians. The party responded to this situation by taking up the struggle for equal political, social, economic and cultural rights for French Canadians.

Later, at the May 1947 National Committee plenum, the party formally recognized French Canada's right to national self-determination. But the main emphasis was unquestionably on the abolition of the economic and social inequalities between English and French Canada. This was politically sound because Duplessis continued to wage total war against social reforms on an all-Canada basis as proposed by the federal government, which was under heavy pressure from the working class and democratic forces.

This war reached its climax in 1949 when provincial police were sent to break a strike in Asbestos by miners, members of a Catholic union, who had taken this action against a U.S. transnational. It was only then that significant sections of democratic and Catholic opinion began to break with Duplessis and the movement for national self-determination for Quebec took on a certain mass, progressive

character. This played a significant role in the inclusion of the following formulation in the draft program adopted by the CPC National Committee in 1951:

"Such a union of both Canadian nations can be achieved only if it is voluntary and based on the free choice of the people of each of the two nations. That is why the recognition of the existence of the French Canadian nation by the English-speaking Canadians, of its full rights and sovereignty, including the right of secession, is the path along which the friendship and close union of the two peoples can become firm and lasting ... The future of French Canada will be decided by the French Canadian people themselves."

This proposition provided the foundation for unfolding a struggle for the right of self-determination for Quebec. However, it was important to apply the Leninist approach to the national question in the specific, complex conditions of Canada.

The party demanded the scrapping of the BNA Act and the elaboration of a new, made-in-Canada constitution guaranteeing the right to self-determination up to and including the right to secession for both nations, as well as economic, social, cultural and linguistic equality as the basis for a voluntary equal partnership in a truly united Canada. At the same time, it firmly opposed separatism as weakening the unity of the working class and playing into the hands of U.S imperialism.

In order to work out such a constitution the party proposed the convocation of a Constituent Assembly composed of representatives of Quebec and of English-speaking Canada and based on a completely equal footing and unanimity between the two delegations. The constitution would require endorsement in a countrywide referendum.

Further, the party proposed the abolition of the Canadian Senate, whose members are chosen by the Prime Minister of Canada, and the establishment of a bicameral confederal parliament, one house based on proportional, elected representation and the other house to be elected, but to be composed of an equal number of representatives from Quebec and from English Canada. Each house would have equal authority*, and all legislation would require

*Moreover, the Communist Party has demanded representation in parliament for the native peoples — the diverse Indian tribes and the Inuit (formerly called Eskimos by non-Inuit). The communists have always acted to defend the native peoples from the hateful discrimination to which they are subjected. They demand the right to self-determination, to self-government of the native peoples on their territories, the biggest part of which had been forcefully taken or stolen from them.

the endorsement of both. These proposals are upheld by the communists of the entire country.

The Communist Party of Quebec is consistently gaining support, especially among organized workers, but it is still a small party, which cannot realistically expect to be able to present a credible alternative to the Liberal Party and the Parti Québécois in the next general elections, expected at the end of 1984 or sometime in 1985.

A void exists in the political scene in Quebec. There is as yet no mass independent political movement of the working people, and more particularly of the working class that can challenge the parties of the big and petty bourgeoisie, and lead the people of Quebec in the fight to take Quebec out of the economic and political crisis. The New Democratic Party, a social democratic party which has significant support in some parts of English-speaking Canada, is practically non-existent in Quebec. This is in large part due to the refusal of its leadership to accept the right to self-determination for Quebec. It backs Trudeau's constitutional approach for fear of losing support among Anglo-Canadian chauvinists in western Canada, where it is strongest.

Unfortunately, the main leaders of the two biggest trade union centers in Quebec have chosen the path of class collaboration through different schemes of "tripartism" (union-government-employers' organizations). The basic principle of these various schemes consists in the acceptance of the workers that it is useless to resist by militant economic and political action the concerted pressure by government and the monopolies to make the working class pay for the economic crisis.

A very big proportion of the membership of these two trade union centers, not to speak of the teachers' big trade union center, rejects these opportunist policies. Many welcome the call of the Communist Party of Quebec for a common political front which would take over the leadership of the struggle for national self-determination and link it with the anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist struggle in unity with the working class and democratic forces of English-speaking Canada and with the anti-imperialist, anti-war and socialist forces throughout the world.

The PCQ has found allies among many former PQ activists, trade union militants, and other activists of popular movements. The objective is to call a conference of representative activists and leaders in the near future in order to adopt a common program, such as outlined

above, so as to present a credible alternative in the next general elections directed toward the formation of an anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist government, which, together with extra-parliamentary mass action, could open the door to advance to socialism.

Even if such a common front takes the form of a mass federated party of the working people, the Communist Party must maintain its identity while remaining loyal, as all other component parts must remain loyal, to the minimum program agreed upon. As the most consistent and determined fighters for the unity that is essential to victory, the communists cannot, and must not, accept the role of silent partners. Without the active participation of a Marxist-Leninist party such as the PCQ, a political common front would be extremely unstable, lacking both a compass and cement. In fact it

would be still-born, a terrible disappointment to the working class of Quebec and of Canada as a whole.

We feel it is important to move forward the united struggle in the trade union movement against the class collaborationist policies of certain leaders, a struggle which is taking form and substance at this time.

To the degree to which there is success in linking the struggles for national equality with the anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist, and peace movements, to that degree will the progressive forces in Quebec contribute to the creation of a coalition that would include the national and democratic forces in Quebec.

The formation of such a coalition is the strategic objective of the Communist Party of Canada at this stage of the revolutionary process in our country.



There is no other way

Mary Kaldor, *The Baroque Arsenal*, London, Andre Deutsch Ltd., 1982, 294 pp.

This book is a contribution to the growing anti-militarist literature. Apologists for imperialism put forward hollow arguments for the arms race as a "stabilizing" factor allegedly deterring war. They seek to bemuse the working class by insisting that in a time of economic crisis and mass unemployment matters would be even worse if it were not for the employment given — or so they say — by the arms industry.

Mary Kaldor, a Fellow of Sussex University, England, assails this falsehood at its root. She writes that the arms race, far from providing employment, helping to lift a declining economy out of a state of chaos and benefiting society as a source of useful advances and devices, is a cancer, parasitic on the world economy, diverting research, energy and manpower into useless paths and aggravating the ruinous effects of economic crisis (see p. 221).

The seemingly odd title of the book is no eccentricity; it is precise and refers to the author's theses. She has borrowed it from Herbert York, a physicist and former top U.S. govern-

ment official, who wrote of "baroque, even rococo varieties of A-bombs and H-bombs" (p. 4).

The words "baroque" and "rococo," of course, are usually applied to styles of art and architecture developed in the Europe of the 17th and 18th centuries, exuberant and extravagant, indeed so elaborate as often to interfere with their functional usefulness. Mary Kaldor finds these characteristics in modern armaments, which "have become increasingly remote from military and economic reality" (p. 3). Perfecting military technology, developing more and more sophisticated weapons and building up arsenals have become an end in itself. More and more often, politicians take their cue from arms manufacturers instead of determining by themselves the weapons needed to achieve strategic goals. The weapons come first — the more fantastic, elaborate and dramatic, the better (because the greater the costs and the less controllable the budget, the easier the profit). Reflections on where and how to use them come next.

Who needs all this and why? President Eisenhower's warning to Americans at the end

of his time in office to beware of the military-industrial complex (MIC) may be helpful as an answer. It is primarily the bosses of U.S. military business that are responsible for the escalation of the arms race. Drawing on a wealth of factual data, the author reveals a direct connection between each new MIC offensive and the worsened international situation.

"By the end of World War II," she writes, "the United States was producing more aircraft and tanks than all its allies and enemies combined, excluding the Soviet Union . . . but if World War II saw the culmination of American economic development, it was also the limit" (p. 55). In 1945 and 1946 there came a sharp drop in U.S. arms production. Understandably, neither arms manufacturers, nor their men in Washington could be reconciled to lower profits, and so they campaigned to secure greater appropriations for the Pentagon. The result was that already in 1947 a new boom began in the U.S. death industry, with arms monopolies receiving large orders. Mary Kaldor stresses that this should not be regarded as mere government reaction to the problems facing the arms industry (see p. 64). The upturn in arms production was indicative of a change in U.S. foreign policy, which the Truman Doctrine defined explicitly enough by making clear Washington's claim to world domination.

It is only natural that arms production reached a high "before the formation of NATO and before the outbreak of the Korean war" (p. 64). In 1947 the USA set out to form a global system of military alliances based on bilateral agreements with particular countries and a chain of regional blocs — NATO, SEATO, ANZUS, CENTO. The book shows that the chief purpose of this policy was to impose U.S. domination on various parts of the globe on the pretext of "detering communism." This U.S. policy went hand in hand with growing military expenditures, which have reached fantastic proportions by now, and with increasing MIC influence on the nation's economy, politics, and public life generally.

Classes and Nations

G. Glezerman

paper 269 pp \$3.50

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst Street

Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6

The ruling quarters of the United States, blinded by their global ambitions and prodded by the MIC, count on military power as a means of achieving their objectives. They bank on an "absolute weapon" that could help to gain overwhelming superiority over the enemy. The Pentagon's arsenals are continuously supplied with ballistic nuclear missiles, intercontinental strategic bombers, nuclear submarines and aircraft carriers. Next in line are Cruise missiles, the neutron bomb and binary gas. U.S. generals are intent, as if under the influence of sci-fi, on getting increasingly deadly weapons although the existing nuclear stockpiles are enough to destroy the whole of humanity many times over. Nor will they stop to think that militarization has "successfully eroded the economy of the United States and . . . of those countries that have followed in her wake" (p. 3).

On the strength of numerous facts borrowed from statistical reports, government documents and other sources, the author shows how very ruinous the arms industry is. She cites a very costly new U.S. tank whose operational testing resulted in less than one-third of the design goal being realized before it broke down. An Armed Service Commission member who investigated the tank called it an "awful piece of junk" (p. 179). The same lot befell a U.S. transport plane — it proved unacceptable. Experts calculated that it would be unable to perform the missions for which it was designed even remade (at an estimated cost of 1.300 million dollars). How high a price for "baroque arsenals" the American people have to pay is suggested by an American senator's comment quoted in the book. He pointed out that some new U.S. military aircraft are about twice as costly as their weight (with load) in gold.

The exposure of militarism is particularly relevant now that Washington has launched an unprecedented rearmament program. The book leaves no room for doubt as to where the threat to peace comes from. The author shows that it is the United States and its allies who have been the pacemakers in the arms race, while the measures adopted by the Soviet Union to strengthen its defenses have invariably been a forced response.

Modern weapons, Mary Kalder points out in conclusion, possess colossal destructive power. To ban arms of mass annihilation and counter the arms race with the struggle for disarmament is the only way to safeguard humanity and civilization against destruction. There is no other way. This idea runs all through the book.

Ivor Montagu

Who is shielding the nazi butchers?

John Loftus, *The Belarus Secret*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1982, 196 pp.

Nearly 40 years have passed since World War II ended, but there is no end to the memory of the horrible crimes of the nazis, nor can there be.

The recent trial in France of the nazi butcher of Lyons, Barbie, focuses attention on some questions: Why is it that hundreds of war criminals have not yet been brought to trial? How did they manage to get away from Europe? Who has a vested interest in keeping them from being brought to justice?

The answer to these questions is given in John Loftus' book, *The Belarus Secret*, published in the USA. The author, a former investigator and federal prosecutor for the U.S. Justice Department's Office of Special Investigations, served as coordinator of a highly classified inquiry called the Belarus Project, in the course of which he had access to the files of several government agencies. His book is based on what he learned from these investigations.

The book reveals how the U.S. government illegally arranged the flight of nazis from Europe and brought many of them to the USA. It also shows the motives of Washington. In 1948, the author writes, the State Department was given the responsibility under National Security Council directive 10/2 to set up an agency to conduct a secret war against the Soviet Union (pp. 8 and 9). Soon it emerged under an innocuous enough designation, the Office of Policy Coordination, headed by a certain Frank C. Wisner who had, as an operative of the Office of Strategic Services (forerunner of the CIA), been engaged in clandestine activities in the Balkans during the war.

NSC 10/2 licensed Wisner to do anything whatsoever just so long as the State Department could deny knowledge of his activities should his operations be blown. And Wisner did not have any scruples about means. The armory of his agency, the book says, included propaganda, economic warfare, sabotage and subversion, including assistance to counter-revolutionary groups in Eastern Europe.

Wisner undertook to recruit an army of anti-communist guerrillas to "turn them loose" against the Soviet Union. He went to West Germany for that purpose. There he made contact with former high officials in the nazi hierarchy who had directed the activities of nazi collaborators in Eastern Europe during the war, and

with Reinhard Gehlen, who had been chief of the Eastern Military Intelligence Section of the nazi Armed Forces High Command. At the end of war, Gehlen had surrendered himself, his whole staff and extensive files to the U.S. Army. Later the USA put him at the head of the organization which conducted espionage activity against the Soviet Union and the Eastern European socialist countries.

From the leads given him by the former nazi leaders — war criminals in the employ of the USA — Wisner found the cut-throats of the Belarus Brigade hiding out in the refugee camps of West Germany from the war crimes investigators.

The book then shows how Wisner brought most of the top Byelorussian traitors and nazi collaborators to the USA, in violation of U.S. law, arranged for them to become U.S. citizens, again in violation of U.S. law, and began to direct their activities against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. For these nazi war criminals, who had killed tens of thousands of innocent Soviet people, it was simply a continuation of the occupation they had been engaged in under the nazis. The only change was in the forms of their work, their locales and their new master. From the ranks of such vermin came the hirelings of the CIA, FBI, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

In 1955, in compliance with NSC 5412/1, Wisner set about preparing counter-revolutionary coups in a number of East European countries. Under his plan, the book says, his people had to provoke riots in the capitals of socialist countries. The groups infiltrated in advance had to seize government buildings and radio facilities, while airborne forces had to cut off the roads, blow up bridges and railway tracks. The next stage was the occupation of those countries by NATO forces (p. 131).

With the failure of the counter-revolution in Hungary in 1956, President Eisenhower assigned General Lucian K. Truscott to investigate Wisner's operations. Truscott visited camps of Hungarian "refugees" in New Jersey, where he found out that Wisner's agents had promised the Hungarian counter-revolutionaries a "direct military intervention by the USA." "Truscott also discovered that despite the disaster in Hungary, Wisner was pressing ahead with his plan for Czechoslovakia with the same hope of inciting or assisting a mass uprising" (p. 135). All of Wisner's operations

met with failure. In 1965 he committed suicide.

However, even today people like Wisner fill the "corridors of power" in Washington. These top government officials not only show disregard for international law, but also their own laws. They reveal an absolute lack of integrity in honoring the pledges and obligations of the USA in the anti-Hitler wartime coalition, and show complete disrespect and disregard for all the victims of nazism.

The attitude of the top government officials in Washington was probably best expressed by General George S. Patton, commander of the 3rd U.S. Army, as related by Loftus in the following incident:

"When General Joseph T. McNarney, the deputy U.S. military governor of Germany, told Patton that the Russians were complaining about the Third Army's lack of diligence in disarming and confining German units in Bavaria, he snapped: 'What do you care what those goddam bolshies think? We're going to have to fight them sooner or later. Why not now while our Army is intact and we can kick the Red Army back into Russia? We can do it with my Germans . . . they hate those red bastards'" (p. 47).

It did not at all worry Patton that many of "his Germans" were the nazi war criminals responsible for the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of innocent people.

What the international public has been charging all along about U.S. protection of nazi

war criminals, and which the U.S. government has categorically denied, is convincingly proven by the evidence in this book.

The book covers only a limited part of the total number of nazi war criminals who had fled from the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and were taken to Washington's bosom and given a safe haven in the USA. The United States became the protector and employer of thousands of nazis and nazi collaborators following World War II. For years the Soviet Union and other countries have sought the cooperation of the United States in bringing these monsters to justice. In this effort, during the past five years alone, the Soviet Union sent over 3,000 depositions on hearings of witnesses and victims, and a number of other documents on nazi crimes to the USA, the FRG and other countries.

According to the Soviet first deputy procurator-general, Nikolai Bazhenov, who spoke at a press conference in Moscow on March 22, 1983, out of 140 war criminals convicted in the Soviet Union of committing war crimes on the territory of the USSR, and who lived then in the USA, only seven were stripped of U.S. citizenship and not a single one was extradited to the Soviet Union.

Had the nazi butcher of Lyons, Barbie, been in the United States, the likelihood is that he would not have been extradited.

John M. Holden
U.S. educator and author



Serving peace and socialism

FRATERNAL PARTIES GREET OUR JOURNAL ON ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY*

In its message of greetings to *World Marxist Review* the Central Committee of the Guatemalan Party of Labor writes: "The 25 years of the journal's theoretical and political activity are of tremendous historical significance for the international communist movement, for the struggle of all the anti-imperialist forces for

peace, progress and independence, against war, injustice and oppression. . .

"Our journal has always been distinguished for the maturity of its judgments and its political consistency. The history of the past quarter of a century has been most fully and richly reflected in the *WMR*. The aspiration of the peoples for peace and justice, for independence and progress, and the loftiest thoughts of the people of the world, the vital interests of the proletariat, and the most splendid cause of all, the cause of communism, have made an indelible imprint in our journal."

*Concluding instalment. First instalment in *WMR*, No. 11, 1983.

In its letter of greetings, the *Central Committee of the Communist Party of Greece* states: "Our party considers that the publication of the journal and the role it has been carrying out for 25 years are one of the most valuable achievements of the world communist and working class movement ... Presently, with international relations seriously threatened and deteriorating from day to day on account of U.S. imperialism's adventurist policy, with life itself and civilization on our planet under direct threat, special significance is acquired by the journal's contribution to the struggle of the peoples to end the arms race, prevent the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe, and preserve world peace."

"The CPG will continue doing its utmost to reinforce its traditional relations of fraternal cooperation and solidarity with the journal."

The *Central Committee of the Communist Party of Denmark* notes: "The journal plays a significant role in writing of the struggles waged by fraternal communist parties, of their elaboration and application of the theory of Marxism-Leninism under the conditions obtaining today. For our party this is a valuable source of inspiration in our work. International cooperation around the journal brings to light the potentialities of internationalism in action. It is doing a great job."

A telegram from the *Egyptian Communist Party* says: "We highly appreciate the journal's role in disseminating Marxism-Leninism under conditions of confrontation with bourgeois and revisionist ideology and the struggle that progressive humankind is waging for national liberation, peace and socialism."

C. Rajeswara Rao, *General Secretary of the National Council of the Communist Party of India*, writes: "Throughout all its 25 years of existence the journal has functioned as a tribune of the world communist movement. It has rendered precious assistance to the dissemination of the immortal ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Its yeomen service in promoting exchanges of experience of the work of communist and workers' parties among the people and strengthening the unity of the world communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and in the fight for the triumph of the cause of peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism is highly valued by communists in India."

"We feel pride in recalling our association with the journal since its foundation ... The relations between our party and the journal are most cordial and constantly expanding. We take this opportunity to reiterate our desire to strengthen these relations further."

The *Central Committee of the Communist Party of Indonesia* writes in its message of greetings: "The journal, collectively brought out by fraternal parties, disseminates scientific socialism and consistently and uncompromisingly champions the interests and ideology of the working class, upholding the cause of national independence, democracy, social progress, socialism and world peace ... It enriches us with knowledge of theory and practical experience, which are invaluable to our party that is today fighting under difficult underground conditions against the reactionary military regime and imperialism. We regard *World Marxist Review* as mandatory reading for all the leaders and rank-and-file members of our party."

The *First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Jordanian Communist Party Faik Warrad* writes: "The journal is contributing immensely to the struggle between the forces of socialism, peace and liberation and the forces of imperialism, war and oppression. The participation of 65 communist and workers' parties in the work of the journal gives it a special place in this struggle. It publishes exchanges of the constantly renewing experience of building developed socialism in countries of the socialist community, analyzes issues related to the struggle for peace and liberation carried on by all progressive humankind under complex international conditions where, seeking world domination and trying to break the vice of the crisis gripping it, imperialism is growing increasingly aggressive and stepping up the nuclear arms race."

In its message of greetings the *Central Committee of the Iraqi Communist Party* notes: "The journal has always been and is a major rostrum and a dependable champion of the purity of Marxism-Leninism. Ever since its first issue it has been a close comrade of the Iraqi communists, helping them in their struggle ..."

"One of the journal's most distinctive features is that it tirelessly champions peace and détente. This is especially important today when U.S. imperialism and aggressive NATO circles are fanning international tension, stepping up the arms, particularly the nuclear arms race, seeking to deploy weapons of mass destruction throughout the world, notably in Europe, wrecking international efforts to ban these weapons, and refusing to accept the realistic peace proposals of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The struggle for peace and the right of peoples to live in an atmosphere of brotherhood and freedom is the central task of all humanity. The communist press plays a special role in this struggle."

The Central Committee of the People's Party of Iran (Tudeh) writes: "The journal reflects, as in a mirror, the huge impact of the socialist community countries on world development, their growing might and the enormous achievements of the USSR in the first place . . .

"Quite naturally, the journal gives prominence to exposing present-day anti-communism and to fighting right and 'left' opportunism. It is vital to rebuff every manifestation of anti-Sovietism, especially today when reactionary quarters have started an unparalleled anti-Soviet and anti-socialist propaganda drive, when with its delirious plans for world supremacy the ruling élite in the USA has, through the lips of President Reagan, proclaimed a 'crusade' against existing socialism, which is the main obstacle to U.S. imperialism's hegemonistic ambitions . . . The revolutionary struggle is unquestionably acquiring an increasingly more pronounced internationalist character. Proletarian internationalism has been and is an effective weapon of the communists in the struggle against imperialism and reaction. It is gratifying to note that all these issues are getting the journal's close attention."

"The journal," says a letter from Michael O'Riordan, General Secretary, and Andrew Barr, National Chairman of the Communist Party of Ireland, "has helped to give communists in our country, as well as the world over, a profound understanding of Marxism-Leninism. *World Marxist Review* has provided the CPI with the unique opportunity of explaining the particulars of the situation in Ireland to the progressive movement the world over."

"The importance of the journal for the progressive movement is increasing even more in the present conditions of an unprecedented capitalist crisis and the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. *World Marxist Review* has a significant role to play in rallying the forces against imperialism and war."

"*World Marxist Review* is the longest continued publication of an international communist journal in history — a testimony of the enduring and vital quality of its content and role," writes General Secretary William Kashtan on behalf of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Canada. "It has been a source of strength in combating the assault on Marxism-Leninism and in strengthening understanding of the dialectical inter-relationship of the national and the general, patriotism and internationalism. *World Marxist Review* has been an equal source of strength in meeting the counter-offensive of imperialism, particularly the reactionary forces

of U.S. imperialism and some NATO circles, in their drive for nuclear war against socialism, the national liberation movement and the international working class, in their insane effort to roll back social progress . . .

"In the present complicated and dangerous international situation we believe *World Marxist Review* is called upon to play an ever greater role in helping bring together the forces of anti-imperialism on a worldwide scale so as to beat back the offensive of imperialism."

In his message of greetings General Secretary of the Progressive Party of Working People of Cyprus (AKEL) Ezekias Papaioannou writes: "AKEL highly appreciates the important work done by the WMR during the past quarter of a century in the service of world peace and the lofty ideals of Marxism-Leninism. WMR, true to its mission, has rendered invaluable services to the international working class and the national liberation movement as a source of exchanges of information and experience and as a unifying factor and a promoter of international solidarity in the struggle of the three revolutionary forces of our time against imperialism and reaction for peace, independence, democracy and socialism . . .

"AKEL and the people of Cyprus are grateful to the WMR for publishing information on the anti-imperialist liberation struggle of our party and people and for promoting international solidarity with it."

The Colombian Communist Party notes in its letter: "Our party has always highly appreciated the articles published in the journal . . . The cardinal task of our party is to educate its members in the spirit of proletarian internationalism, of uncompromising struggle in defense of Marxist-Leninist principles, and to set our political task in indissoluble connection with the course of events in the world. *World Marxist Review*, thanks to its serious and responsible approach to preparing articles, is extending invaluable assistance to us in this matter."

"We would be very grateful to the journal for further articles giving a political and economic analysis of the situation in developing and dependent countries. Because imperialist propaganda misrepresents this situation we have to accord more attention to giving our militants the needed knowledge and correct assessments of the situation in these countries."

The Central Committee of the People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica writes: "During the journal's 25 years of productive work we, communists, have acquired a sincere affection and respect for it for the important role it plays in strengthening our movement's unity, for its

profound Marxist-Leninist analyses of the new and complicated phenomena of our time. As was planned by its founders, *World Marxist Review* has in these years made a huge contribution to the elaboration of Marxist-Leninist theory. It is an invaluable and irreplaceable medium for educating our cadre.

"Confidently and wisely, the journal helps to strengthen the cohesion of the communist and national liberation movements on the basis of proletarian internationalism and militant solidarity."

A message of greetings from the *Central Committee of the Lebanese Communist Party* states: "The journal's importance is growing steadily. Ever since it was founded it has been raising and analyzing topical questions of theory, disseminating the ideas of peace and democracy, researching problems of the national liberation movement, and strengthening internationalist solidarity between the communists and all other progressives in the world..."

"Problems of the national liberation movement generally and the tasks confronting Lebanon and the Arab world, in particular, receive wide coverage in this journal. For a quarter of a century *World Marxist Review* has been emphasizing the growing significance of the national liberation struggle in the world revolutionary process, showing the role played in it by our parties and the revolutionary-democratic and progressive forces."

Addressing a sitting of the Editorial Council dedicated to WMR's 25th anniversary, the *Chairman of the Communist Party of Luxembourg Rene Urbany* declared: "It would be fair to say that the idea of starting this journal has justified itself entirely. This is seen quite clearly in its popularity and recognition throughout the world and in the growth of its readership... The journal is contributing to closer unity in our movement, reflecting its collective experience, helping to study and analyze fundamental issues of the day on the basis of scientific methodology in the spirit of the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and furthering the quest of the communists for more effective forms and methods of revolutionary struggle for the cause of the working class and all other working people..."

The *General Secretary of the Communist Party of Malta Anthony Vassallo* notes: "Our party deeply appreciates the crucial role and uninterrupted contribution of WMR to the theoretical and practical concepts so essential to the world revolutionary process. The journal also plays a foremost role in the struggle against the unprecedented arms race unleashed by the

United States and its imperialist designs."

The *General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Working People's Party of Nigeria Dapo Fatogun* writes: "The progressive forces, the youth and the working people in our country are very active readers of *World Marxist Review*. And they have been since its birth a quarter of a century ago. They have since found that the articles, reports and analyses, which the journal publishes from time to time, are always thoroughly educative and deeply informative... The journal helps readers to understand all the problems of the anti-imperialist and anti-war campaigns, the ups and downs of the anti-capitalist struggle in the West, and the prospects in newly independent countries of their struggle against neocolonialism and capitalism..."

The *Central Committee of the Palestinian Communist Party* recorded its high appreciation of the journal, declaring: "It has always been and is a dependable bulwark in the struggle for the purity of Marxism-Leninism, for strengthening the unity of the communist and working class movement... It profoundly analyzes humankind's basic problems, above all the problems of war and peace, of the struggle for liberation from colonialism, imperialism and class exploitation, and for the establishment of equitable, fraternal relations between peoples. The journal does not passively observe the intrigues of the enemies of peace. On the contrary, it convincingly exposes the social and class roots of militarism and aggression..."

"For the Palestinian people, who are fighting for their inalienable national rights, including the right to set up on their territory, occupied in 1967, their own national state under the leadership of the PLO as their sole representative, the journal has always been and is a symbol of friendship and consistent principled solidarity."

A telegram from the *People's Party of Panama* says: "The history and the road of our journal prove the correctness and importance of its establishment... We, the Panamanian communists, believe the WMR properly fulfils the task of disseminating the rich experience of the communist movement in our epoch... We highly assess our relations with the journal and are determined to develop and strengthen them in the future."

In its letter of greetings, the *Central Committee of the Paraguayan Communist Party* writes: "For the Paraguayan communists *World Marxist Review* has always been a major instrument of theoretical and practical activity in the struggle for a democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution... The fascist dictator-

ship of General Stroessner has burned tons of Marxist-Leninist literature. And yet month after month WMR reaches Paraguayan patriots and democrats, reasserting again and again that communism is immortal.

"Many members of our party began their communist education by reading the journal and party documents, having for months no possibility of getting a single work of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. Our fidelity to the journal, which we regard as our own publication, is boundless."

The *Central Committee of the Portuguese Communist Party* notes: "Throughout its history *World Marxist Review* has been an important channel for publicizing the political experience and theoretical work of communist and workers' parties, of all revolutionary forces. It gives wide coverage to the struggle of the working people and peoples of all continents for democracy, national independence, social progress, socialism and communism..."

"By steadfastly giving an accurate picture of the historic achievements of the world communist and revolutionary movement, participating in the struggle for peace, against imperialism's militarist policy of aggression, and identifying itself with the peoples fighting against imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, fascism and racism, the journal has won indisputable prestige."

The message from the *Senegal Party of Independence and Labor*, signed by its General Secretary Seydou Cissokho, states: "At its eighth plenary meeting in Dakar in August 1983 the Central Committee reiterated its high appreciation of the work conducted by the journal in accordance with the decisions and basic guidelines defined at conferences of fraternal parties."

"Our Central Committee considers that the journal's productive theoretical, political and ideological work helps the Senegalese communists in their struggle for national independence, peace and socialism. The journal is a major medium for educating and training our party's cadre at all levels. We reiterate our readiness, as we actively participate in the work of the journal, to do everything in our power to continue enhancing the prestige and influence of our collective journal and its Senegalese edition *Gestu*."

In greeting the journal the *Central Committee of the Communist Party of Sudan* notes: "Our party highly appreciates the work being done by the journal and accords considerable and quite justified attention to supporting this tribune created as a result of the collective will of fraternal parties. This is especially necessary

today when the class struggle has intensified in the world and the international situation has deteriorated drastically, when everybody can see that led by the USA international imperialism is out to halt the revolutionary process, threatening peace in the world, poisoning international relations, reviving the cold war, and preparing to start a nuclear shambles that may bring about the destruction of humankind..."

"*World Marxist Review* is a class instrument and potent weapon in the hands of the parties of the working class that are fighting imperialism and its local allies for peace, national liberation, democracy and socialism. It is helping to develop forms of our joint struggle and understand key problems of our epoch on the basis of the collective thought and collective experience of communist and workers' parties."

National Chairman Henry Winston and General Secretary Gus Hall of the *Communist Party of the USA* write: "*World Marxist Review* has proved to be indispensable for our party and the world communist movement in its first 25 years of existence. All of the journal's work contributes to unifying the world communist movement on sound Marxist-Leninist principles. The result of the more aggressive policies of imperialism, headed by the Reagan administration, can be more effectively fought. There is greater cohesion and clarity in the struggle against neocolonialism, to overcome the consequences for the working class and its allies of the cyclical and structural crisis of monopoly capitalism..."

"The current severe threat of imperialist military adventures and nuclear war, the new deepening of the general crisis of capitalism and its attempt to overcome its much sharper problems at the expense of the world's peoples require greater unity and cohesion of the communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. In this situation, *World Marxist Review* makes a most unique and necessary contribution."

"Since its foundation," states a letter from the *General Secretary of the Communist Party of Turkey* Haydar Kutlu, "the journal *World Marxist Review* has been making an invaluable contribution toward strengthening the international solidarity and unity of communist and workers' parties... Its significance will grow steadfastly as world development grows more complicated. The communists and other progressives of Turkey look forward to the publication of each issue. It is an honor for our party to publish *World Marxist Review* in Turkish."

General Secretary of the Central Committee

of the Communist Party of the Philippines Felicisimo C. Macapagal writes: "In this period when imperialism has grown to be more oppressive and war-like, communist parties, peace fighters and other democratic forces need an effective and efficient outlet through which their experiences in struggle and organization are properly shared. *World Marxist Review* is about the most viable of these forums for this revolutionary aim."

A telegram from the French Communist Party states: "The French communists appreciate the role of the journal as a forum where parties can exchange diverse and very valuable achievements and experience in various spheres of activity."

"The journal helps communist parties know each other better and contributes in this way to stronger international solidarity among them, to the struggle against imperialism, and for great common goals: peace, democracy, national and human liberation, and socialism."

A letter from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Chile signed by its General Secretary Luis Corvalan says: "In the course of the past quarter of a century the journal has been steadfastly developed and perfected. It has analyzed and disseminated the experience of the gains made by socialism and the liberation movements, consistently acted from Marxist-Leninist positions to give ever more accurate answers to the problems of the ideological struggle with imperialism and reaction, and has been an effective medium for exchanges of experience and drawing together and uniting communists and other democrats and revolutionaries ..."

"On this anniversary we should like to convey our gratitude to you for your inestimable assistance in training our party members, for the possibility of publishing an edition specially for Chile, and for your contribution to international solidarity with our people who are fighting fascism."

Greeting the journal, the Communist Party of Sri Lanka writes: "Our party highly appreciates the valuable contribution the journal makes in the intense ideological struggle proceeding on the plane of the international class struggle ... *World Marxist Review* has proven itself to be a unique forum of the world's Marxist-Leninist parties for exchanges of information, experience and theoretical work reflecting the activities and struggles of communists in societies at different levels of development and in diverse and varying conditions ..."

"WMR, which has enjoyed a readership in Sri Lanka from its very inception, is today read in our country in the Sinhalese, Tamil and Eng-

lish languages and is held in high esteem by its readers. Its articles are a great contribution toward the ideological and theoretical development of our party and a splendid training in the great ideas of proletarian internationalism."

The message of greetings from the South African Communist Party says: "We feel we are in a good position to judge your achievement, having travelled through a dangerous world by your side, and faced together with you many of the challenges which have been presented to our common cause — the cause of peace and socialism, the liberation of all humankind from the shackles of capitalism, imperialism, exploitation and national oppression."

"Throughout the last 25 years *World Marxist Review* has illuminated the path of all progressive humankind with the clear light of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. You have given your readers, activists in the international communist movement, and all who love peace and social progress, the benefit of your lucid analyses and judgments on the crucial issues of the day, issues of life and death, of war and peace. You have provided guidance and assistance ... On your 25th birthday we wish you many happy returns, and thank you for the inestimable service you have rendered the international communist movement."

The Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Jamaica writes: "We wish you continuing success in your inestimable theoretical work, in providing a rich source of information on the contemporary world revolutionary movement, in strengthening and enriching the fraternal parties' internationalist ties, and promoting peace, democracy, progress and socialism throughout the world."

Congratulations were received also from revolutionary-democratic parties.

A letter from the Front of National Liberation of Bahrein declares: "We greatly appreciate the important role that your journal has played and is playing in the development of Marxist-Leninist theory, the study of the new phenomena in the world today, and the generalization of the experience of communist and workers' parties. We value the journal's outstanding contribution to the struggle for peace and socialism, its coverage of the breath-taking achievements of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and also the persevering battles of the communists and democrats in countries with fascist, dictatorial and reactionary regimes for the freedom and happiness of their peoples, of the working class. Throughout its glorious history the journal has been a

dependable weapon in the hands of the world's communists in their struggle for socialism, for peace throughout the world in the face of the mounting aggressive tendencies in the policies of international, chiefly U.S. imperialism.

"The Front of National Liberation of Bahrein is proud that the problems of our people, of our working class have been mirrored in the journal."

In greeting the journal the *FRELIMO* Party says: "Note must be made of the journal's unfailing firm support for the national liberation movement, for all revolutionary-democratic forces, and its active assistance in strengthening the international anti-imperialist front. Productive relations have been established between the *FRELIMO* Party and *World Marxist Review*, and this is expressed in the publication in the journal of articles contributing to a better understanding of the revolutionary experience of Mozambique and the theoretical positions held by our party ...

"We are confident that cooperation between the *FRELIMO* Party and *World Marxist Review* will continue to develop in the spirit of the good traditions that now exist."

The Central Committee of the Commission for Organizing the Party of the Working People of Ethiopia writes in its message of greetings: "We ... greatly value the cooperation that the journal extends to revolutionary democratic forces that are struggling for complete national and social liberation ... Besides the organ of

the Central Committee of COPWE Serto-Ader and the CC's theoretical journal *Meskerem*, the Amharic edition of *World Marxist Review* is doing a great service to the cause of socialism and progress in Ethiopia by disseminating Marxism-Leninism and the experience of fraternal communist and workers' parties.

"We have participated in various international theoretical conferences, dealing with current questions of the international communist movement, sponsored by the journal *World Marxist Review*. To us such international theoretical conferences are an indispensable means of giving correct answers to new issues raised by life and help us a great deal in improving our theoretical work and practical activities."

* * *

The journal has, moreover, received innumerable messages of greetings from the central press organs of communist and workers' parties, their theoretical journals, centers of Marxist studies, communist and other progressive publishing houses, various organizations, and individual readers.

Once more the Editorial Board, the Editorial Council, and the entire international staff of the journal express their heartfelt gratitude and cordial acknowledgement to all who have sent greetings and congratulations, for their high appreciation of the work of this journal of fraternal parties and for their wishes for further successes.

World Marxist Review

Problems of Peace and Socialism

Contents for 1983

Numbers 1-12, Volume 26

Afghanistan

Zeray, S.M., Noor, N.A. Strengthening the people's patriotic unity Number 7/Page44

Africa

Cissokho, S. A social democratic "project" for Africa, or the way to an impasse 12/14

International symposium The nationalities question in Asian and African countries 3/44

Southern Africa: rebuff aggression 8/28

Argentina

Fava, A. Nothing has been the same since Malvinas 4/24

Pereya, J. For a mass proletarian vanguard 8/33

Asia

International symposium The nationalities question in Asian and African countries 3/44

Australia

Middleton, H. What is the Aboriginal demand in Australia? 2/58

Symon, P. Needed: real change 10/41

Austria

Kalt, H. Against manipulating the masses 6/28

Bangladesh

Rahman, M. People's will: restore
democracy 9/58

Bolivia

Rodriguez, F. A result of the people's
struggle 1/61

Brazil

Dias, G. The process of change is
irreversible 10/11
do Nascimento, A.V. Brazilian trade unions on
the rise 8/61
Released from detention 3/80

Britain

Costello, M. The British trade unions:
opposition to the Tories 2/54
Pocock, G. The Tories once again.
Why? 10/48

Bulgaria

Kubadinsky, P. Role of public organizations in
the development of socialist
democracy 8/7

Canada

Phillips, J. Communist anti-crisis
proposals 5/67
V'alsh, S. On the national question in
Canada 12/62

Caribbean

Jagan, C. The Caribbean danger zone 8/51

Chile

Corvalan, L. The bankruptcy of imperialist
policy in Chile 5/8
Rojas, R. Solidarity inspires confidence in
victory 11/63
Zuniga, C. Popular protest in Chile 9/70

Congo

Thystere-Tchicaya, J.P. From African realities
to the socialist ideal 9/62

Cuba

Castro Ruz, R. Banner of the Cuban
revolution 8/1
Sukhostat, A. Nationality: Cuban 7/57

Cyprus

Papaioannou, E. Cyprus after the presidential
elections 7/19

Czechoslovakia

Jakes, M. Our society's revolutionary
task 12/9
Kapek, A. Revolution and democracy 2/4

Denmark

Jensen, J. Through unity to change 10/23
Norlund, I. Crisis of the "Scandinavian
model" 2/50

El Salvador

Barrios, J. Combat drive and political
initiative 4/58

Europe

Fath, J. West European integration in
crisis 7/50

France

Danet, D. Mass unity against monopoly
sabotage 5/63
Zoughebi, A. Important factor in social
struggles 1/53

German Democratic Republic

Mittag, G. On the highroad 10/1
Naumann, K. Party work: questions of
effectiveness 1/26
Tisch, H. Role of the trade unions in socialist
changes 3/24
Wessel, H. "While honoring him, we are
building a better life" 5/50

Federal Republic of Germany

Eichholz, U. Help those who seek 2/24
Gautier, H. A new coalition in Bonn: which
way the helm? 6/56
Neonazism — a serious challenge 7/76
Noll, F. Party factory newspaper 5/41
Schroder, K. Shift to the right in Bonn 1/55

Greece

Florakis, C. For a peaceful future and real
change 5/35
Tsolakis, C. Party work: criteria of
effectiveness 9/27

Grenada

Solidarity with the people of Grenada 12/36

Hungary

Lipkovics, K., Pavlova-Silvanskaya, M. In
search of a flexible economic
mechanism 5/56

Iran

Khavari, A. Any blow at the party is a blow at
the revolution 4/76
Kianuri, N. The arduous path of the Iranian
revolution 3/30

Ireland

Bower, J. The communist posture on trade
union unity 7/29
Farrell, N. The force of national unity 6/12
O'Muircheartaigh, A. Multinational
penetration of the Irish Republic's
economy 4/63

Jamaica

Harriot, A. The conditions for mass
support 12/33
Munroe, T. When the oligarchy is in
power 3/61

Jordan

al-Khatib, I. Jordanian society in the grip of
contradictions 10/62

Latin America

- Dias, G. "Big stick" policy doomed 2/15
International symposium Social democracy
and Latin America 8/43
Symposium Latin America in the grip of
international finance capital 11/49
Teitelboim, V. The Latin American intellectual
and the defense of cultural identity 12/20

Lebanon

- Samhoun, R. Between the hammer and the
anvil 4/73

Mauritius

- Jugnauth, A. The people have made their
choice 5/70

Middle East

- Ashhab, N. Palestinian CP: firm principles,
flexible tactics 2/28
Ashhab, N. The Palestinian revolution after
the battle of Beirut 6/62
Warrad, F. A new development in the balance
of strength in the Middle East 5/15

Mongolia

- Batmunh, Z. Loyalty to the chosen
goal 2/10

Nicaragua

- D'Escoto, M. We have popular support 3/65
Grabivker, M.J. The truth will out 6/75

Norway

- Kleven, H. The CPN and mass
movements 4/31

Panama

- Souza Batista, R.D. The dynamic of the
revolutionary process 5/19

Paraguay

- Gonzalez, R. Where are Maidana and
Roa? 8/64

Poland

- Jaruzelski, W. The message of the Polish
experience 11/11

Portugal

- Brito, C. In defiance of the people's
will 10/44
Cunhal, A. Portugal on the eve of
change 1/12
Sa, L. Portuguese democrats score
success 4/68
Yastrzhembsky, S. Defending every inch of
ground won by April 6/32

Saudi Arabia

- Abdallah, A. Bring the patriots out of
prison 7/65

The Seychelles

- Belmont, J. Defend gains 5/73

South Africa

- Nzo, A. Stepping up the fight against the racist
enemy 9/20

Soviet Union

- Bauer, R., Lewis, R., Mussa, H. Voice of peace
from Moscow 2/1
Chernenko, K. The ideology of revolutionary
creative effort and peace 11/2
CPSU: facts and figures 8/66
Pelshe, A. The democratic substance of party
control 1/4

Turkey

- Kutlu, H. For national democracy in defiance
of the dictatorship 11/22
Why the Turkish editor of our journal was
thrown into jail 4/77

United States

- Cannon, T. The CIA under Reagan 8/69
Hall, Gus Against the currents of time 9/3
Perlo, V. Reaganomics: the economic and
social consequences 1/47

Uruguay

- Perez, M. The hour has struck 7/53

Venezuela

- The arduous road to unity 1/41

Vietnam

- Hoang Tung Strategy of building socialism
and defending its gains 9/15

Capitalism: General Questions

- Clarke, R. New technology: workers' enemy or
ally? 3/55
Commission discussion Working-class
struggles in the context of capitalist
integration 6/41
Factories: bastions of the working
class 10/30
Harris, L. Monetarism: economic and class
context 9/45
Kashtan, W. The crisis and class
interests 6/18

Developing Countries: General Questions

- Crisis exported to developing
countries 9/73
Mitra, S. Non-alignment today: a time of
responsible decisions 2/20
Mitra, S., Sevortyan, R. Non-alignment: trends
and orientations 10/52

Socialism: General Questions

- Damdin, P. For the fraternal community's
common benefit 10/6
Opitz, H. Socialism: realities, advantages,
motive forces 11/42

Shiryaev, Y. CMEA: working for intensification 4/47
 Socialism: unity of theory and practice.
 Poryazov, D., Aroyo, J., Pachev, T. Bulgaria: the whole people's property. Ways of contemporary development 12/55
 Socialist countries: the people's power mechanism 6/70
 Valdes Vivo, R. Dialectics of the general and the specific in socialist construction: the Cuban variant 2/44

Questions of Marxism-Leninism

Fromm, E. The peculiarities of anti-Marxism 12/47
 Furch, B. Existing socialism and the working-class movement 4/53
 International scientific seminar Lenin's theory of hegemony in the ongoing class struggle 2/37; 4/39
 Kapitonov, I. A working class party, the whole people's party 7/1
 Matous, M. Anti-communism — its specifics in the 1980s 3/68
 Organized and organizing force 12/27
 Urbany, D. Traditions serve contemporaneity 9/8

Marxism A Hundred Years After Marx

Arismendi, R. On interpretation of Marx's philosophy 4/9
 Bauer, R., Valbuena, R., Collure, R., Malki, A. A demonstration of Marxism's greatness 6/25
 The communists of the globe say: the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin are our banner 4/1
 Engels, F. In memory of Karl Marx 1/1
 Fedoseyev, P. A great international ideological heritage 3/7
 Hager, K. Viability and topicality of a great doctrine 5/1
 Hoffman, J. Marx's theory of politics 7/15
 Honecker, E. An immortal doctrine transforming the world 6/10
 Huffschnid, J. Contemporary capitalism analyzed 11/27
 Lenin, V.I. The historical destiny of the doctrine of Karl Marx 1/2
 Milhau, J. The French communists' research activity 12/41
 Steigerwald, R. At the heart of the ideological battles 8/22
 SUPG Central Committee Scientific world view of the working class 3/14
 Wimmer, E. A class shaping the future 7/9

For Peace, Against War

The anti-war movement and the trade unions 10/66

Auersperg, P. The call of the October revolution resounds over the globe 11/16
 Auersperg, P., Mitra, S., West, J. Local conflicts are a threat to world peace 7/24
 Auersperg, P., Tsukasov, S. Socialism in the drive for peace 3/1
 Bauer, R. For peace and life, against nuclear war 8/16
 Bauer, R., Lewis, R., Mussa, H. Voice of peace from Moscow 2/1
 Bilen, I. Turkey: way to peace — unity of anti-war forces 4/18
 Blishchenko, I., Piradov, A. Tairov, T. International law helps to oppose war 6/50
 Brown, F. The noble mission of all women 3/16
 Bykov, O. Military-strategic parity in the 1980s 11/57
 A crucial year for Europe 9/38
 Didusenko, A., Shveitser, A. Peace March 82: an inside story 2/61
 Europeans against Euromissiles 5/29
 Husak, G. Peace: the ideal of socialism 6/1
 Indictment of imperialism 2/69
 Jorgen, E. Bishops censure the nuclear threat, the White House snubs the Bishops 2/66
 Korakas, S. Euromissile shadow over the globe. Not yet too late to ward off the threat! 10/17
 Malik, I., Valdes Vivo, R. Local conflicts in imperialist strategy 1/22
 Massive anti-war protest 6/9
 McLennan, G. A central issue 8/13
 Muhri, F. Austria: there are no neutrals in the fight for peace 3/20
 Mussa, H.M. What makes Centcom dangerous 7/63
 The New Year motto: for peace and life, against nuclear war 1/18
 Pakaslahti, J. Rejecting false impartiality 10/59
 Participants in the West Berlin Coordinating Committee of the Peace Movement In unity against missiles 7/34
 Ponomarev, B. Two lines in world politics and the problem of limiting nuclear weapons 12/1
 Sorsa, K. Do everything possible for disarmament and peaceful development 12/53
 "There were 500,000 of us but there should be millions" 10/27
 West, J. Big lie brings big sting 9/71
 West, J. How the USA is reviving Japanese militarism 11/72
 Workers oppose missiles 12/37

Book reviews

- Collure, R. Peace for the Indian Ocean: The Indian Ocean in Global Politics, edited by L.W. Bowman and I. Clark 2/78
- Delgado, M. Bitter fruit: who is it for this time? Bitter Fruit. The Untold Story of the American Coup in Guatemala by S. Schlesinger and S. Kinzer 9/79
- Delgado, M. Pondering the way of revolution: Survey of writings on Nicaragua 10/74
- Farrell, N. "But what about Ireland?": Troublesome Business: the Labour Party and the Irish Question, by G. Bell 8/78
- Farrell, N. "Law and order" British style: Pamphlets about the situation in Northern Ireland 1/73
- Holden, J.M. Who is shielding the nazi butchers? The Belarus Secret by J. Loftus 12/69
- Kirpichnikov, Y. Union born of a great revolution: Survey of books on the Leninist national policy of the CPSU 11/76
- Lava, J. Justified disappointment: In Search of Alternatives: The Third World in an Age of Crisis and Marcos Notes for the Cancun Summit 1981 by F. Marcos 1/75
- Lewis, R. Following Lenin's behests: The Working Class Party. Principles and Standards by T. Munroe 5/77
- Mark, S. The moloch of militarism: The Costs and Consequences of Reagan's Military Buildup by R. De Grasse Jr., P. Murphy, W. Ragen 11/80
- Mark, S. Trip across the USSR: Fast Train Russia by J. Higginbotham 9/78
- Mark, S. Who does run Washington?: Who Runs Washington? by M. Killian and A. Sawislak 6/77
- Matthews, G. The implications of a polemic among British militarists: The Uncertain Ally: British Defence Policy 1960-1990 by M. Chichester and J. Wilkinson 7/74
- Meyers, G. Chief hero: the working class: My Shaping-Up Years by A. Shields 8/77
- Montagu, I. There is no other way: The Baroque Arsenal by M. Kaldor 12/67
- Pahad, M. Indomitable spirit: Island in Chains by I. Naidoo 8/75
- Paull, A. Airland Battle: the road to nuclear omnicide 7/66
- Phillips, J. Forged by class battles: Canada's Party of Socialism 4/77
- Phillips, J. Siberia through the eyes of a Canadian: Soviet Frontiers of Tomorrow by H. Griffin 7/73
- Smith, B. The story of a staunch communist: Hollywood Red by Lester Cole 1/74

- Steigerwald, R. A close look at reality: A Swing to the Right? A Look at the Past and Present After 13 Years of SDPG Administration by H. Mies 7/70
- Sudiman, S. Under the guise of academism: Communism in South-East Asia by J.M. van der Kroef 3/79
- Tsukarov, S. Leninist unity of theory and practice: Selected Speeches and Articles by Yuri Andropov 10/71
- Valdes Vivo, R. A severe indictment: The World Economic and Social Crisis by Fidel Castro 8/72
- West, J. The stumbling block: Survey of literature on the Cold War 3/74
- West, J. With the weapon of truth: Communism in a Changing World by B. Ponomarev 5/75
- Willough, A. There is no justification: Herbicides and Defoliants in War; and A Higher Form of Killing by R. Harris and J. Paxman 10/78

Miscellaneous

- Aldridge, J. The artist in the ranks of fighters: a mighty instrument of peace 9/66
- The communists and non-traditional social movements 11/33
- Democratic character of the party press 8/38
- Grabivker, M.J., Kholopov, B. Peaceful atom: a stable orbit 9/51
- Guayasamin, O. The artist in the ranks of fighters: "I am part of the people" 6/66
- Marxist international discussion "Mass culture" or culture for the masses? 1/35
- New experience 1/31; 2/34; 3/37; 4/36; 5/44; 6/39; 9/33; 11/40
- Notes and comments 1/70
- Our journal's 25th anniversary 11/1
- Ramelson, B. May Day 1983: pitch of social battles 5/25
- The reader and the journal 7/78
- Stepan, M. IUS: acting vigorously today 8/56
- To our readers 9/1
- Toward the 25th anniversary of the journal 1/78
- WMR: serving peace and socialism 11/67; 12/70
- Youth of the 1980s: outlines of a social portrait 1/64

In Memoriam

- Nicholas Chaoui 4/80
- Yusuf Mohammed Dadoo 12/inside back cover
- Gustavo Machado 10/80
- Waldeck Rochet 4/79

In memory of Yusuf Mohammed Dadoo

The international communist, working class, and national liberation movements have suffered a grievous loss. Dr. Yusuf Mohammed Dadoo, Chairman of the South African Communist Party and member of the Political-Military Council of the African National Congress, died in London on September 19, 1983. The story of his life and work is inseparably linked to the struggle for national liberation and the emancipation of the working people of South Africa. He played a prominent part in creating and consolidating unity among all fighters against racism, fascism, colonialism and imperialism in his country. From his youth to the end of his life he was always in the forefront of struggle, repeatedly becoming the victim of racist repression.

Yusuf Mohammed Dadoo was born on September 5, 1909 in an Indian family in the town of Krugersdorp, South Africa. After completing his medical studies in Edinburgh he returned to South Africa in 1936, where he devoted all his energies to mobilizing Indians in South Africa to fight for the unity of all oppressed people. In 1939 he joined the South African Communist Party and ever since emphasized that without membership in a Marxist-Leninist party he would have remained a half-developed revolutionary.

In 1944 Yusuf Mohammed Dadoo was elected a member of the party's Central Committee. In 1969 he became Vice-President of the ANC Revolutionary Council. Following the death of the SACP Chairman J.B. Marks in 1972, Yusuf Mohammed Dadoo was elected unanimously to that high post.

Yusuf Mohammed Dadoo was an outstanding party leader and an eloquent orator, whose words reached the hearts of the people. He was a modest, charming man with a fine

sense of humor. His great strength also lay in his ability to listen to different viewpoints and quickly single out what was most essential and, above all, in his inexhaustible energy and profound devotion to the South African and international working class.

As all true patriots, Yusuf Mohammed Dadoo was a committed internationalist. He had a sincere affection and unshakable confidence in the party of Lenin, the Soviet Union, and the other socialist countries. Shortly before his death, in a message to a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the South African Communist Party, he wrote: "Our party, whatever its weaknesses over the years, has also consistently been a great source of strength and power. This strength is rooted in the firm foundations laid, from the very beginning, by the emphasis placed on a correct understanding of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism by all cadre; on the emphasis of education classes and the correct teaching of Marxism-Leninism to cadre; on the unqualified discipline and high level of commitment demanded of cadre; and in the unswerving loyalty and respect our party has for the CPSU."

Yusuf Mohammed Dadoo was a tireless fighter for the unity and cohesion of the world communist movement. He had an abiding admiration for *World Marxist Review* and contributed a number of articles.

The fighting people of South Africa and the world communist and anti-imperialist movements have lost a distinguished and courageous champion of freedom. Today let us recall words spoken by him a few hours before he died: "Don't mourn, mobilize, organize, fight back!" Yusuf Mohammed Dadoo is buried in Highgate Cemetery, London, opposite the grave of Karl Marx.

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., \$15 a year. Institutions, double rate.

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

tuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Sinhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tagalog, Tamil, Telugu, Turkish and Vietnamese.

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

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

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

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

Editions of the journal **PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM**

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

Central Books Limited,
14 The Leathermarket,
London, SE1 3ER, England
Progress Subscription Service,
71 Bathurst Street,
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6, Canada
Imported Publications,
320 West Ohio Street,
Chicago, Illinois 60610, USA
New Horizon Publications,
P.O. Box 2165
Mushin, Lagos, Nigeria

FRENCH EDITIONS:

Coopérative Ouvrière de Presse et d'Éditions,
16, rue Christoph Plantin,
Luxembourg/Gasperich
Société Populaire d'Éditions,
rue de la Caserne, 33-35
1000 Bruxelles, Belgique
Éditions Nouvelles Frontières,
185, rue Ontario est,
Montréal, Québec H2X 1H5, Canada
Gestu BP 2678
Dacar, Senegal

AMHARIC EDITION:

Press Department
Ministry of Information and
National Guidance
P.O. Box 30232
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wakt, POB 6247,
Beyrouth, Liban
32, rue Ledru Rollin B.P. 152
Casablanca, Maroc
Dar Al-Hilal
16 Mohamed Ezz-Arab Street
Cairo, Egypt

BULGARIAN EDITION: Hemus,
Russki 6, Sofia, Bulgaria

CZECH EDITION: Artia,
Praha 1, Ve smeckach, 30, CSSR

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden,
Bredgade 37, 1260 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 Nymyn, Khudaldaany Gazar,
V.I. Lenin gudamzh 1, Mongolia

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Verden og vi,
Boks 3715, GB Oslo 1, Norway

PERSIAN EDITIONS: P.B. 49034,
10028 Stockholm 49, Sweden
16 Azar Ave.
No. 68, Tehran, Iran

POLISH EDITION: RSW "Prasa-
Ksiazka-Ruch", BKWZ Warszawa,
ul Towarowa 28, Poland

PORTUGUESE EDITION: Revista Internacional,
Av. Santos Dumont, 57,
30 Lisboa-1, Portugal

ROMANIAN EDITION: Ilexim,
Calea Grivitei 64-66,
POB 2001, Bucuresti, Romania

RUSSIAN EDITION: Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga,
Moskva 121200, USSR

SINHALESE EDITION: 91 Cotta Road,
Colombo 8, Sri Lanka

SPANISH EDITIONS:

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Aéreo 1253, Bogotá, Colombia
Revista Internacional,
Apartado 4665, San José, Costa Rica
Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa,
16 616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR
Ediciones Cubanas,
Ministerio de la Cultura,
La Habana, Cuba

Empresa Editora e Importadora C.A.,
Villami 211 y Calderon,
Casilla 6217, Guayaquil, Ecuador
Ediciones de Cultura Popular S.A.,
Filosofia y Letras 34,
Col. Copilco Universidad,
Mexico 20, D.F., Mexico

Revista Internacional,
Calle 46, Este No. 16,
Panama, Rep. de Panama
Ideologia Y Politica,
Jr. Rufino Torrico No. 671-Of. 401,
Lima, Peru

San Pedro a San Francisquito,
Edif. Cantacaro, Caracás, Venezuela

SWEDISH EDITION: Internationell Revy,
Fack, 12206 Enskede 6, Stockholm, Sweden

TURKISH EDITION: Baris ve Sosyalizm
Sorunlari, PK: 41, Sirkeci
Istanbul, Türkiye

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'ô xuất nhập,
Khẩu sách báo 32, Hai Bà Trưng,
Hà-Nôi, Vietnam

