

WORLD

Problems of

MARXIST

Peace and Socialism

REVIEW

August 1983, Volume 26, Number 8 \$1.00



Cuba / 1

**Southern
Africa / 28**

**Caribbean
danger zone / 51**

**For peace
and life / 16**

**CIA under
Reagan / 69**

Brazil / 61



WORLD

Problems of

MARXIST

Peace and Socialism

REVIEW

August 1983, Vol. 26, No. 8

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

Features

- 1 Banner of the Cuban revolution
Raul Castro Ruz
- 7 Role of public organizations in
the development of socialist democracy
P. Kubadinsky (Bulgaria)
- 13 A central issue
G. McLennan (Britain)
- 16 For peace and life,
against nuclear war
R. Bauer
- 22 At the heart of the
ideological battles
R. Steigerwald (FRG)
- 28 Southern Africa:
rebuff aggression

The Party

- 33 Argentina: for a mass
proletarian vanguard
J. Pereyra
- 38 Democratic character of
the party press

Exchange of views

- 43 Social democracy and
Latin America
International symposium

Viewpoints

- 51 The Caribbean danger zone
C. Jagan (Guyana)
- 56 IUS: acting vigorously today
M. Stepan
- 61 Brazilian trade unions
on the rise
A.V. do Nascimento
- 64 Where are Maidana and Roa?
R. Gonzalez (Paraguay)

Facts and figures

- 66 CPSU: facts and figures
- 69 The CIA under Reagan
T. Cannon

Book reviews

- 72 A severe indictment
R. Valdes Vivo
- 75 Indomitable spirit
M. Pahad
- 77 Chief hero:
the working class
G. Meyers
- 78 "But what about Ireland?"
N. Farrell



Banner of the Cuban revolution

Raul Castro Ruz
CC Second Secretary,
Communist Party of Cuba

CONTEMPLATING THE LESSONS OF MONCADA

July 26 of this year was the 30th anniversary of the storming of the Moncada barracks, a heroic act that marked the turning point in our people's long struggle for complete liberation. For its significance and outcome this act objectively set an example to the Latin American countries fighting, as Cuba's national hero José Martí put it, for their second and final independence.

Challenging the ruling circles of the USA that held the island in neocolonialist bondage, dissociating themselves from the local traditional bourgeois parties, and acting openly in defiance of the alliance between the former and the latter, a small and determined revolutionary vanguard launched a sudden assault on the country's second most powerful fortress with the intention of arming the people immediately after its seizure and beginning a general rising of the Cuban people. That opened a new chapter of Cuba's history. Armed action became the basic form of struggle against the murderous dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista and against oppression by the USA and its monopolies, who have been exploiters of the Cuban nation since the beginning of the century.

A progressive program specifying the cardinal elements of the socio-economic and political reforms that could be enforced in the national situation of the time became the ideological motor of the armed action.

The action and the program were consistent with the conclusions drawn earlier in a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the main objective and subjective preconditions of the struggle. These matured with extraordinary speed, beginning with the pro-imperialist coup of March 10, 1952 accomplished to prevent a reformist party (which then had the support of the majority of the people)¹ from coming to power as a result of elections within the framework of so-called "representative democracy," which the bourgeois regime, dependent on the USA, did not itself respect.

As Fidel Castro pointed out, while imperialism and its minions were directing the

fire of their biggest guns against the small, heroic party of Cuban communists, this new vanguard, composed primarily of working people, whose top leaders subscribed to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, started a flanking movement that subsequently brought about the downfall of the system of neocolonialist exploitation.

A process that was to tear up the roots of age-long dependence on Washington, ensure full national sovereignty, and radically reshape the country's socio-economic structure commenced 140 kilometers away from the shores of the world's strongest capitalist power. These aims, set in the heartland of the region that the U.S. imperialists regarded as their own, as the traditional sphere of monopoly expansion and influence, as an object of White House foreign policy, acquired a profound historic meaning for our continent.

The tactical setback of July 26, 1953, when we fell short of our military aim, does not change the essence of the historical effects of the assault, that has entered the annals of our revolutionary process. A new phase of the armed struggle, that did not cease until the pro-imperialist tyranny's total defeat on the eve of 1959, commenced at the walls of Moncada in Santiago de Cuba (a town with long-standing traditions established in past battles for independence) and, simultaneously, at the approaches to the barracks in the town of Bayamo.

From the ranks of young participants in the people's irrepressible revolutionary movement came the leadership and the political organization that proclaimed a determined struggle against the anti-democratic, traitorous regime. The young revolutionary movement advanced a program, which Fidel Castro enunciated in his defense speech, *History Will Absolve Me*, at the Moncada trial. This program accurately and coherently articulated the hopes of the people and the country's requirements and later welded together a broad front of popular resistance and struggle.

Unswerving commitment and faith in the ideas that led to the heroic assault sank deep roots among the people. Moncada was the start-

ing point and produced invaluable experience for the two succeeding decisive battles — the *Granma* expedition and the guerrilla warfare in the mountains that then became the principal form of revolutionary action and had the unstinting support of the nation-wide underground.

At the first congress of the Communist Party of Cuba (1975), the keynote report stated, assessing the significance of the events of July 26, 1953: "This was not the personal credit of those who charted revolutionary strategy that was ultimately victorious. They assimilated the priceless experience of our military and political struggle; they were inspired by the battles for our independence, the rich heritage of militant traditions, and the people's love of freedom; and took their strength from the political thought that had directed the revolution of 1895, and from the revolutionary doctrine that spurs the struggle for social liberation today. All this made it possible to act on a solid foundation: the masses, historical experience, the behests of Marti, the principles of Marxism-Leninism, and a correct assessment of what could and had to be done at that moment in the conditions prevailing in Cuba."

The participants in the storming of Moncada did not see it as the only and decisive act for bringing down the barbarous, sadistic tyranny, which was (perhaps more than the previous corrupt governments of the pseudo-republic) the product of U.S. interference in the country's life and destiny. They saw Moncada as the beginning of broad and powerful actions by the masses, who had to get their impulse from a sense of lofty and comprehended patriotism, from a will to continue the struggle for the country's freedom, and the realization of the hope that was blasted as long ago as the turn of the century as a result of armed interference by the United States.

Fidel Castro said that our people's battles for liberation did not by any means begin on July 26. "It was the resumption," he declared, "of the heroic march started in 1868 by Cespedes² and continued by José Marti, spiritual father of Moncada and outstanding personality, whose centenary was marked precisely in that year (1953. — Ed.)."

José Marti's ideas, which strongly influenced the political and moral make-up of many generations of Cubans, were particularly close to the participants in the assault. The behest of the man who was the highest spokesman of the revolutionary thought that led Cuba to national independence exercised the decisive influence on their revolutionary work.

What inspired the organizers of the Moncada

assault and became one of the crucial historical lessons of July 26, 1953 was the natural and indispensable fusion of the revolutionary ideas of national liberation — which are a key component of Cuba's patriotic tradition — with the aspiration for the most advanced social change substantiated by Marxism-Leninism.

The program of the Communist Party of Cuba explains the political circumstances in which the Moncada barracks were stormed, and the dialectical link of that event with the Marxist call for social revolution. It states: "Fidel Castro, a young revolutionary . . . of our country, realized that the only way to wage a successful struggle against the Batista regime and everything it stood for lay through the creation of an independent movement disencumbered of corrupt politicians subservient to the imperialists, and through an armed rising of the people as the highest form of mass struggle . . . In his historical speech at the trial of participants in the storming of the Moncada barracks (this speech *History Will Absolve Me*, that was the factor turning the tactical defeat of July 26 into a strategic victory), Fidel gave a Marxist exposition of the progressive people's program of the movement headed by him. Among other things, this program contained an analysis of the most serious ulcers ravaging the pseudo-republic and an accurate assessment of the factors of struggle and the concept of the people helping to unite all classes and strata interested in fighting the local oligarchy and imperialism. It enumerated and substantiated the main urgent steps that the revolutionary government would have to take as soon as it came to power."

After reviewing the events of Moncada — linked to the assault itself and to the emergence of the *History Will Absolve Me* political platform — we have, especially as three decades have elapsed, to briefly recall the national and international conditions of those days; the former were favorable and the latter were unfavorable for the revolutionary forces.

Cuba's political history of the 1950s shows how the bourgeoisie and the imperialists barbarously destroyed the human freedoms and rights formally proclaimed in bourgeois constitutions. This is a characteristic feature not of our historical process but of bourgeois regimes that is to be seen more or less distinctly. Whereas in the epoch of bourgeois revolutions wide-ranging programs were put forward that could, despite their formal character, stir the people to fight for their implementation, even the most limited possibilities for bourgeois democracy are blanked out in the epoch of imperialism and the general crisis of capital-

ism, when economic and social contradictions are exacerbated and the ruling oligarchies bury in oblivion the former liberal chatter.

Cuba was one of the countries of America where imperialism's political and economic predominance was particularly strong. Up until the third decade of this century the USA had the juridical right (as a result of the Platt Amendment forced upon our country in 1901) to intervene in Cuba militarily, and it invoked this right on several occasions. In the course of five decades of the pseudo-republic the bourgeois governments took their orders directly from the U.S. Embassy. The Americans introduced and then encouraged the odious practice of administrative corruption and oppression. They asserted their influence not only by political levers of power and absolute economic domination but also by their total control of the mass media and all other neo-colonialist means of administration.

Latifundia, most of which belonged to Americans, dominated the countryside. "Eighty-five per cent of Cuba's rural producers," Fidel said in the *History Will Absolve Me* speech, "pay rent and live constantly with the threat of eviction. More than half of the most fertile arable land is in the hands of foreigners. In Oriente, the largest province, the land owned by the United Fruit Company and West Indian extends from the northern to the southern coast." Sugar latifundia occupied a huge portion of the national territory: of the 1,793,000 hectares under sugar in 1958, 1,173,000 hectares were the property of big U.S. monopolies.

In the 1950s U.S. investors were in control of over 30 per cent of the agricultural production and one-third of the communal services. Official statistics indicated that small Cuba held second place after Venezuela for the size of U.S. investments in Latin America. They were larger than even in Brazil, which is the biggest country in the region. The Yankees acquired an absolute monopoly over the nation's key resources, for instance, nickel.

What were the consequences to Cuba of this economic and political dependence? The results of Cuba's neocolonialist oppression are illustrated convincingly and accurately in the vivid *History Will Absolve Me* speech. Of a population of 5,500,000, over 600,000 people were jobless. The 1953 census showed that more than one-fourth of the population was illiterate. Of the children of school age 54.1 per cent had no access to education. And yet among the 600,000 jobless there were 10,000 schoolteachers.

In 1958 a survey brought out the fact that 31 per cent of the rural population suffered from

malaria, and 35 per cent from diseases caused by intestinal parasites. The child death rate reached 70 per 1,000 live births. Over and above the lack of culture and the growing poverty there were racial discrimination, prostitution, and the most shameful imaginable moral decline.

The Truslow mission,³ which studied Cuba's economy in 1949, produced "recommendations" for "economic development" aimed above all at demolishing the gains of the proletariat. This demolition was begun from the close of the 1940s, and this meant the assassination of progressive leaders, attacks on trade unions, and the most brutal harassment of workers, peasants, and other working people, beginning with communists, many of whom, like the trade union leader Jesus Menendez,⁴ were among the first victims of the unceasing repression.

In spite of this the thoroughly corrupt "autenticos" governments (the name derives from the party that formed them) were not seen as a sufficient guarantee by U.S. imperialism. In 1952 it was obvious that "authenticism" would be defeated by the Party of the Cuban People (Orthodox), a political movement, which, despite being heterogeneous and reformist, and having many conservatives in its ranks, especially among the top leaders, included revolutionary elements and was supported by the people. This made it a threat to the neo-colonialist system. The purpose of the Batista takeover in 1952 was precisely to remove this danger. The coup laid the beginning of six years of bloody tyranny, which instituted a reign of terror against the people and their democratic, progressive forces, and brought corruption in the state apparatus to a magnitude unknown even under the most discredited governments.

Imperialist economic oppression was intensified under Batista. Powerful transnational corporations pursued a policy of exploitation without hindrance. The conditions for this were created by merciless repression, by the murder and torture of thousands of Cubans. Large sections of the population were deprived of elementary rights. Subordination to dictation from the White House and the U.S. Embassy took the most humiliating forms. The Yankee governments lauded Batista, while in Cuba the masses were brutally suppressed, poverty grew, and betrayal of national interests became undisguised day-to-day practice. The communist party and all other democratic organizations were constantly and ruthlessly persecuted. Workers' and other progressive newspapers were closed. The press was cor-

rupted by bribery and gagged by the military censor.

Students (who were a major political force, as in most other Latin American states) used every opportunity to go into the streets and protest against the regime, engaging the police in battles. However, their heroic actions, which were suppressed by the tyranny, could not break its political, judicial and military apparatus.

The Orthodox party, the largest opposition force of those years, was neutralized by infighting in its leadership and the death of its founder Eduardo Chibas, who had strong support from the people because of his exposures of corruption and abuse of power in governmental agencies.

The traditional bourgeois parties drew close to the pro-imperialist regime of Fulgencio Batista or began playing at war, accumulating weapons which were almost always consigned to useless storage. Meanwhile, young people turned their gaze to the Orthodox left wing headed by Fidel Castro.

To put an end to the tyranny it was necessary to set the masses in motion: the workers, the peasants and other working people fettered hand and foot by the police state that took its orders from the U.S. military mission. It was then that we asked ourselves: what was a reliable way of achieving this aim?

The situation was analyzed by Fidel in his speech of July 26, 1973. "Were the objective conditions for a revolutionary struggle on hand or not? We believe they were. Were the subjective conditions in existence? The deeply-felt universal protest caused by the coup of March 10 and Batista's return to power, a situation witnessing society's dissatisfaction with the regime of unrestrained exploitation and poverty of the disinherited masses could give rise to the subjective conditions for leading the people to revolution.

"History later showed that we were right. But what helped us to get a clear picture of the road along which our country could rise to the summit of its political development, and our people, the last in Latin America to shake off the colonial yoke, could be the first to tear the chain of imperialism here and enter the period of their second independence?

"No group of people could by itself find the theoretical and practical solution of the problem. The Cuban revolution is not a gift of Providence, it is not a political and social miracle isolated from the realities of present-day society and the ideas that are in confrontation in world politics. The Cuban revolution is the result of conscious action consciously tied in with the historical laws of human society.

People neither make nor are able to make history at whim. Such might have been the impression of the events in Cuba had we not explained them scientifically. However, nor is the revolutionary process independent of human actions; it slows down, is late or advances in proportion to how the revolutionary classes and their leaders learn the laws governing their own destinies. Marx, who revealed the scientific laws of this development, put the factor of the revolutionary's consciousness in the forefront of historical events."

In the period preceding the storming of Moncada, Fidel Castro said that it was necessary to start a small motor that would help to start the big motor of the masses. This small motor was to be the impact of Moncada, which was seen from the very beginning as the spark that would awaken the people and blaze up into a war against oppressors; three years later this line was continued by the *Granma* expedition and the formation of the first guerrilla nucleus in the Sierra Maestra.

However, while internal conditions were conducive (as the revolutionary war subsequently showed) to the attainment of the aims of those who assaulted Moncada, the external conditions were unfavorable. This was the period of the cold war and the frenzied anti-communist campaign fanned by the U.S. government, the period of the imperialist aggression in Korea and the growth of the influence of the FBI in the United States and the creation of the CIA.

Suffice it to recall that in 1952-1955 seven Latin American governments were deposed in fulfillment of the strategic designs of imperialism, which sought to reinforce its ideological and economic hold on Latin America. It was in line with these designs that a coup was engineered in Cuba on March 10, 1952.

The character of U.S. policy in those years was reflected in the work of the conferences of the Organization of American States and the various anti-communist congresses sponsored by Washington. In December 1950 the U.S. government, invoking Article 40 of the OAS Charter, demanded the convocation of the fourth consultative conference of OAS Foreign Ministers. It was alleged that the "aggressive policy of international communism, pursued by its satellites, is creating a situation imperiling all free nations." Four years later, the OAS 10th Conference in Caracas adopted, alongside innumerable treaties, resolutions and undilutedly demagogical commitments — an anti-communist declaration that stated: "... domination or control by the international communist movement in the political institu-

tions of any American country, which leads to the spread of the political system of an outside power to the American continent, will be a danger to the sovereignty and political independence of American states and threatens peace in America."

Having in mind the international situation in which the Moncada events developed, Fidel Castro said: "I believe that had we put an end to Batista in 1953, imperialism would have crushed us, but later, between 1953 and 1959, a very significant change took place in the balance of strength in the world." The First Secretary of our party's CC explained: "... at the time (1953. — Ed.) the Soviet state was still not so strong; it should be remembered that the Soviet state extended decisive assistance to us, something it could not have done in 1953."

Subsequently, the first congress of the Communist Party of Cuba analyzed these internal and international factors, which were taken into account by the organizers of the storming of Moncada and to some extent predicated their actions and the possibility of showing the political significance of the process that began on July 26, 1953. It was noted at the congress that in the revolutionary struggle that led to the people's victory on January 1, 1959, "the aims on the agenda and for which the revolutionary movement and the people had matured were proclaimed and achieved at every stage."

Five years, five months, and five days after Moncada the tyranny was brought down. This was a tortuous path, and to move along it the experience learned in the first revolutionary battle was of enormous significance. Moncada was not a revolutionary triumph but it showed the road and suggested the program of national liberation that opened the doors to socialism for our country.

In the subsequent major achievements, Fidel Castro noted, the aims and strategy of the revolutionaries were the same as on July 26, 1953.

The military context, the plan for storming the barracks at Santiago de Cuba and Bayamo consisted in seizing the arsenals of both garrisons and calling the people to a general strike. In the event of a failure to paralyze the country, it was planned to begin an insurgent war in the mountains. In other words, there were two options. The first was to try to get the most important province (which is also the farthest from the capital) to rise against Batista. The storming of Bayamo in the center of this province and the planned seizure of the bridges across the Cauto River, the largest in the country, were seen as vital to excluding or, at least, preventing the arrival of reinforcements. In the event this option failed, the task was to go to the

mountains with the weapons captured in the barracks. This was what we did three years later. The Moncada strategy brought us to victory with the difference that this second time, we started in the mountains.

Moreover, Moncada in effect molded a new revolutionary leadership that rejected the passiveness and reformism that had hitherto been predominant in the country's political life, and brought into prominence Fidel Castro as the leader and organizer of the armed struggle and of determined political actions. When we, the revolutionary leaders, were released from prison in 1955 there already was an elaborated strategy of struggle, about which Fidel Castro spoke in his analysis of the Moncada events.

We knew that we had to show there could be no political settlement of the national problem with Batista in power. We succeeded in proving to the people the correctness of this thesis, which is inseparably linked to Marti's principle that war is a last resort, when all other possibilities are exhausted.

An important feature of our revolutionary process (it is often mentioned abroad) is that diverse social classes participated in it.

The majority of those who stormed the Moncada barracks were from the poorest and most exploited sections of society. But it was these people, who at great personal sacrifice, contributed to the funds for the purchase of arms that were then used in the assault.

Our concept of the "people" was formulated in 1953 in the *History Will Absolve Me* speech. For us the people are rural and industrial workers, peasants, intellectuals and small shopkeepers. A section of this document, our program, said: "The people are those who suffer from all misfortunes and therefore able to fight with consummate courage! To the people whose arduous path is beset with deceit and false promises we will say not 'We will give you,' but 'Take, fight with all your strength so that happiness and freedom is yours.'"

Within a few years, when the guerrilla movement evolved into the insurgent army, the core of our ranks consisted of workers of countryside and town, and its high command, above all Fidel Castro, continued to be guided by Marxist-Leninist analyses.

On January 1, 1959 the U.S. Embassy and the higher military hierarchy tried to steal victory from the revolution. Fidel Castro, who was in Oriente province at the time, called for a national strike. The Cuban working class responded, dealing the government apparatus a crushing blow.

We thus have the indisputable fact that the

most exploited classes played the principal role in our insurgent movement and their socio-political unity was shaped in the joint struggle against the chief enemy. This unity — a vital condition for the conquest of power — has since been protected and guarded by Fidel Castro and our political leadership as one of the key principles on which we rely for the fulfillment of the great task facing us.

Enemies have, of course, attempted to sow discord, at first in the forces acting against the tyranny and then among those who defended the revolution and ensured its advance. Use was made chiefly of anti-communist prejudices that are constantly planted by imperialist propaganda. But all these attempts fell short of their aim thanks to the political leadership, which began and completed the war against the tyranny, a leadership that has the wholehearted support of the people, a leadership motivated by the bright ideals of unity and alien to sectarianism of any kind.

A major lesson of the Cuban revolutionary process is that it is vital to forge, preserve and strengthen the unity of the revolutionary forces and the entire people.

Cuba's glorious past, including the assertion of national consciousness during the first war of independence, paved the way for the action of July 26, 1953 ideologically and in practical terms. When Fidel Castro told the judges that José Martí was the spiritual father of Moncada he was telling them the truth. Our generation has been powerfully influenced by that towering, universal personality of the anti-colonialist movement and independence struggle of the 19th century. How well this was summed up by Fidel Castro when he said: "José Martí symbolized the thought of our society, of our people in the struggle for national liberation. Marx, Engels and Lenin personified revolutionary thought in the struggle for the social revolution. In our country national liberation and the social revolution fused under the militant banners of our generation." We have always cherished this fusion of two influences — the progressive Cuban movement, that began in the mid-19th century, and the Marxist-Leninist world view.

Thirty years after the storming of Moncada, an analysis of its specific historical features, the national and international conditions under which it took place, the experience that it gave the national liberation struggle, the participation of members of different classes in these events, and the fusion of Cuban patriotic traditions with Marxist-Leninist theory helps us to appreciate the true significance of July 26, 1953 to the development of the Cuban revolution.

The storming of Moncada and the

imprisonment of its participants were followed by *Granma*, which signalled the realization of the experience mastered by the revolution's leading core. This exploit and then the battles in the Sierra Maestra were a continuation of Moncada. It materialized in the triumph of January 1959 and in the first decrees, which had a broad base and the people's support. These prescribed the agrarian and urban reforms, the conversion of army barracks into schools, and the nationalization of the property of American monopolies that had been pillaging Cuba's wealth. All this enabled the Cuban people, for the first time in our history, to determine by themselves their political and economic destiny.

After the program of initial measures was carried out, the spirit of Moncada was seen in the Playa Giron victory in April 1961 and in the proclamation of our revolution's socialist character, which ever since that day, July 26, 1953, was seen as the only possible conscious prospect of our revolutionary process.

For that reason, in evaluating this event from the distance of the three decades that have passed since the day a group of determined young people tried to storm the country's second most powerful fortress, we must compare it with the heroic achievements of our people in the building of the new society in the face of the most powerful enemy and with firm faith in ultimate victory.

Thirty years after Moncada, which many felt was a utopian storming of the heavens, and only a few months before the close of the first quarter century of our revolution, the two anniversaries give Cubans food for the most profound contemplation about the past, the present and, above all, the future of our struggle. A little over three decades ago I started out as a rank-and-file soldier in this battle, at first utilizing the opportunities offered by university autonomy for work in the Federation of University Students. That was when an extremely motley revolutionary movement lacked a mature party such as we have today, a party that could unite fighters of various trends and surmount the ideological confusion that reigned at the time. There was a need for a hand like Martí's to hold the "helm in the teeth of the storm."⁵ This role of coxwain, the champion of revolutionary unity, and of brilliant political leader in the difficult battles that have been fought and won by the Cuban people has been and is being fulfilled now by Fidel Castro Ruz at the head of the Communist Party of Cuba.

1. Party of the Cuban People (Orthodox). — Ed.

2. Carlos Manuel Cespedes was a leader of the Cuban insurgents during the Ten-Year War of Independence (1868-1878). — Ed.

3. This was a group of experts sent to Cuba by the U.S. government. — Ed.

4. A Cuban workers' leader, the communist Jesus

Menéndez was killed by the secret police in 1948. — Ed.

5. These words are from *Military Diary* by José Martí, who piloted a small schooner from which he landed on Cuba with General Maximo Gomez and four other members of the expedition to begin the war of liberation of 1895. — Ed.

Role of public organizations in the development of socialist democracy

Pencho Kubadinsky
CC Political Bureau member,
Bulgarian Communist Party,
Chairman, National Council, Fatherland Front

At the stage of building mature socialism the development of the Bulgarian political system is characterized mainly by the further, steady improvement of socialist democracy and an enrichment of its many forms. In this process a very important part is played by public organizations, whose role is growing steadily in the administration of the affairs of state and society. "As the socialist state develops," says the BCP program, "public organizations will play an ever wider part in the affairs of state and acquire ever broader powers."¹ This is natural.

Socialism opens up the greatest opportunities for genuine democracy, for safeguarding and promoting the interests of different classes and sections of working people and, lastly, for the self-expression of the public-spirited individual. The growth of general and political culture in town and countryside, the rise of living standards, the consolidation of the people's social confidence, and more free time ultimately facilitate the people's real participation in the work of public organizations and strengthens the social base of the people's power. "In our country virtually every citizen belongs to one mass organization or another, thereby going through an effective school of communist education and a school of administration, joining his efforts to those of the entire people in socialist construction . . . This is part and parcel of our political system,"² said Todor Zhivkov, General Secretary of the BCP Central Committee and Chairman of the State Council of Bulgaria, at the ninth congress of the Fatherland Front in 1982.

In deepening and widening the democratic foundations of socialist statehood, the party is committed to enhancing the prestige and influence of public organizations. It directs and coordinates their actions and their relations with organs of the people's power, the state administration, and the working people. Every

new stage of socialist society's development witnesses the corresponding development of democracy. Its forms are renewed and enriched on the solid foundation of joint activity by state and public organizations.

The need for the "coalescence," so to speak, of these organizations was noted by Lenin,³ and this proposition remains in force today. Socialism is built on the foundation of social property in the means of production, and it not only presupposes the broadest and conscious participation of the people in administration but cannot develop without such participation. In the same way that no genuine democracy is possible without socialism, socialism is inconceivable without the constant development of democracy. They are indivisible in the true sense of the word. Lenin wrote that consistent democracy evolves into socialism, and that the working masses are drawn "into constant and unflinching, moreover, decisive, participation in the democratic administration of the state."⁴

As it unfolds socialist democracy more and more fully, the BCP takes as its point of departure that the state is the main instrument by which the working people successfully carry out the tasks of socialist construction. The state directs economic construction, enforces a social policy, and promotes the all-sided development of culture, education, the health services and so forth.

Further, the party believes that the political system can improve only if the efficiency of state and public organs is fostered, and that to a large extent this depends on the development level of the political relations in the country. In practice this means, above all, strengthening the cohesion of the people and their unity around the communist party. "Every success, every advance in improving the structure and work of the political system," it was pointed out at the party's 12th congress (1981), "has one

and the same denominator: they mirror and powerfully foster the unfolding and improvement of socialist democracy."⁵

Party congress decisions, resolutions of plenary meetings of the party's Central Committee, and other party documents give public organizations sure orientations and help to define their guidelines. The plenary meeting of the BCP Central Committee in April 1956 was an outstanding milestone in our party's history. This plenary meeting restored the Leninist principles and norms of party and state leadership. The development of democracy in the party led to an improvement of the entire socio-political climate and still further consolidated the BCP's role in society.

As society's leading and guiding force, the Bulgarian Communist Party has been and is the chief proponent of the principles of socialist democracy, which it translates into practice. In view of the multiformity and complexity of social interests, it is the party that ensures the integration of these interests and embodies socialist society's oneness.

A hallmark of Bulgaria's political system is that the Bulgarian Agrarian People's Union (BAPU) is active in the administration of all the affairs of society and state. Unity and close fraternal cooperation between the BCP and the BAPU rest on a community of tasks and aims, namely, the building of developed socialism in Bulgaria.

At its 12th congress the BCP probingly analyzed the basic results of the first decade of building a mature socialist society in the country and mapped out the tasks that have to be carried out in the eighth five-year plan period (1981-1985) and in the period up to 1990.

The congress' main conclusion was that in socialist Bulgaria's history there has never been such a fruitful period of socio-economic and cultural development as the past decade. Bulgaria has registered notable success over the past 10 years in carrying out the party program. The national income, for instance, has more than doubled to make it possible to allocate the impressive sum of 52 billion leva for capital investment. This is 60 per cent more than the investments of the first five five-year plan periods combined. The economy's basic assets have also increased, amounting to 77 billion leva in 1980 against 33 billion leva in 1970. It would be hard to name an area of material and cultural life in which no progress has been made. The features of mature socialism are increasingly asserting themselves in the economy and in politics and culture.

The way to these successes was paved by the

growth of the creative activity and conscious participation of millions of people in building the new society, and this gave the 12th congress grounds for noting that favorable conditions had been created for a further advance toward developed socialism on the basis of a huge economic and cultural potential, and the higher maturity level of socialist relations.

The results that have been achieved are eloquent evidence of the correctness of the party's policy, notably, its course toward a further deepening and extension of socialist democracy. Several basic directions can be identified here.

The first is linked to the improvement of representative democracy. In Bulgaria representative organs — the People's Assembly and the People's Councils — are part of the system of state power. As stipulated in the constitution, they are formed on the basis of the results of universal, equal and direct voting by secret ballot.

As the bedrock of state power the representative organs have, as they develop, the job of more and more fully articulating the will of the people and embodying socialist democracy. The People's Assembly, as the highest organ of power, fulfils all the main functions of state power: it combines legislative with executive activity, exercises supreme control and planned leadership of social development, and handles the most important problems of political, economic, social and cultural life. The People's Assembly and the People's Councils ensure a direct link between the state and the people and enable hundreds of thousands of citizens to go through the school of administration. The potential of these organs for enlisting the masses into state affairs is practically inexhaustible. As centers organizing public activity the People's Councils, headed by the People's Assembly, and acting through ancillary organs — standing commissions set up on the functional principle — tackle the most diverse problems comprehensively.

The work of the representative organs and their rights and powers in directing and monitoring all processes linked to the interests of the inhabitants of administrative-territorial units develop constantly in breadth and depth. Special importance is attached to the systems of population centers, which are social entities linked by joint production activity, a single transport network, and a common sphere of service. In tackling socio-economic, territorial and cultural problems each system is regarded as a single whole. As a form of state power and local self-administration, these systems and communities play the role of a sensitive

instrument that brings to light a wide spectrum of the population's interests, needs and requirements.

The state-social and social-state principle in the leadership of the various areas of economic, social and cultural activity is an important element fostering the perfection of representative democracy in Bulgaria. Central to the theory and practice of this deepening of democracy is, therefore, the growth of the social base of representative organs, the ever broader participation of the people in decision and policy-making.

Our society's rapid transformation is enriching all areas of life with diverse new forms of socialist democracy. Here, public organizations are making a tangible contribution. As distinct from state organs, which promulgate acts that have juridical force and are mandatory, these organizations can count on voluntary action and operate by means of persuasion and education. At the stage of building developed socialism these are the factors that acquire growing significance and enhance the role and prestige of public organizations in the administration of society's affairs.

It is indicative that while they go to all lengths to discredit socialist democracy, bourgeois ideologues and politicians are silent about the fact that the BCP does not act by decree, does not impose its leading role but implements it by constantly strengthening its links to the people. Getting massive assistance from public organizations, the party, for its part, encourages their activity in every way and cooperates with them creatively day after day. As a consequence, all the formerly existing mass organizations that have proved their devotion to the working people function to this day, and new associations have been formed.

In the extension of democracy and in the building of a mature socialist society a large role is played by the Fatherland Front, the trade unions, and the Dimitrov Young Communist League. Using various forms and methods of work they are helping to carry out the socio-economic tasks confronting society. In this respect public organizations are working productively in enlisting working people of town and countryside into the drawing up of draft laws and normative acts. The constitution grants public organizations the right of legislative initiative. For instance, the Fatherland Front is currently drawing up the draft of a Code of Laws on the Family. The tradition of nation-wide discussion of key draft laws, and the participation of public organizations in this discussion make it possible to adopt documents most consistent with the objective

requirements of economic and social development. Public participation in the discussion of draft normative acts is most effective when the People's Councils are to pass particularly important decisions affecting the interests of the different sections of the people.

In the People's Republic of Bulgaria state power is exercised not only by representative organs but also directly by the people by means of direct democracy. The very essence of socialist democracy presupposes such direct rule by the people. The party's 12th congress pointed out that in dealing with matters important to population centers and communities it would be expedient to conduct local referenda. This work is done by the Fatherland Front. The decision of many important economic, social and other questions requires the direct participation of citizens, and this, needless to say, does not belittle the role of representative organs.

Today direct democracy is most frequently applied in resolving matters concerning small social units: work collective, residential neighborhood, population center, and the systems of population centers.

It must be noted that public organizations are conscious of their responsibility for the precise and full utilization of the traditional structures of direct socialist democracy and for the effective use of new structures.

A Law on Polls has recently been enacted in Bulgaria. This law is justifiably called a law on direct democracy, for it regulates the basic forms of democracy. This law very distinctly mirrors the role played by mass, public organizations. Indeed, the participation of these organizations ensures the correct exercise of direct democracy in the discussion of draft laws and other acts, during referenda, and also in the decision of issues within the terms of reference of the People's Assembly, the State Council, or the People's Councils. Prior to the adoption of the Law on Polls there were active nation-wide discussions of the draft of the new constitution, the draft laws on deputies to the People's Assembly and the People's Councils, the draft law on People's Councils, the draft decree on the mandates given by constituents to deputies of the People's Assembly and the People's Councils, the new Labor Code, and so forth. The Fatherland Front, the trade unions, the DYCL, the Bulgarian women's movement, and other public organizations, were active in all these discussions.

Concern for the common cause, exchanges of views, and heightened socio-political activity by every citizen are one of the cardinal features of socialist democracy, which is a living, functioning democracy.

The party sees the development of the political system not only as the means of perfecting administration but, and above all, as a process of deepening political relations, strengthening the people's cohesion, and uniting the people around the Communist Party.

Since the party's 12th congress Todor Zhivkov has been according much attention to ensuring the fullest creative theoretical elaboration of the problems and tasks of the Fatherland Front, the trade unions, and the DYCL. In his speeches at the congresses of these organizations he substantiated theoretically the tasks set them by the party and mapped out the practical ways and means for perfecting their work, which has always to fully conform with present-day requirements.

The further enhancement of the role played by public organizations in social administration is seen, above all, in their extended participation in forming organs of state power. First, under the Election Law, party and public organizations nominate candidates for election to the People's Assembly and the People's Councils and organize elections to these representative bodies. Second, public organizations assist state organs in drafting decisions and in the fulfillment of these decisions. Third, and last, in some areas the functions of the state are carried out jointly and concurrently by state and public organizations.⁶

All these directions are to be seen in the work of the Fatherland Front. Formed during the Second World War on the initiative of Georgi Dimitrov, immortal son of the Bulgarian people and the Bulgarian Communist Party, it played a prominent part in the struggle against the monarchal-fascist dictatorship. Since the victory of the socialist revolution the Fatherland Front has been contributing tangibly to the building of socialism.

In 1982 it marked its 40th anniversary. It has become the largest social base of the people's power, embodying the moral and political unity of the Bulgarian people, the alliance of workers, peasants and intellectuals, and the militant cooperation among communists, members of the Bulgarian Agrarian People's Union, and non-party people. Its collective members include the trade unions, the Dimitrov Young Communist League, the Bulgarian women's movement, and scientific and cultural associations. The Fatherland Front strikingly personifies Lenin's ideas about the unity of the popular forces in the struggle of the working class and all the working people for liberation and in the building of socialism.

At the ninth congress of the Fatherland Front, Todor Zhivkov noted: "The Fatherland

Front has played a meritorious role in our development over the past four decades. History has shown that the Fatherland Front is not a tactic but a long-term strategy, a historical need for Bulgaria . . . It has exemplified and is exemplifying the creative, Marxist-Leninist solution of our country's concrete historical problems. It is a new and unique contribution by our party and our people to the theory and practice of socialism; it is our contribution to the treasury of the communist cause and struggle."⁷

This assessment is fully justified, and has been borne out by the activities of the Fatherland Front from the moment it was founded to the present, when prominence is given to the development of socialist democracy, which is an essential element of mature socialist society.

Today more than 70 per cent of the country's voters belong to this most massive public organization. The Fatherland Front organizes elections to the People's Assembly and the People's Councils, thereby having a say in selecting and nominating candidates and the possibility of involving the working people in controlling the work of the people's representatives. Moreover, the Fatherland Front is the channel for the people's links with state power, with district and communal People's Councils.

Also important is that among the members of the Presidium of the Fatherland Front's National Council there are leaders of all public organizations and most of the movements and creative unions. The decisions and actions of the Fatherland Front thus telescope the recommendations and efforts of many organizations. This is seen clearly in its participation in nation-wide campaigns such as the modernization of population centers, the protection of the environment, the building of dwellings by various organizations, the rendering of voluntary assistance to agriculture and so forth.

A major feature of the Fatherland Front is that all the working people, even if they are not members, have the right to participate in its meetings and freely state their opinions. The Front thus combines hallmarks of a socio-political organization and a people's movement, and as such it provides the people's power in our country with the broadest social base. From this stem the current and long-term questions facing the Fatherland Front.

Mentioning these questions, Todor Zhivkov said: "This means that the *Fatherland Front* should be given the task of perfecting its coordinating function, cooperating broadly with other public organizations and state agencies in residential neighborhoods, being the social

guarantor of the correct functioning and of the growth of the role and significance of communities, the systems of population centers, and local organs of the people's power."⁸

The concept of "social guarantor" appeared in the Bulgarian political lexicon quite recently. It reflects the process of our state's evolution into a state of the whole people and the gradual erasure of the social distinctions between the classes and sections of society. To be the social guarantor of this or that organization of the working people means not only making higher demands of state and economic organs and controlling their work but also ensuring that every public organization actively participates in administration and in the fulfillment of the tasks set us by the party. For the Fatherland Front this means maximum assistance for the development of the system of population centers and for converting them into full-fledged territorial units capable of effectively resolving problems linked to the work and everyday life of their population.

These systems, set up on BCP initiative, are a new phenomenon in the country's socio-state life. The party sees them as an important form for the further development of socialist democracy and the way to go on eradicating the distinctions between town and countryside. The party's 12th congress called for all-out efforts to strengthen these socio-economic and administrative units. This is creating ever more favorable conditions for the Fatherland Front's active participation in the modernization of towns and villages, the development of the self-supply system, and the improvement of the trade network, medicare and communal everyday services. Concern for every citizen is, as everybody knows, the alpha and omega of the party's policy.

A vital element of democracy is the right of the people to control the work of state and economic agencies and organizations. The party has launched extensive work to fulfil the tasks, set by the 12th congress, of making control more effective and of raising the responsibility of executives. This gives wide scope to the Fatherland Front and other public organizations. Their cooperation with state and people's control agencies helps to achieve the aim, set by the party, of creating an atmosphere of intolerance of any violations of democracy.

At the ninth congress of the Fatherland Front much attention was given to studies of public opinion. It is important to know how people live, what they think of their work and everyday life, what their requirements are, what worries them, and what they recommend to state, economic and other agencies. At this congress

Todor Zhivkov said that there had to be a single, effective system for studying public opinion that would give the party and the state the possibility of keeping their finger on the pulse of the nation. The Front can and must make a large contribution to the establishment of such a system.⁹

The Fatherland Front's entire socio-political, cultural, educational and agitation work, and its assistance to the economy and to the development of the systems of population centers are thus directed toward the basic aim of still further uniting the people around the BCP and reinforcing their moral and political cohesion. This springs naturally from the essence of our social system and is one of the underlying factors of the prosperity of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, which is successfully building a developed socialist society. That is why Todor Zhivkov's statement at the ninth congress of the Fatherland Front that we should guard this unity as the apple of our eye and enrich and develop it was received with total approval as a profoundly felt truth, as a conclusion reached in a long struggle and convincingly proving its viability in the years of socialist construction.

At the 12th congress of the BCP and in the nation-wide discussion of the main propositions of the party's concept of a new Labor Code the question was raised of giving the trade unions a larger role than ever in promoting democracy and of enhancing their influence in the economy and in management. The idea expressed in the theses of the party's 12th congress and well-reasoned in Todor Zhivkov's speech at the ninth congress of the trade unions was subsequently enlarged upon. The trade unions are regarded as a social guarantor of the correct and effective use of the new economic mechanism, of the observance of the rights and duties stemming from the provisions on the work collective as the owner of socialist property.

The trade unions have been vastly successful in this respect. They are very active in fostering the new economic approach to the organization of production and labor, in drawing up upwardly-adjusted plans, speeding up the fulfillment of economic tasks on a high level of quality, in disseminating advanced experience, organizing socialist emulation, and putting to the relevant state agencies questions related to giving work collectives a larger say in the management of production.

The 12th congress of the BCP stressed that the trade unions had to work toward a fuller exercise of their functions in protecting the interests of the working people, drawing workers actively into the management of produc-

tion, helping to reinforce labor discipline, and developing ways and means of improving working conditions and the quality of life. With this are linked labor protection, the organization of rest and leisure, trade and everyday services, education, and the training and re-training of workers. In the basic provisions of the concept of a new Labor Code it is accentuated that the trade unions play a significant role in labor and in labor relations and emphasized that no normative act in this area, regardless of whether it is a law, decree, resolution, rule, order or instruction, can be passed without the participation and agreement of the Central Council of Trade Unions.

At the various stages of socialist construction the questions dealt with by the trade unions differed, but the trend toward the extension of rights and the growth of responsibility has remained. Hundreds of thousands of trade union activists, the commissions set up by factory trade union committees, and the delegates of the trade union groups are today involved in matters related to labor protection, the observance of labor legislation, the organization of rest and leisure, professional training and so on. Here democracy is real, direct.

The managerial, social functions of the trade unions and their work in promoting culture, education and the public health services are in dialectical harmony. The conscientious fulfillment of these tasks enhances the role and social prestige of the trade unions. The very fact that they enjoy such wide rights is evidence of their important and growing part in perfecting socialist democracy.

The BCP has always given considerable attention to the rising generation, who are our successors and future, and to their active participation in socialist construction and in the administration of the state and society. The party is tireless in its concern to enhance the role and importance of the Dimitrov Young Communist League (DYCL), which is its chief assistant in all areas of the country's life. This organization is the true spokesman of the many-sided interests and aspirations of young Bulgarians. The DYCL's aim is all-round development of every young person and their active participation in the country's sociopolitical life. It has extensive opportunities for achieving this lofty aim. It has a large material base, strong positions in the administration of society's affairs, and wide rights and powers. The DYCL enjoys the right of legislative initiative. One in every five deputies in the com-

munal and district councils and one in every ten deputies in the People's Assembly is a member of the DYCL. All this enables the DYCL to act most energetically as the direct spokesman and champion of the interests of young Bulgarians and as an effective factor of our democratic system.

The deepening and enrichment of socialist democracy in political, economic, cultural and social life create opportunities for political rule by the whole people. This is a natural process but it does not always run smoothly. That is why the party adopts the relevant measures to ensure a smooth and steady improvement of social relations. It abides by the general laws of the socialist state's development and invariably acted in keeping with our people's traditions and the specific conditions of Bulgaria during the transition period and at the various stages of socialist construction. In this lies the vital strength of the leadership provided by it. "The party," said Todor Zhivkov, "is the decisive force guaranteeing the development of socialist democracy."¹⁰

This explains the party's constant concern for strengthening public organizations as creative, autonomously functioning factors of the extension of socialist democracy. Their prestige and growing influence over all aspects of society's life are an objective, regular process. There are unshakable unity, cooperation, and fraternal relations between communists and members of the Bulgarian Agrarian People's Union. An active part is played in the administration and in the constructive work of our society by the Fatherland Front, the trade unions, the Dimitrov Young Communist League, and all the other public, professional and creative organizations of the Bulgarian working people that have an important role to play in the development of socialist democracy.

1. *Programa na Bolgarskata komunisticheska partiya*, Sofia, 1971, p. 98.

2. Todor Zhivkov, *Dvanadesetiyat kongres na BKP i pmatatyshnoto izgrazhdane na zreliya sotsializm*, Sofia, 1982, p. 402.

3. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32 p. 29.

4. *Ibid.*, Vol. 28 p.465.

5. Todor Zhivkov, *op.cit.*, p. 73.

6. See *Tezisi na TsK na BKP za sestoyaniето i razvitiето na partiyata i na obshchestvenite organizatsii i dvizheniya*, Sofia, 1976.

7. Todor Zhivkov, *op.cit.*, pp. 405, 408.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 415.

9. *Ibid.*, pp. 416-417.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 73.

A central issue

Gordon McLennan
General Secretary,
Communist Party of Great Britain

The issue of nuclear war and of British policy toward disarmament has come right to the forefront of political discussion and activity in Britain. There is not a town of any size that does not have its activists and peace organization — usually a branch of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. This unprecedented movement — unprecedented both in breadth and scale — means that for the first time ever questions of defense policy, of nuclear weapons and their control are matters for mass discussion.

The current general election¹ campaign — not yet complete at the time of writing — is the first at which nuclear weapons have played such a prominent part. Whatever the outcome of the election, the impact of the peace movement and of the discussion on nuclear weapons will have made a lasting impression and it is certain that the peace campaigning will continue.

Peace movements are not new in Britain. There has always been active campaigning since the days of the Stockholm Appeal.² CND itself first emerged in the late 1950s and early 1960s with the Aldermaston marches³ that inspired a generation. The Communist Party has always seen peace as a central issue, including the need both for measures of disarmament and for cuts in the enormous arms burden.

However, it was undoubtedly the NATO decision on Cruise and Pershing-II missiles in 1979 that led to the enormous and unparalleled expansion of the movement, and, more significantly, to clear opposition in public opinion to both the Cruise⁴ and to the decision to purchase Trident as a replacement for the obsolete Polaris.

In a public opinion poll at the beginning of this year, people were asked whether they approved or disapproved of the Cruise decision. Only 27 per cent said they approved, 12 per cent had no opinion, and a clear 61 per cent majority were opposed. A question on Trident showed a similar low level of approval — 25 per cent — and a slightly higher percentage with no definite opinion — 19 per cent. And once again a clear majority against.

During the election campaign it has become clear that a very big concern in people's minds

is the issue of control of Cruise, and on that question there is an even bigger majority — 80 per cent for a British veto on their use. And that question has provided the Conservative government with considerable embarrassment.

The same opinion surveys showed a sizable minority of around 21 per cent in support of the proposition that Britain should "abandon nuclear weapons no matter what other countries do." While the emphasis of the movement is on the immediate proposals for escalation of the arms race through Cruise and Trident, there is also a strong feeling that unilateral action is a component of the process of multilateral disarmament. As Monsignor Bruce Kent, General Secretary of CND, has put it: "A unilateralist is a multilateralist who means it." Unilateral moves could give an impetus to international negotiations. Demands for unilateral action also provide a focus for a mass popular and autonomous movement, and make peace an issue of mass politics.

The deep concern about nuclear war also arises from the fact that Britain, a densely populated island, is a very vulnerable target in a nuclear war and one that would suffer total destruction.

However, the factor which above all else has made peace such a prominent issue in the general election is that the labor movement has been won for positive peace policies and a non-nuclear defense policy. This is unprecedented. The resolution adopted at the TUC last year called for the cancellation of Cruise and Trident, and the removal of all nuclear bases from British soil and waters. The sentiment of the delegates was a rejection of the government thesis of nuclear deterrence as a means of guaranteeing peace: "Congress recognizes that there can be no effective medical response after a nuclear attack and is convinced that the prevention of nuclear war offers the only possibility of protecting people from its devastating consequences."

This declaration followed decisions by a number of unions to adopt such a policy and to affiliate to CND. This was by no means an automatic process but the product of consider-

able discussion. In some unions the vote was lost but there was discussion.

Defense policy, nuclear weapons, was a matter for wide public debate. This led to the historic decision of the Labour Party Conference to adopt unilateral nuclear disarmament as its policy. Along with withdrawal from the EEC and the alternative economic strategy to tackle unemployment, unilateral nuclear disarmament became one of the distinctive aspects of Labour's policy for the forthcoming general election. It was this development that sent shock waves through the establishment, raising as it did the prospect of a general election fought on the issue of nuclear weapons policy.

Labour's manifesto for the general election included this commitment in the emergency program of action to "Cancel the Trident program, refuse to deploy Cruise missiles and begin discussion for the removal of nuclear bases from Britain, which is to be completed within the lifetime of the Labour government," though, in the course of the campaign this commitment was undermined by speeches of some leaders of the Labour Party, and of former Labour Prime Minister, James Callaghan.

Another key aspect of the growth of the movement in these years was the development of new forms of struggle. Firstly, there was its mass character with over 1,000 local CND groups with a total membership of more than a quarter of a million, plus other peace committees.⁵ In towns and villages up and down the country, to advertise a meeting was to be greeted with hundreds of applications to join. CND's national organization with 55,000 members, elected national council, annual conference, publications, provide cohesion and structure.

There has also been the declaration of nuclear-free zones by local councils which also developed partly in response to government plans for civil defense. These plans were subjected to fierce criticism, and eventually the government's "Operation Hard Rock" civil defense exercise had to be abandoned because of the number of councils threatening non-cooperation.

So concerned did the Conservative government become at the rapid growth of CND that it was obliged to enter the arena of public debate in order to try to counter the arguments of the opponents of nuclear weapons. Needless to say, this counter-offensive has not been confined to straightforward debate. It has included a concerted campaign to denigrate the leading bodies of the CND, to label unilateralists as being "dupes of the Kremlin" and the

like. In addition to this vilification is the attempt to present the peace movement as wanting "one-sided disarmament," of wanting to leave the country defenseless.

While these arguments do not confuse the activists they need, and get, careful rebuttal. One result has been, as already mentioned, to increase greatly the amount of public discussion of what has most often been an untouched subject — defense policy.

The churches, too, have been increasingly involved in the question of nuclear weapons and the immorality of using them. While the report submitted to the leading body of the Church of England, and which advocated unilateral nuclear disarmament, was defeated, the ferment of discussion continues. Many thousands of Christians and members of other religious groupings have taken part in demonstrations and organized their own distinctive contributions as, for example, the action of Christian CND on May 23 who climbed the perimeter fence of the Upper Heyford nuclear bomber base and prayed, as U.S. planes roared overhead.

The following day hundreds of thousands of women took part in International Women's Day for Disarmament in 600 towns and villages throughout Britain. The section of the community to seize the headlines most dramatically has been the Women's Peace Movement. Their Peace Camp and actions at Greenham Common are now known throughout the world.⁶ They have shown, too, that direct action could both express a very distinctive women's approach to peace, as shown in the decorating of the perimeter fence with items of children's clothing and toys, and also win mass support and participation. Last December 30,000 women circled the base. At Easter tens of thousands, men and women, young and old, symbolically linked hands in a human chain surrounding the base.

The Communist Party has played a vital and distinctive part in this peace movement. It is active in all mass peace demonstrations and readily gives support to all initiatives that will help develop understanding. In particular, the party has emphasized the importance of winning trade union and labor movement involvement both in adopting these policies and in encouraging their members to take part in peace initiatives. The party has also conducted its own independent campaign, arguing its case in leaflets, pamphlets and meetings throughout the country.

Our 37th congress in 1981 detailed the main demands we are making. Among these were: opposition to Cruise missiles; an end to Polaris

and cancellation of the planned Trident; closure of all foreign and military and nuclear bases in Britain and the withdrawal of U.S. troops; unilateral nuclear disarmament for Britain as an essential step toward winning multilateral disarmament; an immediate two billion pounds cut in arms spending as a first step toward cutting the arms bill by half. This to be accompanied by conversion of the arms industry to socially useful production. (I should say that one of the Tory arguments has been that defense cuts mean unemployment. It is important to be able to counter this argument and to show very concretely that it is not the case, and in the recent period some of the trade unions have done important studies on how this conversion to socially useful production could take place and actually create more jobs.)

In addition our congress policy calls for Britain's withdrawal from NATO, a nuclear-free zone in Europe, and the mutual dissolution of both NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The Communist Party's peace activities have also sought to expose the big Tory lie of the Soviet threat, and to show that the fight for peace is not only an issue of national politics but demands also a change in Britain's foreign policy. This point, of course, was demonstrated most dramatically in the spring of 1982 with the Falklands war. We also emphasize the need to cooperate with peace organizations and liberation movements throughout the world.

Another important part of our independent activity has been demonstrated during the early part of the present general election campaign. That is, we have constantly warned that the winning of the labor movement for peace policies would be threatened by right-wing leaders, and this has proved to be the case. On the question of Polaris and on cuts in arms spending there have been very strong efforts made to confuse the issue and move away from labor's commitment to a non-nuclear defense policy.

To conclude, some points on the impact of the peace question on the general political situation in Britain.

Firstly, It has created a powerful and sustained mass pressure on the subject of nuclear weapons and disarmament, which has involved most diverse sections of the population. This is particularly marked among the young and among women, and has involved the trade union and labor movement in a big way. Mass demonstrations of a traditional nature are combined with new forms of activity. There is scarcely a democratic organization that has not been touched by this debate and these ac-

tivities, including the Liberal Party and some Tories, alongside the left parties. The government and the media response has largely failed in its attempts to denigrate the peace movement, although in the post-election period it will be necessary to have a fuller discussion of how questions of peace featured in the campaign. The broad base of the peace movement is also shown in the involvement of such as Scientists Against Nuclear Arms, the Medical Campaign Against Nuclear Weapons, and Architects for Peace.

Secondly, the peace movement has opened up for unparalleled public debate an area of policy that hitherto had remained a subject for "experts." There is now much discussion on defense, on non-nuclear defense policy, on alternative products. This debate also brings into question British foreign policy and role in the world.

A number of democratic questions have also been raised in a new way, starting with the question of the control of Cruise missiles, a concern much heightened by the considerable anxiety about American policy. But also the exposure of contingency plans for dealing with the aftermath of nuclear war have caused people to question the role of government in such a situation. The attempts to impose civil defense procedures have come up against the resistance of local authorities.

Not least in importance, the debate on nuclear weapons policy has presented a challenge to the right in the labor movement on one of the key fundamental points of policy, and opened up debate inside the labor movement. It is significant that one of the issues on which some of the right wing left the Labour Party to form the Social Democratic Party was precisely nuclear weapons.

After the general election, the issue of Cruise and of nuclear weapons policy will not go away. Nor will the mass peace movement. It will continue to grow, and to have a profound and lasting influence on political developments in Britain.

1. These elections were held on June 9, 1983, and they returned the Thatcher Conservative government to power. — Ed.

2. The Stockholm Appeal called for banning nuclear weapons, strict international control of compliance with this ban, and the proclamation as a war criminal the government that uses nuclear weapons first. This Appeal was adopted by the Standing Committee of the World Peace Congress in March 1950. Up to November 1950 it was signed by nearly 500 million people. — Ed.

3. These marches usually follow the route from Alder-

maston to London. The first march took place in April 1958. Since then, with the exception of the period 1969-1971, they have been held annually. — Ed.

4. One hundred and sixty Cruise missiles are to be stationed in Britain. — Ed.

5. Alongside the CND and other anti-war groups mentioned in this article, the British peace movement includes

the British Peace Assembly, Mothers for Peace, the movement for the rights of women of Northern Ireland, and other groups. Despite the diversity of their political attitudes, all are determined to inhibit any further escalation of the nuclear war threat. — Ed.

6. This is dealt with at length by Freda Brown in *WMR*, No. 3, 1983. — Ed.

For peace and life, against nuclear war

Roland Bauer,
SUPG CC member,
Chairman, WMR Commission on Problems of
Peace and Democratic Movements

COMMENTARY

The world is going through a troubled period. Hot-spots keep emerging in various parts of the globe. The Israeli soldiers are still committing excesses in Lebanon; the undeclared war at atmosphere along Nicaragua's borders is being intensified; the sorties by the South African racists and their mercenaries against the Front-line States are ever more brazen; bloodshed continues in the fratricidal Iran-Iraqi conflict. The European continent, across which runs the main divide between the two principal social systems of our day and where the NATO and the Warsaw Treaty forces are in confrontation with each other, has been converted into a mammoth arsenal.

Over the past few decades, thousands of men, women, children and old people have fallen victim to armed clashes, while tens and hundreds of thousands are dying of hunger, poverty and disease, having been sacrificed to the preparation of new wars. The spending on armaments now comes to \$600 billion a year — over \$1.5 billion a day. Used for peaceful purposes, all that money could have long since helped to put an end to the famines, the disease, the illiteracy, the housing crisis and unemployment.

Meanwhile, the specter of an atomic mushroom, the threat of an incinerating nuclear war is looming on the horizon. U.S. President Ronald Reagan has got Congress to agree to the deployment of 100 new strategic MX missiles. A highly mobile missile, the Midgetman, is to be developed over the next few years. Under U.S. diktat, the meeting of the seven major capitalist countries at Williamsburg reaffirmed the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe, so giving the green light to further spiralling the arms race. Penta-

gon chief Caspar Weinberger, who set out on a tour to check up on preparations for the deployment of the missiles and to nudge the hesitant NATO allies, was once again unable to refrain from bellicose statements; these were a reminder of Washington's plans for a "limited" and a "sustained" nuclear war, the projects for the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons and the program for militarizing outer space. All of this has caused alarm in and drawn protests from the broadest strata of the population on every continent.

A sense of alarm and protest, together with a comprehension of the urgent need to act to preserve and strengthen peace determined the atmosphere at the World Assembly for Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War, which was held in Prague at the end of June. Its 3,625 participants, who came to the Czechoslovak capital from every continent, from 132 countries with different social systems, represented 1,843 national, 108 international non-governmental and 11 inter-governmental organizations, that is virtually every social stratum, nation and ethnic group on the globe. This provided them with the opportunity of engaging in the broadest discussion and outspoken dialogue, in the course of which they voiced their common view: no task is more important for humankind today than to preserve and strengthen peace. The peoples are faced with this alternative: either to perish in nuclear omnicide which threatens all living beings, or to use their energies, strength and potentialities to avert another worldwide conflagration, with the prospect of eventually excluding wars from the life of the human community altogether. The participants in the World Assembly unanimously declared in their joint appeal: "War is not inevitable. It is not yet too late to prevent a nuclear

holocaust. Salvation is in the hands of the peoples themselves, of each man and woman, resolutely standing together for peace."

In the final third of the 20th century, in the epoch of the worldwide transition from capitalism to socialism, of the renewal of every form of social existence, and the advance of the scientific and technological revolution, humankind is truly in possession of the political, economic and military means for averting another world war.

First, as it was forcefully emphasized at the Prague Assembly, there is the world socialist system, which has now become, because of its inherent structure and state policy, the chief factor in the preservation of peace. The USSR was the first of all the countries to raise its voice both for general and complete disarmament and for an end to all types of nuclear weapons tests, liquidation of their stockpiles and a ban on their use. At a summit meeting in Moscow at the end of June, the representatives of the Warsaw Treaty countries once again came out against the nuclear arms race and against any military rivalry, and voiced their firm conviction that world problems, including the historical contest between socialism and capitalism, cannot be solved by military means.

Second, the overwhelming majority of the newly liberated countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, notably the non-aligned countries, want stronger peace and a spread of the process of détente to all the continents.

Third, the working-class movement, the communists and other social forces in the non-socialist part of the world are carrying on a struggle for peace and social progress. Statements in favor of peace and peaceful co-existence have come from the ruling circles of a number of neutral capitalist states: Sweden and Austria, among others.

Fourth, on every continent there is a widening of the mass public movements to avert a world thermonuclear war. As it was rightly noted at the Assembly in Prague, they have become a "powerful force, a determining factor in the international situation, capable of influencing the practical policies of governments in the direction of peace."

There has probably never before been such a broad forum attended by the representatives of all these forces and displaying such unanimity on the vital issue of averting the danger of war and preserving peace. No wonder, therefore, that hardly had the assembly got under way, when the imperialist mass media began to play down its importance, to claim that it was another "communist conspiracy" manipulated by "the hand of Moscow," and so on and so forth.

These assertions crumble like a house of cards, when one recalls the events which preceded the assembly: the broad sweep of the movement for peace, which we have witnessed in the recent period. Hundreds of thousands of demonstrators in the streets of Bonn, Brussels, London, Rome and Tokyo, half a million in Paris and Washington and a million in New York — nothing of the sort has ever happened there before either. In common columns with common anti-war slogans marching together are men and women of different generations, from different strata of the population, of different political affiliations, world views and cultural traditions. In Canada, the advocates of peace have staged demonstrations and pitch peace camps in protest against the planned testing of U.S. Cruise missiles on Canadian soil. In Japan, dockworkers in the major ports and workers at factories have come out against the entry of U.S. warships with nuclear weapons on board. In Western Europe, the participants in new mass demonstrations by working people took over from the Easter Peace Marchers which were staged on a tremendous scale in early April.

In many countries, there is a widening movement to declare cities and entire districts nuclear-free zones. In Britain, more than 150 town councils representing 50 million people have already proclaimed their territory free from nuclear weapons. In Belgium, mayors and municipal councillors in 230 towns and villages took a similar stand, and many towns in the Netherlands, the FRG, Italy and Denmark have been declared nuclear-free territory. In the United States itself, this movement has involved several states, where it is running parallel to the struggle for a freeze on the nuclear arsenals of the United States and the USSR. The wide human spectrum involved in the movement makes nonsense of the claims about "the hand of Moscow" or the "Communists."

What is more, I think, even some communists were surprised by the new scope, spontaneity and diversity of the present movement for peace, although they had fought for years to realize the great idea voiced by Georgi Dimitrov that the globe should be ringed with peace bastions from London to Tokyo, from Berlin to New York.

Indeed, it has changed substantially as compared with the peace movement of the 1950s and 1960s, and has a different character from any other movement of our day. The movement for peace is broader in the spectrum of participating nations, classes, parties, and political and ideological trends, it has more concentrated goals, and is more dynamic in its

action. Anyone can join this movement without being bound by programs, charters or commitments of any sort. That is its most important distinction and simultaneously its strength.

Today's movement in defense of peace, like the historical situation in which it originated, has no parallel in history. In the past, wars killed millions of people, inflicted untold suffering and caused immense losses, but they still lent themselves to control and they could be won. Today, a war with the use of nuclear weapons threatens the life of all humankind. The explosive power of the available nuclear weapons is sufficient to destroy the world many times over. A new world conflagration, while still being a continuation of politics by other means, would also be the end to all politics — in a nuclear war there can, after all, be neither victor nor vanquished. Even those who managed to find refuge in shelters would not find the conditions for survival when they got out. Such warnings have been repeatedly sounded by physicians from various countries. This terrible prospect has made for the general upsurge of the movement for peace, and not some kind of communist policy or propaganda.

All present and future world developments are inextricably bound up with the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, with the preservation of peace, with security and disarmament. On this largely depends the solution of urgent global problems: the need to overcome the backwardness of the newly liberated states; to provide the world's growing population with food, schools and hospitals; to satisfy humankind's present and future requirements in energy and raw materials; to preserve favorable ecological conditions; to use the resources of the world ocean, and to explore outer space. These global problems can be solved only in an atmosphere of peace and peaceful coexistence.

In the course of the discussions at the Prague Assembly, it was repeatedly stressed that our day is one of profound revolutionary changes and sharp contest in all the spheres which are vital to humankind. At various levels and in differing conditions, classes, peoples, nations and states seek to attain partially common and partially different objectives. Some are carrying on a struggle for the further development and improvement of socialist society; others, a struggle against the effects of the general crisis of capitalism; still others, a struggle for their complete national liberation or social emancipation. Almost always these struggles are in one way or another connected with the struggle against imperialism, and for peace and social progress. At the focus, at the center of this

gigantic contest there is a clash, unprecedented in intensity and acerbity, between the two diametrically opposite social systems, ideologies and key political lines.

As a result of all these objective realities, which determine the character and priorities of the communists' strategy, their practical policies, and tactics in ideological work, there arose a number of questions which can be correctly answered only if one understands the peculiarities of the present historical situation and the specifics of the peace movements of our day.

There is no doubt at all that preservation of peace and prevention of an annihilating nuclear war is the greatest priority, that which is *most important* today and in the foreseeable future. In the face of the threat such a war would pose to the whole of humankind, many, if not all, of the problems appear in a new light. That is how, I believe, one should understand the idea expressed by CPSU CC General Secretary Yuri Andropov at the June 1983 plenary meeting of the CPSU CC that "the threat of a nuclear war impending over the world compels a new evaluation of the fundamental meaning of the activity of the whole communist movement."*

In a historical situation in which the question of the existence or destruction of the human civilization is being decided, it is necessary to consciously push into the background differences on some other issues, so as to act together against the prospect of annihilation in a nuclear holocaust. Say, the traditional disputes between atheists and believers should not stand in the way of their unity to avert the nuclear threat. Differences concerning the ways and means of improving the world should not stand in the way of the unity of all the forces in defense of life, when the world is threatened with destruction. Even differences on a subject that is paramount for any peace movement like the question of the causes, sources and main culprits behind the arms race and the dangerous sharpening of the international situation should not be an impediment to mobilizing all the forces to avert war in view of the "life-or-death" alternative. We feel that the question of the dialectic of joint action and polemic, of the character, forms and methods of polemics within and without the movement for peace also appears in a new light.

The communists lay no claim to monopoly of the leadership of the peace movement. Nor do we have any ideological bias against the other forces in this movement. We do not at all be-

*Pravda, June 16, 1983.

lieve that if there is to be joint action, all differences need to be eliminated. Even when we are convinced that our knowledge, views and positions are correct, even then we do not set them up as yardsticks or necessary conditions for active work in defense of peace. No one has the right to make interaction between the various political or ideological forces contingent on the others accepting his views.

The communists take a different view of many things than do other organizations and forces acting within the framework of the peace movements. We are also aware that the motives, political intentions and long-term goals of some forces now acting for peace and in the name of peace differ radically from our own. But what is most essential is the political fact that, despite the many differences and even contradictions, highly diverse forces are now prepared, for the sake of safeguarding humankind, to seek points of contact making possible joint action for the attainment of the common goal: to avert a devastating nuclear war. Cooperation implies consideration of the views and positions of others wishing to act together.

The free and open dialogue carried on in this vein between the various social circles and trends is all the more necessary in view of the numerous attempts to split the peace movement and even to set some of its circles against socialism. All the partners in the dialogue have a responsibility to carry on the inevitable discussion, not for the sake of debate as such, but for the purpose of attaining positive results, without letting the discussion run into a barren channel leading away from the main issues. It is not the number of controversial issues, not the sharpness or loudness of the words and arguments used that are the touchstone of success in such a dialogue, but only the sum-total of the propositions on which an understanding has been reached, with their common aspects brought out, only the effectiveness of the action taken, of the real steps and results along the hard, contradictory and long way to averting a thermonuclear world war, to achieving peaceful cooperation, disarmament and lasting peace.

We feel that the strength of the movement, multiplying its capacity to put pressure on the parties and governments which have not acted in the interests of the masses, lies in readiness to cooperate for the sake of peace, regardless of political and ideological contradictions. But it would evidently be wrong to ignore the fact that certain internal trends in the present movement for peace spring from the inevitable difference of notions about the causes of the heightened war danger and the ways to elimin-

ate it. Transcending, as it does, all the national, class and ideological boundaries, this movement cannot have a common standpoint on all the issues arising from the problems of war and peace. To demand that it should would mean sharply narrowing down the movement and depriving it of many supporters, and eventually ruining it. At the same time, if it is to resist diverse external influences and internal contradictions, it must inevitably choose common goals that all its participants can understand and accept. The Prague Assembly for Peace and Life has shown that such goals stand out in ever bolder relief. These are, first of all, the most urgent demands of the peoples of the world formulated in the Assembly's appeal:

No to new missiles in Europe!

Yes to real negotiations on the reduction of all types of nuclear weapons in Europe!

Freeze all nuclear arsenals now!

No to nuclear weapons in the West or in the East, around the world!

Stop the arms race, nuclear and conventional!

Yes to nuclear-free zones!

For general and complete disarmament!

Peaceful political negotiations, not military confrontation!

The world's resources for peace and life!

Peace, freedom, independence and prosperity for all nations!

There are, I repeat, different views of how to realize these principles; indeed, there are even different views concerning the extent of the blame for the arms race falling on this or that side in the world confrontation. Some equally accuse the USSR and the United States of having caused the present difficult international situation. Such assertions were also made, though not frequently, in some speeches at the Assembly in Prague. I myself, like the communists of my country, for whom peace is the meaning and goal of the whole of foreign policy, believe that the question is clear and requires no debate: imperialism, above all U.S. imperialism, is the source of the danger of a third annihilating world war. Socialism's ideal and philosophy are not war, but the strengthening of peace. Our social system has no need of war, our world view rejects force as an instrument for solving international problems, our laws prohibit the propaganda of militarism. I think that people in the non-socialist part of the world are increasingly coming to realize this, and that is something the Prague Assembly has once again demonstrated.

There is no doubt that the purposefulness and effectiveness of peace action in this or that country largely depend on the capacity of pub-

lic circles to understand and explain the existing reality correctly. We, communists, will always fight against the notorious "Red peril from the East" lie, the main lie of the 20th century, and against the idea that there must be "equidistance" from the USSR and the United States, with these two great powers equally blamed for the arms race and the sharpening of tensions in the world.

It is not the existence of the two world systems or the contest between them that jeopardizes peace and European security. Peace is jeopardized by the intention of one of the systems to destroy the other. And a look at the facts will show even to the inexperienced which system has set itself such a reckless goal.

The Soviet Union has no military bases around the United States. Its leaders have never threatened to use weapons, to use force to destroy the United States and do away with the American way of life. The USSR wants Europe to be a nuclear-free continent and is prepared even today to effect a radical reduction of nuclear weapons in the area with the maintenance of a rough parity with NATO not only in the delivery vehicles of medium-range nuclear weapons, but also in the number of warheads they carry, and this a parity at a very much lower level than just now. The USSR has unilaterally halted the further deployment of medium-range missiles on its territory where these would be within range of the countries of Western Europe. In their Prague Declaration, the Warsaw Treaty countries proposed that the continent should also be cleared of chemical weapons.

The USSR agrees that while the talks on limiting and reducing strategic nuclear weapons are in progress the nuclear arsenals of both sides should be frozen.

Finally, the Soviet Union has unilaterally pledged itself not to use nuclear weapons first. The Warsaw Treaty countries have invited the NATO countries to conclude a treaty on the mutual non-use of armed force and on the maintenance of peaceful relations.

How have the governments of the United States and the other NATO countries responded to these calls? There has effectively been no response. No constructive reply has come forth. On the contrary, the United States and some of its allies have themselves made no secret of the fact that their acts continue the line of attaining military superiority.

We, the communists of the socialist countries, believe that it is imperative to stop the formulation of diverse doctrines suggesting the false idea that victory can be won in a nuclear war. We share the apprehensions that such a

war would destroy all living beings on the globe. We note with satisfaction that the socialist community countries' initiatives designed to strengthen peace and security have met with approval from the other fraternal parties and from the whole of progressive world opinion.

Last April, the communist and workers' parties of eight NATO countries — Canada, Denmark, FRG, Greece, Luxembourg, Norway, Turkey and the United States — emphasized in a joint appeal: the proposals of the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty Organization clearly show that it is possible to reach solutions which take into account the equal security of the sides. The USSR and WTO proposals on the non-use of armed force against the NATO member states, on disarmament and on a relaxation of tensions, the appeal says, together with their positive response to the proposals of the Swedish government and the governments of the Balkan countries concerning the establishment of nuclear-free zones and the proposals of the non-aligned states on disarmament provide the peoples with a reliable reference point and give their struggle a mighty impetus.

But at this point, there is also a need to ponder the following. We, communists, have been frequently reproached for saying a great deal about the proposals of the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty Organization and of giving them wholehearted support, while allegedly being altogether incapable of grasping the initiatives of the United States and NATO, which, it is said, also have many constructive proposals, like Reagan's "zero" and "interim" options for Europe, which have been approved by the governments of Great Britain, the FRG, and several other countries. I must frankly say that we in the GDR, like our friends in the fraternal socialist countries, find it very hard to believe that the European advocates of the "zero" or "interim" options are unbiased and disinterested, for these "options" are designed to attain military superiority.

It is common knowledge that equality and equal security for all, big and small nations, developed and developing countries, can be the only realistic basis for disarmament. But what kind of equal security can there be when both the "zero" and the "interim" option and the just as widely advertised U.S. proposal for a sizable cut in Soviet land-based strategic missiles (the USSR's main strategic weapon) with a virtual retention of all the U.S. submarine-based nuclear missiles (the USA's main strategic weapon) are from the start designed to reduce the security level for the one side and raise it for the other? What then is the purpose of such "initiatives," which have no prospect of

being accepted? The purpose is to lay the blame on the other side, to accuse the USSR and the other Warsaw Treaty countries of being "intransigent" when it comes to disarmament, and behind this propaganda smokescreen to develop one's own armaments program covering land, air, sea and outer space, a total program for the destruction of socialism as a socio-political system.

The existing equilibrium between the armed forces of the USSR and the United States, of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO serves to contain the aggressive schemes of imperialism. The Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries are fully resolved to prevent this parity from being upset. That is why the Soviet government's serious warning that in view of the growing threat to the security of the USSR and its allies, the Land of Soviets is confronted with the need to take counter-measures to strengthen its defense capability, including the deployment of appropriate strategic systems, is timely and legitimate. If an understanding on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe ruling out the deployment of new U.S. missiles in the area is thwarted, the Soviet Union will have to take effective counter-measures in this field as well.

Every right-minded person will realize that Moscow's warning is a logical response to the growing war danger coming from imperialism.

Together with the U.S. ruling circles, a great responsibility for this kind of development of the international situation in Europe and the world falls on the FRG government. After all, it is in the FRG that revanchists demanding changes in the existing European borders keep staging rallies under police protection. The incumbent FRG government is among the political forces in Europe which are prepared to turn their countries into nuclear hostages of the United States, and which have unconditionally followed in the wake of the Reagan administration's dangerous line.

We, communists of the GDR, feel, for instance, that if not only the GDR, but also the FRG insisted that, following the Soviet Union, the other nuclear powers should also repudiate the first use of nuclear weapons, that would benefit the cause of peace, security in Europe and cooperation. The FRG should, like the GDR, support the proposal for a nuclear-free Europe, for the conclusion by the Warsaw Treaty and the NATO countries of an agreement on a mutual repudiation of the use of armed force and on the maintenance of peaceful relations between them. The FRG should, like the GDR, insist that an understanding be reached at the Geneva talks both on the number of medium-

range missiles held by each side and on the number of land, sea, and air-based warheads. Like the GDR, the FRG should insist that the United States also express at the Geneva disarmament conference a readiness to work out and to conclude in the shortest possible time a treaty on the complete and comprehensive prohibition of nuclear weapons tests.

Indeed, as the experience of our century shows, all of this still falls short of giving a 100 per cent guarantee of security, for the dangerous weapons would still be there. But their use would be prohibited by treaty, and this, as compared with the present state, would already be an advance. After all, if each of the states promised not to be the first to use nuclear or conventional weapons, there would then also be no one having to use them second. Such a step would undoubtedly also put limits on the development, production and deployment of new types of weapons.

The Prague Assembly has shown once again that in the recent period there has been an unprecedented widening of the spectrum of forces which believe that the only way to reliable peace and security lies through the limitation, reduction and liquidation of the accumulated weapons stockpiles.

It is quite natural that, having to act under the capitalist system, which itself generates the danger of war, many participants in the anti-war movement oppose only the effects but not the causes, which they either fail to see or do not understand. The logic of the struggle, however, inevitably impels the movement to intrude into the sphere of social problems. Life shows to its participants the interconnection between the struggle against the arms race and the danger of war, and the struggle against militarism generally, against the subordination of the society to the dominant military-industrial mafia, and for the realization of people's social rights: the right to work, rest, health care, education. In these conditions, we believe it is important that the communists should not only master the art of acting together with various anti-war forces, working to overcome the misunderstanding, mistrust and rivalry, standing up for cohesion and cooperation, but also be able to grasp professionally and in depth the intricate questions of military technology and the specifics and interconnections of each problem produced by militarism. That is a necessary prerequisite to enable the masses to take part consciously in the anti-war movement.

Human reason rebels against the war danger, against the senseless waste of the world's funds

and resources for the production of the instruments of death and for preparation of a nuclear holocaust. The peoples believe that common sense will ultimately triumph. Success in this historical struggle between the forces of peace and the forces of war will not come of itself. Historical experience shows that it is no use begging for peace, that peace must be fought for and defended.

The united strength of the mass movement for peace is capable of holding in check those

who love military gambles and of preventing the destruction of life on the Earth. That is a point on which a broad consensus was reached at the Assembly in Prague. Negotiations, and not a build-up of arsenals of death-dealing weapons, are the only clear road into the future which accords with the interests of humankind. On behalf of the millions of peace fighters from various countries, this idea was once again reaffirmed by the World Assembly for Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War.

At the heart of the ideological battles

Robert Steigerwald
German CP Board member

MARXISM A HUNDRED YEARS AFTER MARX

Classical bourgeois thought and art strove to comprehend the "whole." Hegel believed that the whole alone constituted the truth. Goethe wanted to discover the "inner nexus of the universe." Today, the bourgeoisie, against whom the working class and anti-imperialist movement is contending for this whole, for its universe, has totally different interests in the field of knowledge. It now has a need of conceptions that confine cognition and activity only to the *limits of the bourgeois world*. It is not allowed to go beyond these limits, for the assumption is that knowledge and activity must go on serving capitalism. How is that achieved by contemporary bourgeois philosophers? They present the crisis of bourgeois being as the crisis of human being, claiming that it springs from our ostensibly limited capacity for cognition. Indeed, they assert that that which exists beyond capitalism (even if it does actually exist) is unknowable. In other words, capitalism is depicted as an insuperable final state of human history. Existing socialism — and here the extreme rightists and the ultra-left Trotskyites are of the same mind — is an "aberration," a line of development which has to be cut short as soon as possible. In philosophical jargon, this is called "impotence of the spirit," "parting with history," "the end of philosophy," etc.

Such are, one could say, the coordinates of all the variable vogues which sway the philosophical doctrines of the contemporary bourgeoisie as they criticize Marxism. It is a criticism that is caused above all by the growing might of socialism, for the time is long past

when Marx's doctrine could simply be ignored. And while the scale of covert criticism of Marxism is still considerable, the problems of Marxism, "neo-Marxism" and anti-Marxism tend to prevail in West German philosophical writings, as one recent survey of contemporary philosophy shows.¹ Consequently Marxism increasingly imposes its own topics on bourgeois philosophers.

The philosophical critique of Marxism tends to run above all within the framework of two lines of latter-day bourgeois thinking: positivism, a subjective idealist philosophical trend, and the "philosophy of life," which have both a purely philosophical and a socio-political orientation.²

How Marxism is ousted from the "higher spheres" of knowledge

The "philosophy of life" has come up with an elaborate critique of Marxism whose point of departure is the interpretation of the role of consciousness as an element that is essentially a complement to man's imperfect biological organism. It is said that consciousness provides man with the means in the struggle for survival. The spirit, especially in its rational form, helps to dominate Nature. To the extent that our concepts are a comprehension of reality, we subordinate the world of life by means of a type of rationality which transforms objects into predictable ones that are fit for the performance of functions and that lend themselves to operation. That, it is said, is the origin of domination and of hostility to life.

The whole of latter-day bourgeois thinking provides a cover for that kind of reasoning.

These ideas, initially expressed in the past century by the reactionary German philosopher Nietzsche, will be found in the writings of the founder of the phenomenological school Husserl, the existentialist Heidegger, Horkheimer, who for more than 30 years headed the Frankfurt Institute of Social Studies, and Adorno, the co-author of his book *Dialectics of Education*, and Marcuse. We find Habermas of the Frankfurt school inclining to these ideas, and in the recent period also the so-called "new philosophers" in France and many Greens. The "therapy" which they all propose boils down to a substitution of some modern myth for reason. This line (from Nietzsche via Heidegger to its present adherents) and, as will be shown below, the British philosopher Karl Popper's positivism as well, demand a "repudiation" of the European philosophical tradition and a "return" to the period before Socrates, for it was he who stands at the beginning of conceptual thinking, of rationalism and — in connection with it — of all "evil" all the way to Karl Marx. The latest word in latter-day bourgeois ideology is a break with the traditions of West European philosophy and with the history of cultural and spiritual development, because they are the source of Marxism. Such an approach is taken by the "philosophy of life" not only of the fascist (Alfred Rosenberg, *The Myth of the 20th Century*), but also of the liberal (Sigmund Freud) or the "left" persuasion (Herbert Marcuse).

This main thesis was elaborated above all in the writings of Heidegger, and this needs to be dealt with, however briefly, in view of the latter's influence both on the contemporary clerical critique of Marxism, and on the present-day non-proletarian protest.

Like Nietzsche, Heidegger asserts that since the time of Socrates West European philosophy has followed an erroneous way of cognition. Philosophy has allegedly lost itself in the existence which appears in the foreground, by which Heidegger means objective reality. He depicts it "super-critically" only as a world of phenomena, beyond which lies the true reality that is essentially spiritual. That is what Heidegger calls "being." Having started out in quest of this "superficial existence," philosophy since Socrates has allegedly forgotten about the true being. It has increasingly dispersed itself among the various sciences. It wanted to help men to master the world, first through concepts and then in actual fact. But that is allegedly what has directly resulted in the tragedy of our day. Science is the consummation and end of that philosophy which has forgotten about the study of the "true,"

Heidegger being ("oblivion of being"). Science has simultaneously developed as technology and together with it rules the world. Consequently, at the end of this way of aberration stands the boundless and "planetary" domination of technology. The world is in a state of stagnation and is short of vital forces. And Marxism is precisely the consummation of this false West European way of thinking.³ Consequently, the "philosophy of life" presents Marxism as the substance of the "crisis of the times." The fact that Marxism spells out in theoretical terms the death sentence for capitalism is distorted through the prism of bourgeois ideology.

The demonic role of technology is deduced from man's allegedly false "proto-choice," which is false because that initial choice implied the possibility of establishing control over the whole of being with the aid of science and technology, something that is rejected by the "philosophy of life." The point, consequently, is to alter man's "proto-choice" and his plans and projects.

However, bourgeois philosophy cannot ultimately be reduced to presenting technology as an absolute evil, for no bourgeois politician would have any use for that kind of philosophy. After all, the bourgeoisie and its intelligentsia live off what this technology yields (indeed, without printing, radio and television, the products of the anti-technology philosophers would simply have no consumers at all). It follows that the actual point is a different one, namely, the identification of different levels of human being.

There is allegedly its lowest level, the level of "doing and doers" (this is evidently a distorted reflection of the fact that the bourgeoisie cannot manage without the workers). This level is connected with technology and the logico-rational sciences, which are fully adequate to it. But there is allegedly also a higher level of human being, when men no longer "do," but "use what has been done"! It corresponds to the higher and allegedly supra-rational forms of cognition, activity and community. Just as the level of "doing and doers" correlates with mass being, so the level of this higher phase of humanity correlates with the mode of existence of élites and the corresponding "higher" forms of community.

The anti-democratic character of this conception leaps to the eye. Although it allows that both levels of human being appear to be necessary (after all, say the bourgeois philosophers, technology is our "destiny") it is the "supra-technical," the "supra-rational," that is the "truly human." And here we come to the gist.

Marxism is referred to the rational-technical mode of thinking of the "lower" type of being. Hence the conclusion that Marxism is allegedly just as incapable of perceiving the sphere of true human knowledge, experience and being, as the mass working-class movement. That is where the in-depth meaning of the latter-day bourgeois philosophical interpretations of the role and nature of technology lies. In holding forth about the negative effects of technical progress, this philosophy switches attention from capitalism to technology. Since it connects the latter with socialism, its critique of technology turns out to be primarily a critique of scientific socialism:⁴ its target is precisely scientific socialism and the working-class movement oriented toward it. This is one of the methods of indirect criticism of Marxism.

Present-day non-proletarian protest is for the most part unconsciously allied with such latter-day bourgeois philosophical interpretations. In the atmosphere of the general crisis of capitalism, the potential of this protest tends to increase. In political and social terms, it is the reaction of non-proletarian strata to the hard problems with which they are confronted by the epoch of the worldwide transition to socialism. But being spontaneous and petty-bourgeois, this protest tends to run along the course of false ideological and political conceptions (initially, at any rate, until the working class is able to alter this tendency by means of a patient policy of alliances and ideological contest). That is the ideological development of non-proletarian protest in which the critique of Marxism influenced by the "philosophy of life" is most markedly manifested.

The critique of Marxism by the advocates of the "philosophy of life" often leaves the impression that they oppose present-day Marxism on the strength of Marx's own writings, and this is achieved by means of a trick suggesting that "philosophy of life" ideas will be found in Marx's writings.

Here is how the trick works. Marx frequently said that people make their own history, but have to do so in circumstances not of their own choosing. If one takes the first half of this statement and drops the second (as Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse and Schmidt among others do) Marx appears as the proponent of a philosophy which holds that man (separated from Nature, i.e., virtually as a spiritual being) creates, "constitutes" the world and dialectics by his own "practice" (which in this version amounts to spiritual practice!). In other words, Marx is presented as the "chief witness" in favor of the idea of "reification" which is put forward by the "philosophy of life," an idea that

the world ultimately has a spiritual instead of a material nature.

Marx wrote that in its rational form dialectics "is a scandal and abomination to bourgeoisdom and its doctrinaire professors."⁵ That is just as true of latter-day bourgeois philosophical thinking.

It is asserted, for instance, that materialist dialectics is degeneration, because "true dialectics" is based on the interaction of consciousness and production, and is the exclusive result of such "practice." Marxian dialectics, these critics aver, "is not materialist since it is not the law of motion of the *natural matter* which exists on its own, but the law of the self-production of the human race."⁶ That is a downright fraud. In his *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, Marx wrote: "A being who is objective acts objectively, and he would not act objectively if the objective did not reside in the very nature of his being. He creates or establishes only objects, because he is established by objects — because at bottom he is *nature*."⁷

Such frauds are not novel at all. Professor Wetter, a Jesuit father, suggested back in 1958 that in contrast to Engels' dialectics, Marx's dialectics had no "time context," because of his alleged assumption of man's presence in advance. That is why the "constitution," creation of a "unity comprising Nature and man," even if such unity is "revealed in history," precedes this revelation which occurs with the passage of time.⁸ From his construct, Wetter draws this conclusion: here the ideal factor is once again "involved in the basic constitution of reality,"⁹ and this is said to be found in the writings of Karl Marx — of all people! One will realize that in this case, we are urged Nature is no longer primary, and consequently that is no longer materialism. Wetter asks: Is dialectical materialism at all possible on such a basis? That is how a distortion of Marx's approach tends to confuse the question. But then what are bourgeois philosophers to do in the absence of any serious arguments?

The tendency to distort Marxist dialectics in the Catholic critique of Marxism was first observed in the writings of the Catholic sociologist J. Hommes, who said: "The real things of which Engels says that they are reflected in the human head, are no longer in any sense Nature as such existing independently of man."¹⁰ In dialectics, he asserts, man actually subordinates himself to the whole of being. (But let us ask: What is man? Spirit alone? Or perhaps he is after all made of flesh and blood? What does he subordinate to the whole of being when he submits to it? His incorporeal thoughts? But

can thoughts exist without the brain which thinks? Or are we basically dealing with a pure specter?) Hommes claims that in "genuine Marxism," the objective world allegedly appears only as embodied human practice. (This suggests that a "pure" spirit has generated the objective world! And that is said to be "genuine Marxism"!)

Hommes goes on: "Wherever dialectical method is fully applied in accordance with its substance . . . it is no longer able to recognize the existence of a reality given in advance to life and action."¹¹ Let us note in this context that Feuerbach, a predecessor of Marx's, objected to this kind of philosophizing by pointing out that equating subjective sensation and the objective world amounted to equating wet dreams and impregnation.¹²

This means that in this line of argument as well, dialectics is recognized only *inasmuch* as it is spiritual, and that is a view ascribed to Marx, who kept emphasizing that his dialectics differs from Hegel's, which is based on the recognition of the spirit as the creator of the world, in that for Marx "the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought."¹³

Marxism has been criticized in even more trivial forms. Thus, Walter Hesselbach, President of the Friedrich Ebert Fund (SDPG), declared at the opening of functions to mark the centenary of Marx's death (Trier, March 13-16, 1983) that it was impossible to comprehend the future by means of Marx's concepts and that ethical and moral postulates and principles were therefore more important for social democracy than the controversial propositions of the "materialist view of history." This contrast of ethics and historical materialism reveals an astounding ignorance! This is yet another attempt to circulate the false idea that Marxism is an immoral doctrine.

Philosophical convergence on the basis of anti-Marxism

The anti-Marxism of the "philosophy of life" is fairly manifest. Without considering it in detail, let us merely note that the positivist line of thinking also proceeds in a basically anti-Marxist spirit, increasingly approximating the "philosophy of life." Indeed, even the basic propositions of the concrete criticism of Marxism by both these lines of the latter-day bourgeois thinking are identical. The latest critique of Marxism has been elaborated or popularized in two versions: the ultra-left and the right. The current ultra-left line of argument is aimed against Lenin and is identical with that put forward by empirio-criticism in the early 20th century, a line criticized in depth by

Lenin.¹⁴ This line of argument is based on subjective idealism and rejects the existence of objective reality. This is done in order to reject the objective social uniformities, and if these do not exist, the conduct of a voluntaristic, putschist policy is inevitable.

The line of argument advanced by the avowed right is based on the following scheme: recognition of "a whole" having objective laws allegedly implies a denial of human freedom and so, inevitably, leads to totalitarianism. This is a rehash of the hackneyed argument of Marx's opponents: Marxism allegedly declares the individual to be a magnitude which has no value, regarding man to be "accidental" and subject to some kind of "inexorable economic laws."

These "defects" of the scientific world view of the working class are, its adversaries assert, rooted in Marx's own character. E. Topitsch, whose critique of Marx has run in the wake of Popper's, claims that even as a young man Marx believed that he was "one of the elect" and that this feeling developed "increasingly into a sense of messianism and caesarean pretensions to power."¹⁵ G. Rormoser, another conservative critic of Marx, who could be classed along with the advocates of the "philosophy of life," asserts that the distortion of "Marxist humanism" is latent in "Marx's own approach."¹⁶

Here we have a commonplace method in low-grade criticism of Marx. It tends to reduce all the basic state acts to the personal qualities of great men, a method of explaining history that was excusable at the dawn of historical science. But it is simply ridiculous to give psychological and individualistic explanations to major historical processes today, after such a view of history has been exposed by the classical German bourgeois philosophy as befitting the mentality of lackeys. Lenin already said that some who spread such notions hope to reject Marx out of hand on the plea that "there was indeed nothing behind the Marxist teaching save the 'subjective' views of Marx."¹⁷ Lenin showed that not the slightest hint of such an idealistic perversion will be found anywhere in the writings of Marx and Engels, and that "from the standpoint of this nonsense it is inevitable that Marxism must be rejected *completely*, from the very beginning, from its fundamental philosophical premises."¹⁸

There is a good reason for the kinship between the anti-Marxist ideas of the "philosophy of life" and of positivism. Both these lines of thinking are idealistic. Their answer to the "first part" of the basic question of philosophy — the correlation of the material

and the ideal — is that the world was created by the spirit. Positivism does not, as a rule, go beyond sensory data. (If sensory data are the ultimate given reality, it follows that the subject himself creates, “constitutes,” the reality). The adherents of the “philosophy of life” essentially start from the same premise. Marxists perceive the world existing outside our consciousness and independently of it precisely as it is, without the influence of any “spiritual” creator. The “philosophy of life” objects: to think so is to think erroneously, “in alienation,” with “reification,” and to fail to notice that things do not exist of themselves but have been created either by our own selves or by some spiritual being. What is taken to be the material is actually said to be the spiritual.

The positivist thinker regards the world as a casual agglomeration: we cannot, he says, explain how or why sensory data originate. He does not recognize that the world is an interconnected whole. (Capitalism — a system, a “whole”? That is a bogey!) But if no whole exists, then there is nothing to develop. It follows that there is no way running from that which allegedly should not exist — capitalism — to that which allegedly cannot exist either — socialism. In this way, positivist thinking obviates the problem of development and justifies the “parting with history.” It is a philosophical frame of mind that reflects the bourgeoisie’s fear of the future.

In contrast to positivism, the “philosophy of life” deals with the category of “reality” and does not confine itself to sensory data. The “reality” here is replaceable by “life.” But let us take a closer look. The concept of “life,” according to this philosophy, has here something in common with life only in the biological sense, because it “biologizes” the laws of capitalist competition: “To Live Is to Suffer,” “Sacrifices Are Inevitable,” “Devour or Be Devoured” (those are the roots of so-called social-Darwinism). It is unnatural to rebel against this kind of order, for that would mean swimming against the tide of life itself. Consequently, the categories of “life” and “reality” in this case merely create a semblance of objective reality. In actual fact, they represent the spiritual. That is the hoax perpetrated by bourgeois ideology.

The “philosophy of life” can recognize “development” but, first, only within the framework of “biologized” capitalist laws of exploitation and competition (“to live is to suffer,” etc.). Second, development is recognized only as a gradual organic growth, without revolutions which are “alien to life.” The death of a biological organism does not mean its transformation into a new organism, but its

demise. That is why there is, allegedly, no way running from capitalism to socialism. In this way, both in the “philosophy of life” and in positivism development is ultimately alien to the “reality.”

As a system, capitalism is entirely irrational and does not lend itself to planning, although planning is possible in some of its units, for instance, on the level of the enterprise. From this positivism deduces a virtue. It allows a superficial and partial rationality, partial cognition and partial planning. Consequently, in socio-political terms, it reveals itself to be — for instance, in the “social technology” of Wilson, Keynes and Popper, as state-monopoly reformism. In this way positivism serves big capital, denying that the uniformities of capitalism as a whole can be understood, and that it is historically rooted.

The “philosophy of life” seems to criticize positivism. It says: the superficial and partial rationality on which the positivists hold forth are “knowledge serving domination.” Thus, from its standpoint, even this limited, castrated and halved rationalism goes too far. The theory of the social whole (“the whole,” says Adorno, is non-truth) is also connected with such domination-serving “scientific,” i.e., scientific, knowledge. Consequently, it, too, needs to be rejected. As a result, this philosophy leads into the darkness of irrationalism.

The “philosophy of life” and positivism signify abandonment of materialist dialectics and of reason, and are ranged against the Marxist philosophy of reason and struggle. Positivism “halves” reason (Habermas) by confining it to the system of relations within capitalism. Here, the whole is referred to an order of meaningless expressions. The “philosophy of life” denounces rationality as a means of domination. In place of it, as has been said, it puts the latter-day bourgeois mythologizing. Both these conceptions skim along the surface of phenomena in capitalist society. They only differ in that the “philosophy of life” creates a false image of the capitalist world, while positivism declares: seek nothing beyond the limits of this world. It is such as you perceive it. Be content with it. Make yourselves at home in it. Eliminate its glaring defects by means of reform, for there is no better world. In this way both conceptions also give a false, agnostic answer to the “second part” of the basic question of philosophy, i.e., the question of the cognoscibility of the world.

For all that, the “philosophy of life” has a greater part to play in criticizing Marxism. After all, it is a line of thinking that does not, at first sight, question the reality and its develop-

touch with reality than positivism is, and that is essential in the struggle for men's minds.

The two trends could converge under the pressure of the growing manifestations of the crisis of capitalism and on the basis of the similarity of their basic philosophical tenets characterized above. These trends of thought have become the definitive ones in philosophy in warding off the danger impending over the bourgeois social system. It is not surprising, therefore, that they have been drawing closer to each other, borrowing ideas from, and "converging" with each other. When Fritz Heine mann was putting together his encyclopedia *Philosophy in the 20th Century*,¹⁹ there was evidence precisely of such "convergence" of positivism and the "philosophy of life" in their confrontation with Marxism. Karl Popper, who started out as a modern positivist, moved closer in his later writings to the objective idealism of the "philosophy of life," just as Heidegger, an advocate of the "philosophy of life," in his later writings delved into linguistic analysis, where positivism set the tone.²⁰

Representatives of the two lines of thinking which stage "great fights" with each other at philosophical congresses are at one in their approach to tackling the problem of "domination and oppression." Both are bogged down in the pseudo-"concrete" and wish to have capitalism as a system, a "whole," consigned to oblivion. This applies primarily to positivism, but also, for instance, to Adorno's later writings, which took shape under the influence of the "philosophy of life." He attacks every kind of "system" and systemic thinking, regarding them as doing violence to the individual and the concrete.²¹ The two lines also converge on the demand that the European philosophical tradition should be abandoned. Popper has criticized — on the same fundamental basis as Nietzsche and Heidegger — the "terrorism" of the great European philosophy originating with Plato and culminating with Marx.²² It is true that he does not demand, as Nietzsche, Heidegger and others did, that this way of cognition should be cancelled out. But what is left of it without Plato, Hegel and Marx?

Consequently, from the standpoint of the bourgeois philosophers, the world view of Marx, Engels and Lenin amounts to a virtual scandal. It remains for us to recall the Marxist critique of the basic propositions of the latter-day bourgeois philosophy:

— the idea that only our subjective spiritual element exists and engenders reality is shattered by the fact that Nature existed before the emergence of humankind with its spirituality, and that in the course of the natural process of

ment, which is why it appears to be less out of development we originated from Nature and are ourselves a part of it;

— the idea that there is a spirit which has created the world, a spirit outside the subject can be a matter of faith but not of scientific demonstration; and

— the question of cognoscibility or non-cognoscibility constitutes a bourgeois dilemma.

The latter is exemplified by one of the basic problems of social cognition and practice. For decades, the bourgeoisie has wrestled with the question of cognition and elimination of the causes of cyclical economic crises. It has set up countless institutions, regulatory agencies and so on. Its strategists — from Keynes to Friedman — have spun out economic theories for averting crises, theories based on philosophical conceptions (above all positivism). After all, even Popper is a philosopher in the first place.

As for "cognition" of the crisis and its "therapy," all these lines, despite their individual contradictions, are agreed that in the cognition of the causes of the crisis no account should be taken of capitalist property and capitalist exploitation resulting in disproportions between production and the market: all of these must be taboo. That is a concrete expression of man's allegedly limited capacity to understand the world, which springs from the urge to depict capitalism as the ultimate state of human history.

We now have before us the results of this approach: all the leading capitalist countries are in the grip of a cyclical crisis, regardless of the recipes for "cognition" and economic "therapy" adopted by those in power in these countries.

It is precisely on the fundamental problem of the crisis that Marxism differs from any latter-day bourgeois theory and concept for curing the ills of the capitalist economy. It has been able to expose the real causes of the economic crisis of capitalism because it does not lay down any socially-determined limits to cognition. The development of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries over the decades shows that the Marxist comprehension of the causes of the cyclical crises of overproduction under capitalism and the ways of their eradication through the building of a socialist society is sound.

* * *

What is the role of Marxism in philosophical disputes today? First, it stands at the center of all the basic ideological battles. Second, the Marxist philosophy equips humankind with the instruments that help to obtain true answers

to the great questions of our day. That is why its attractive power has been growing.

Consequently, all of this has a bearing not only on philosophy but also on the everyday life of the masses. It does not follow from this, of course, that there is something automatic about the understanding of the correctness of the Marxist philosophy. No, it calls for painstaking ideological effort by the communists which is capable of carrying conviction.

1. C. Grossner, *Verfall der Philosophie. Politik deutscher Philosophen*, Hamburg, 1971.

2. As far as I am aware, this idea was first elaborated by Manfred Buhr (GDR) and Andre Gedo (Hungary).

3. See M. Heidegger, *Zur Sache des Denkens*, Tübingen, 1969, p. 54.

4. Our reason is engaged only in the spiritual and technical comprehension of the world. This reason, according to Heidegger's remark quoted above, merges with Marxism, which, once again according to Heidegger, consummates the false West European way of thought.

5. Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 20.

6. *Marxismusstudien*, hrsg. v.d. Evangelischen Akademie, 3 Folge, 1960, p. 52.

7. Karl Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, p. 156.

8. See "Philosophie und Naturwissenschaft in der Sowjetunion," in *Enzyklopadie*, Rowolt-Verlag, 1958, p. 13.

9. *Ibid.*

10. J. Hommes, *Der technische Eros*, Frieberg, 1955, p. 80.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 84.

12. L. Feuerbach, *Samtliche Werke*, Vol. X, Leipzig, 1866, p. 198.

13. Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 19.

14. See V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, pp. 17-358.

15. E. Topitsch, *Die Sozialphilosophie Hegels als Heilslehre und Herrschaftsideologie*, Munich, 1981, p. 101.

16. G. Rormoser, *Zeiteichen, Bilanz einer Ara*, Stuttgart, 1979, p. 412.

17. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 319.

18. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 318.

19. F. Heinemann (Hrsg.), *Die Philosophie im XX. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart, 1959.

20. These conceptions "rendezvoused," for instance, in hermeneutics, which is the interpretation of texts, and which was initially under the influence of the "philosophy of life."

21. Th. W. Adorno, *Negative Dialektik*, Frankfurt on the Main, 1966.

22. K.R. Popper, *Die offene Gesellschaft und ihre Feinde*, Bonn — Munich, 1970.

Southern Africa: rebuff aggression

The great victories of the national liberation movement in Southern Africa and the winning of independence by the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe created the prerequisites for establishing good neighbor relations between the states of the region. But the establishment of a situation of stability and lasting peace in the area is being prevented by the continued racist and colonialist domination in South Africa and the illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African militarists. The Pretoria regime, relying entirely on U.S. support, has been ceaselessly attacking the neighboring countries in an effort to gain a preponderance.

The imperialists and their accomplices are trying to paralyze the urge of the newly-liberated countries for independence and progress, to turn them into a "reserve" and an additional bridgehead in the fight against the forces of peace, democracy and socialism, and to put the resources belonging to other peoples at the service of their own interests. This has produced in various parts of the globe hotbeds of critical tension posing a grave threat to peace. One of the most dangerous hotbeds being fanned by U.S. imperialism through the services of its satraps, South Africa's racist rulers, lies in the southern part of the African continent. This militaristic and neo-colonialist activity objectively

creates the basis for uniting in the struggle a wide spectrum of progressive and anti-imperialist forces, regardless of world view and ideological tenets, as will be seen from the joint action by Frontline States of Southern Africa against the Pretoria racists' aggressive moves.

The source and nature of the military threat in the South of the continent, the forms and methods of resisting it, and the importance of international solidarity with the peoples and countries which have fallen victim to this aggression are considered below by leading party and state leaders of Mozambique, Madagascar and Lesotho.

A PIRITICAL POLICY

Joaquim Alberto Chissano
CC Political Bureau, and Secretariat member,
FRELIMO Party,
Foreign Minister,
People's Republic of Mozambique

In the eight years of national independence, the country has made important steps on the way to its economic and social liberation under the leadership of the FRELIMO Party. We could have done much more, if we had not been obliged to divert human, financial and material resources for the sacred defense of our Mother country.

In the People's Republic of Mozambique, we have set the task of enabling every citizen to study and so eradicate illiteracy. We want every citizen of Mozambique to have hearth and home, the cradle of a new life. The people must live in certainty, looking to a future of liberty, peace and happiness. Those are our motivations, and for them we took up arms yesterday, and make all the sacrifices today. Those are the motivations which guide the daily life of every worker, peasant, student, intellectual, in a word, every Mozambican working man and woman. All our people are now engaged in a struggle to realize these beautiful, legitimate and achievable ideals.

However, these efforts are being obstinately blocked by the Pretoria regime, a racist, colonialist, aggressive and expansionist regime, which is decrepit and long past its time. Such is the regime of apartheid, the nazifascism of our day.

In declaring the racist minority, which is illegally clinging to power in South Africa, to be their main ally and actually using it as such, the Western powers have voluntarily, deliberately and cynically supplied it with the material and technical instruments for armed aggression and have voiced their moral support for it. With the approval and assistance of certain imperialist circles, South Africa is carrying on a real but undeclared war against the countries of the region. Pretoria would like to convert the independent sovereign states into bantustans or into its shooting ranges.

The racist regime wants the world to believe that it attacks only the bases of the African National Congress (ANC) and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) on our territory. That was the pretext on which a force of South African commandos penetrated our territory on January 30, 1982, and raided Matola, savagely murdering defenseless South African refugees. That same year, it carried out an armed raid in the area of Ponta do Ouro and concentrated large military contingents along its border with Mozambique.*

The racist soldiers have occupied a sizable part of Angolan territory, with a strong contingent of motorized forces spreading death and destruction among the civilian population in the area. Not long ago, Pretoria's troops attacked Lesotho. And this was done to a country which does not even have an army. Or is

Lesotho also a threat to the heavily militarized racist South Africa? Zimbabwe, which has only recently won its independence at the price of great sacrifice of the lives of its best sons, is a victim of economic strangulation and ceaseless aggressive acts. Botswana, Zambia and Swaziland, and the faraway Republic of Seychelles are also targets of military operations by the racist forces.

Having no social base within the Frontline States for projecting and achieving its intentions, imperialism has resorted to brutal methods of aggression, in an effort to block our development, subvert the considerable advances of our peoples, some of which are leading to qualitative changes, and to impede transformations for the sake of freedom, democracy and progress. These transformations are in themselves a threat to the apartheid regime, which regards them as setting a bad example for other countries.

That is the context in which the Pretoria regime, faithfully carrying out the aims of imperialism, has recruited, trained, financed, equipped and ferried armed bandits, who, on its orders, stage hostile sorties against the countries of this region, committing crimes against the civilian population, building up an atmosphere of fear and terror, and destabilizing the internal situation. These corrupt, anti-social bands, consisting of criminals, traitors and Pretoria's mercenaries, are being presented as a political opposition to the legitimate governments, which enjoy the recognition and respect of the international community.

The chiefs of these armed bands are able to walk about freely in the capitals of some Western countries, orchestrating from there the campaigns of lies and slanders against our peoples, parties and governments, despite the fact that they have no supporters either in our countries or anywhere else in the whole of independent Africa, and that the only motive of their activity is to commit crime for the sake of crime. Far from taking steps to prevent such subversive acts, the authorities of these Western countries have even taken a permissive attitude to them, an attitude which cuts across the generally accepted ethics and moral standards in relations between sovereign states.

The armed bandits have no social base either in Mozambique or in any of the other Frontline States. The apartheid regime is their only base. What does Pretoria in fact intend to achieve by sending in these bands of criminals against our countries? The racist authorities want to destabilize the situation, to hamper our socio-economic development, to make us betray internationalism, to withdraw our unflinching

*On May 23, the racists staged another piratical act. Their planes dive-bombed civilian suburbs in Maputo, the capital of Mozambique; earlier on, Pretoria tried, by means of subversion, to prevent the holding of the FRELIMO Party's fourth congress. — Ed.

and consistent support of the cause of the peoples fighting for their freedom and independence.

The main blow is now being aimed against the SADCC, the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference. The apartheid regime knows very well that the SADCC is a powerful instrument enabling the countries of this region to achieve their economic independence, thus liberating themselves from the racist domination and diktat, which aims to set up in Southern Africa a "constellation" of states gravitating toward Pretoria. The apartheid regime regards the SADCC as an enemy to kill, and so it resorts to every possible means to break it up.

Pretoria would like to see our harbors remain eternal thoroughfares ensuring the revitalization of the racist economy. It wants our chromium, copper, coal and wood to serve its interests instead of those of our own peoples. In short, it wants our agriculture and industry to be mere subsidiaries for the economic development of the racist minority. We say: no! We want to be free, independent and sovereign nations. We want freedom and dignity to reign in our region.

Such are the noble ideals which make us voice solidarity with the struggle of the Namibian people and of the South African people, under the leadership of their sole and legitimate representatives, SWAPO and ANC respectively. In Security Council Resolution No. 435, the United Nations has determined the ways and means for the Namibian people to win freedom without further human losses. But Pretoria has obstinately refused to accept fulfillment of the resolution. South Africa must withdraw from Namibia and leave its people to recover their freedom and dignity.

The South African occupation forces must also withdraw unconditionally from the territory of the People's Republic of Angola, a sovereign state, a member of the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations. There should be full support for the Angolan government's decisions aimed to safeguard the country's sovereignty and territorial integrity, condemnation of attempts in any way to "tie in" Namibia's independence with a pull-out of the Cuban military contingent, which is there on an internationalist mission.

It is not the Cuban troops that are threatening peace and freedom in Southern Africa. It is the apartheid regime, with its military machine. That is why the elimination of apartheid is a necessary prerequisite for establishing a climate of freedom, mutual trust and peace in our region.

Here, a special responsibility falls on the Western powers because they are the ones that have been giving Pretoria military, economic, financial, political and moral support. It is necessary that the foreign companies investing in South Africa's mining and manufacturing industries stop acting as accomplices in the criminal acts of apartheid. It is necessary that the imperialist corporations supplying Pretoria with hardware and technology stop their dealings with the minority racist regime. Military cooperation, including in the nuclear field, with South Africa must end.

The peoples of Southern Africa are fighting arms in hand against the impending threat. The reinforcement of their defense capability is a component part of the struggle for peace. We greet the countries which have materially and without hesitation made a contribution to this struggle.

Together, and united, we shall be able to rout the bellicose forces that seek war, domination and occupation of other lands, and to end the discrimination, oppression and apartheid.

The struggle goes on!

SERRIED RANKS: ASSURANCE OF SUCCESS

Arsene Ratsifehera
Deputy General Secretary of the
Madagascar Independence Congress Party —
Democratic Committee of Support for the
Charter of the Malagasy Socialist Revolution
(AKFM-KDRSM);
member of the
Supreme Revolutionary Council,
Democratic Republic of Madagascar

Never before has it been so obvious as it is today that the whole world, all the regions of the globe, are the objectives of imperialism's expansionist aspirations. Within the global strategy for dominating the world, the U.S. imperialists and their allies have been stepping up their wide-ranging subversive activities on the African continent as well, and especially in its southern part. There are the desperate attempts to regain lost positions, to shackle the newly-liberated countries with the chains of neo-colonialist dependence, to keep them as a periphery of the world capitalist economy and to involve them in aggressive strategic schemes. There is simultaneously the objective of containing the rise of the progressive movements in our region and securing control of strategic points under the pretext of "preventing communist penetration."

For that purpose, use is made of all sorts of instruments, like military and political pres-

sure, economic and financial blackmail, including such instruments of imperialist hegemony as the World Bank (IBRD), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and so on. Having issued their challenge to freedom-loving Africa, the imperialists are increasingly putting their stake on the use of racist South Africa to fight the liberation movements and to undermine the young states following an independent and progressive line.

Washington has publicly declared the Pretoria regime to be the best friend of the United States and has entered into a direct alliance with it. South Africa's policy of terrorism and aggression is a component part of the "crusade" launched by the White House in the hope to stamp out progressive democratic and national liberation movements, heat up international tension and spiral the arms race. With the blessings and support of their imperialist sponsors, the South African racists have intensified their brutal repression of the Black majority, fighting under the leadership of the ANC to break up the hated regime of apartheid and to win their human rights.

It is not only the Frontline states but also the other independent countries of Africa that are the targets of Pretoria's subversive acts: South African mercenaries have staged landings in the Seychelles and Pretoria's spies have been arrested in Madagascar.

In conducting their policy of destabilization, the racists have resorted not only to military and political means. They have also made extensive use of the economic backwardness, which the newly-liberated countries have inherited from the epoch of colonialism, and their economic and financial difficulties for plotting against the progressive regimes.

But all these subversive acts, which have been denounced by the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and other authoritative international bodies and forums, are being deliberately passed over in silence by the imperialist-controlled mass media. Prepared to invent any cock-and-bull story about "Soviet intervention in Afghanistan" or "Cuban penetration into Nicaragua and El Salvador," they seem to be struck dumb when it comes to the crimes being daily and hourly committed by South Africa's racist rulers. That being so, it is especially important to expose, tirelessly and convincingly, the permanent aggression of U.S. imperialism and the South African racists against the nations of our region and to display effective solidarity with the progressive democratic forces fighting not only for their own rights but also for the interests of the whole of freedom-loving Africa.

Alongside the undeclared war and the ceaseless aggressive acts against the independent African countries, the southern part of the Indian Ocean is being intensively militarized. For some time now, there has been a discussion of the plans to realize Washington's project for the establishment of a South Atlantic Treaty Organization (SATO), according to the image and likeness of NATO, which is to include primarily racist South Africa together with some Latin American states. The emergence of another aggressive bloc is still a tangible danger. Meanwhile, the imperialist powers have been stepping up their operations in the Indian Ocean area. The United States has set up and is enlarging a network of military bases on the African continent, including the territory of South Africa. The warships of the United States and other imperialist powers will be constantly seen scurrying across the waters of the southern part of the Indian Ocean washing the shores of Africa. Diego Garcia, an island forcibly wrested from Mauritius, has been converted into a major and ultra-modern air and naval base with stockpiles of nuclear weapons.

This militaristic policy designed to suppress the people's urge for freedom and independence clearly poses a threat to peace not only in our region but throughout the world, and is a great source of war danger just when humankind's future already hangs by a thread because of the super-arms race. That is why all who cherish the cause of peace, freedom and progress must unite so as to join efforts in blocking the way of the imperialist fanciers of military gambles and their racist henchmen. Steps must be taken without delay to implement the well-known UN decisions on turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. The participants in the latest non-aligned summit reiterated their full support for these decisions. The proposal made by President Didier Ratsiraka of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar to hold in Antananarivo a summit conference on the Indian Ocean was also received with approval.

RELIANCE ON ONESELF AND ON EACH OTHER

Vincent Makhele
General Secretary, Basotho National Party,
Minister of Cooperatives and
Rural Development, Lesotho

At one time we were being lulled to sleep by those who wished to persuade us that the Pretoria regime had finally decided to abandon its obnoxious policy of apartheid, and that the

Botha government was either introducing or about to introduce far-reaching reforms in South Africa. It is with a certain amount of embarrassment that I have to admit that in spite of our proximity to South Africa, we, too, did not quite understand its rulers' intentions, for we believed that in spite of everything, they were still guided by certain international morality and principles in their dealings with other states. The 9th of December 1982 brought home to us, with a vengeance, the real nature of the Pretoria regime. In the middle of the night, South Africa's racist forces struck across the border, murdering women and children, and leaving a trail of destruction in their wake. It is a well-known fact that to this day certain parts of the sovereign state of Angola remain occupied by the racist forces. In Mozambique and Zimbabwe, Pretoria is engaged in a terrorist campaign under the cloak of the so-called dissident movements, such as the "MNR" or the "LLA" in the case of my own country.

It is ironic that the racist forces claimed to be doing all this in order "to stop terrorism" in Southern Africa. After December 9, South Africa's Chief of the Defense Forces explained that he had information that the African National Congress (ANC) was planning "deeds of terror in South Africa, Transkei and Ciskei."* But it is South Africa that has raised terrorism to the level of government policy. Typical of their twisted logic, South Africa claims that its own security can only be guaranteed when and if the rest of the region is insecure.

The racists are determined to continue with their policy of destabilization. However, we in Lesotho see indications that this strategy has changed slightly. Instead of continuing to back the ineffective LLA bandits, Pretoria will now make more use of the Bantustans and the mercenaries. First, because it enables Pretoria to deny any involvement or knowledge of what happens in the neighboring states. Second, because it might promote the international recognition of these puppet creations if sovereign states are forced to enter into negotiations with them. Third, because divisions and feuding among Black people in the region would help to divert attention from apartheid and enable the white minority to continue to dominate the area by means of the divide-and-rule policy.

A variety of good reasons have been advanced as to why Pretoria has embarked on this dangerous path. It is said that it wants to exert pressure on the governments of Lesotho,

Mozambique and other neighboring states to refuse to give refuge to the ANC, that it wants to stop the "spread of communism" in Southern Africa and so on and so forth. It is claimed that that is when peace will dawn in this part of the continent. Not so. The racists' real purpose is not to stop the "spread of communism" or to stop the neighboring countries from giving refuge to the victims of apartheid. The real reason is to make South Africa safe for apartheid. Its white minority believes that its security and freedom depend on the successful domination and subjugation of the Black majority. Angola and Mozambique are a danger to South Africa's rulers not because they give refuge to the victims of the apartheid regime, but because they are independent. Similarly, the independent and economically viable state of Zimbabwe is a threat to Pretoria not because it provides bases for the ANC freedom-fighters, but simply because it denies South Africa that feeling of domination.

The cooperation of the independent states of Southern Africa in SADCC is described as a "hostile act" by the Pretoria regime, despite the fact that South Africa has been assured that it, too, has been reserved a seat in the SADCC as soon as it has been cleansed of the system of racial discrimination. It is apartheid that bedevils relations in Southern Africa and not the ANC, as the white minority would like the international community to believe.

But what does accepting apartheid mean? It means recognizing the Bantustans; and accepting that all the Black people of South Africa are not citizens of that country but of the so-called homelands that some of them have never been to in their lives; it means refusing refuge to the victims of apartheid in contradiction to all the international conventions we are party to; it means accepting economic domination by the white minority. In short, it means surrendering our independence. It means accepting that any rights we have as human beings are secondary to those of the white minority. It means for the people of Angola to accept that it is right for the South African racists to occupy part of their country. It means for the people of Namibia to give up their legitimate struggle for independence in their own country. It means accepting that colonialism in Namibia should be allowed to continue.

We all know who introduced the "linkage" in the negotiations for the independence of Namibia. Needless to say, like all members of the OAU, we are most disappointed at this betrayal of trust. And yet ironically we are again being told that we should be grateful for the role

*Pseudo-independent tribal Bantustans set up by the racists. — Ed.

played by some power claiming to have rendered the independence of Namibia more possible than it could have been if it had been left to the United Nations. We have heard all of this much too often, and we no longer have any illusions.

But what can the Frontline States do in the face of this racist regime's onslaught? They can talk and plead with South Africa to stop destabilizing them, but, if they are not prepared to abandon their stand against apartheid, they cannot hope for much success. They can appeal to the international community to talk sense into South Africa's head, but from what we

have seen of "constructive engagement"* so far, they cannot hope for much. They can, of course, rely on themselves and on each other. This perhaps is the answer.

Every cloud has a silver lining. One could say: instead of shattering us, the South African persecution has brought our people closer together than they have been in a long time. Intimidation has made our support for the liberation struggle more resolute. Aggression has made our solidarity with other Frontline States more determined.

*A euphemism for the present Washington administration's policy of indulging the apartheid regime. — Ed.



For a mass proletarian vanguard

Jorge Pereyra
CC Political Commission and Secretariat member,
Communist Party of Argentina

THE CHARACTER OF A COMMUNIST ORGANIZATION

In view of the political and socio-economic developments in Argentina, a mass communist party can and must be built in the country. The British and U.S. imperialist aggression in the Malvinas produced a new situation which is marked by an increasing democratic, anti-imperialist awareness and fighting spirit among the population, notably wage workers and youth. There is a growth of patriotic sentiment and opposition to the policy of colonialism, transnational corporations and their local agents.

Under pressure of mass actions, the anti-people plans of the military junta, which came to power as a result of the 1976 coup, were frustrated and a process of democratization has begun. In the changed situation the communists are seeking to do everything possible to bring nearer the hour when Argentina will occupy its proper place in the world liberation movement. Their entire activity is aimed at achieving unity of the popular forces under the leadership and with the active participation of the working class. Only in this way can a stop be put to the designs of reaction, which has sought to take the initiative, to restrict and even to nullify democratic gains, using every means, including the engineering of bloody coups.

In view of the mounting and massive democratic movement accelerated by the dynamism of the working class, the communists are faced with new, difficult tasks. For their successful solution it is essential first of all to accumulate forces among the proletarian and popular masses, consolidate ties with them while simultaneously strengthening the party itself, its ideological and organizational cohesion so helping to shape a broad alliance of fighters for democracy and progress. We believe that now, more than ever before, there exist real opportunities for the creation of a mass party that is capable of changing the balance of forces in Argentine society in favor of the working class and other laboring strata, in the interests of our nation.

What is this conviction of ours based on?

The working people are taking a growing interest in the activity of the CPA, and are ready to join its ranks. In 1982, 60,000 people joined the party and its youth organization, and in the first months of 1983 there were over 40,000 new recruits. Whole "red" districts are emerging, and communist festivals are held with masses of people thronging the streets and squares of working-class neighborhoods. A recent example is the April 22 rally, at which CPA candidates for the coming October parliamentary elections were nominated. The

Argentine mass media acknowledged that it was the largest and best organized political action in the country in recent years.

The Peronist masses: a turn to the left

The great majority of the CPA's new members come from among the supporters of Peronism. The Peronist masses are being increasingly drawn to the ideas of national liberation. They reject anti-communism, the concept of class reconciliation, and are drawing nearer, though not consciously in every case, to socialist, Marxist-Leninist positions. The new growing leftward leanings in their midst create real conditions for joint action and for turning our party into a mass party. However in assessing the changes taking place in the consciousness of the working class the persisting influence of the Peronist ideology of bourgeois nationalism must be taken into consideration.

At its 11th congress (1946) the CPA evolved the sole correct line of conduct with respect to the representatives of the working class who are influenced by Peronism — to approach them as class brothers, to fight in common with them and to help them in every way in acquiring political experience. The communist tactics proved fully warranted, helping to strengthen ties with Peronist workers and drawing them closer to the party. Victorio Codovilla, a founder and leader of the CPA, forecast back in 1962 that "the dialectical development of the situation will inevitably lead the workers and popular strata from Peronism to positions coinciding with those of the communists, and to a gradual acceptance of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine."¹ He saw this process as a prospect for creating a united mass working-class party based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

The CPA's persistent efforts to bring about joint actions of all the patriotic forces and simultaneously to instill class awareness and militancy in the ranks of the working class resulted in notable positive changes among the Peronists. "The time has come," CPA General Secretary Athos Fava stressed, "to reap the fruit of long years of tremendous effort. And this should be done immediately, for, on the one hand, ripe fruit must be picked in time, and on the other, a delay would be fraught with the danger of a spread of disappointment."²

Numerous facts confirm the correctness of the communists' attitude to the Peronist masses. Peronist workers, particularly young people at large enterprises, are increasingly coming to see the CPA as their own party and comprise a significant part of its new members. An important indication of the effectiveness of

our efforts were the results of the campaign to register the CPA for participation in the coming elections.³

The above-mentioned prompts the conclusion that the aim we set ourselves — to increase the membership of the party and the Communist Youth Federation of Argentina (FJC) to 300,000 — is fully within reach. The possibilities opening up before the CPA are not a spontaneous historical occurrence. They are the result of persistent, selfless activity of many generations of communists and the CPA's Marxist-Leninist leadership, they are the result of the successes of the national liberation movement in Asian, African and Latin American countries, and of the growing authority of existing socialism and of its historic accomplishments, which our party has tirelessly explained.

Vanguard in word and deed

The Argentine communists proceed from the fact that mass activity is the decisive factor in the development of the revolutionary process. The boldness and initiative of the vanguard notwithstanding, the key problem of any revolution — the winning of power — cannot be solved unless the masses are prepared for revolutionary action. Dynamism in the political and trade union fields and diversification of forms and methods of struggle create the conditions for the masses increasing their own experience and developing their revolutionary consciousness.

The deep-going all-encompassing crisis of Argentine society, the upheavals in the world, developments around the Malvinas aroused the broad masses to unprecedented political activity. It is to the communists' credit that they were able to channel it in the right direction. The turn to the left, the urge for joint action are clearly seen today in political parties and public organizations, in army and church circles. Taking shape are various left trends, some of which closely approach Marxist-Leninist positions, and this naturally tends to bring them nearer to our party. In the framework of the burgeoning broad democratic unity, in the very process of mass struggles there is taking place a comparison of programs, demands, methods of action and their results, in other words, the problem of leadership of the movement is being decided.

The Communist Party has every right to count on the support of the masses, for the ideology it is guided by best expresses their fundamental interests. But we are now convinced that it takes more than just proclaiming a program. The guiding role is won by a party

when it actually is in the lead, is able to answer questions that agitate the working people, and not only advances slogans, but translates them into reality. Again and again one is convinced of how right Lenin was in noting: "For it is not enough to call ourselves the 'vanguard,' the advanced contingent; we must act in such a way that *all* the other contingents recognize and are obliged to admit that we are marching in the vanguard."⁴

Today we can say with pride that, as its entire record shows, the CPA has, not in words, but in deeds, proved its vanguard character, its fidelity to the interests of the toiling masses, the people, the entire nation, and has served as an accumulator of forces and ideas for the revolutionary transformation of Argentine society. The struggle for the unity of the working class and for the assertion of its role as the predominant force in the national democratic front; a constant striving creatively to apply the tenets of Marxism-Leninism to the realities of the country; working in the complicated conditions of illegality and semi-legality, repression and the ideological brainwashing of the population in the spirit of anti-communism; a vigorous rebuff to fascism, and working tirelessly to establish democracy — that is a far from full list of the CPA's services over the 65 years of its existence, the "service record" which the communists present to the masses.

Theoretical knowledge

No task is more important for the party than to help the proletariat acquire class consciousness, to transform the sporadic, spontaneous actions of the working people into a purposeful struggle against the oligarchy and imperialism.

We realize that it is not easy for the workers immediately to grasp the entire system of social relations, the fundamental contradictions, whose solution is a condition for social progress. As noted above, only through their own experience of struggle for political and social demands, through a comparison of erroneous opinions with reality, through a gradual liberation from the fetters of bourgeois ideology will the masses of workers come to accept the scientific world view. The revolutionary vanguard helps them in this by disseminating and popularizing a true understanding of world development, the theory of Marxism-Leninism. Only a party capable of seeing the battle with capitalism as a whole, and at each of its stages, can ensure a steady growth of proletarian awareness, a pre-eminence of socialist strivings, a latent though not necessarily explicit communist "instinct." Making the masses' struggle more conscious is not accomplished

by a single act, but through a long-term effort, the success of which depends largely on the extent of the vanguard's own theoretical knowledge.

The formation of our party in 1918 was the result of the maturing of internal conditions accelerated by developments in the world, first of all by the October Revolution in Russia, which gave a powerful impulse to our acquiring a knowledge of the revolutionary science. The theoretical weapon of the communists was honed and perfected in the light of hard-won political experience and principled struggle against opportunist deviations and "left" phrase-mongering.

We have always been aware that fulfillment by the proletarian party of its most important function of leading the masses in the revolutionary transformation of society depends largely on the breadth of the party's scientific knowledge, on how correctly it is able to grasp theoretically the character and direction of objective development and on this basis determine its political strategy and tactics. In all its activity the CPA has relied and continues to rely on scientific analysis of reality, attaching great importance to the elaboration of theoretical problems. Thus, the application to the country's conditions of Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution enabled the party more deeply to grasp the essence of the on-going processes and more correctly to reveal the character of the future Argentine revolution. The present stage of the revolutionary process in Argentina was defined and the prospects of its development outlined on the basis of the fundamental principles of the hegemony of the working class, the alliance of workers and peasants, the united front, proletarian internationalism, and also on an analysis of the problem of allies, objective and subjective conditions of the victory of the revolution, the interconnection between economic and political struggles, between the struggles for democracy, socialism and peace. With the passage of time the conclusions drawn by the CPA are being enriched through an analysis of the changes taking place.

As a result of the communists' long years of theoretical activity, the masses have acquired a clear idea of the country's most important problems: the essence of imperialism (shown by Lenin), the content of the agrarian reform, the meaning of the structural changes in the society, the new type of power, united action with all without discrimination, and the national democratic front. All this enhanced the political awareness of the people, helped the CPA to become the motive force of the proletariat's

major battles, step up the peasants' struggle for their demands and for land, establish an alliance with the working class, and strengthen many trade union organizations. The party gave an impulse to mass actions for democratic freedoms, against repression and reactionary laws, for the rights of the youth, women and the intelligentsia, for educational reform and a national culture for the whole people. Basing itself on its analyses, the CPA helped to step up the struggle in defense of the national economy and independence, against the landed oligarchy, fascism and imperialism, and for world peace.

The result of the communists' theoretical and practical efforts, the ongoing struggle of the people was the program of the party, which defined its main objectives and mapped out the political, economic and social transformations that are essential at the present stage of the democratic anti-imperialist agrarian revolution with a socialist perspective.

Firm ties with the working class

The character of the party as a mass organization enables it to assert its presence in the most varied spheres of social life, ensures it a real opportunity, as Lenin put it, to "go among all classes of the population . . . dispatch units of their army in all directions,"⁵ develop activity everywhere — from enterprises to legislative bodies. Broader prospects are opening up before a mass party for setting up social alliances, reaching agreements with the leadership of other political forces which are prompted toward this by the existing unity at the grass-roots.

In working for a broad front of struggle for democracy the communists are carefully studying the entire range of the complex processes taking place in the trade unions, political parties, public movements, armed forces, extending their activity to all strata of the population: the working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, youth, women, neighborhood organizations, the petty and middle bourgeoisie.

The basis for successful revolutionary activity lies in firm ties with the proletarian masses. It is from among the workers that the party receives a continuous stream of fresh forces. Yet at large enterprises with a high level of concentration of the proletariat this process is still not as active as we would like it to be. Among the reasons are the persisting ideas of class conciliation which hamper the development of proletarian consciousness; hard working and living conditions making political work at enterprises more difficult; maneuvering by the ruling circles, who seek to preserve

the convenient "vertical structure" of trade unions; repression on the part of entrepreneurs and the state.

Along with the listed objective factors, the subjective ones should also be mentioned. The effect is felt, in particular, of the less than unified approach of the party and its youth organization to work among the workers of large enterprises and the main professional associations.

An increase in party membership from among this category of the proletariat will help to strengthen the CPA's influence in factory delegations and committees, and in trade union locals, creating thereby favorable conditions for accomplishing the main task — changing the correlation of forces in the leadership of the organized working-class movement, achieving unity of all popular forces. Of course, the level of political awareness of the new members from among the workers falls short of that of the steered core. But this is no reason for closing the door before those who come to the party. As Lenin put it, it is essential to know how to unite speedily all people with revolutionary initiative and set them to work without fear of their lack of training or trembling at their inexperience and lack of development.⁶ They come to us to learn, but they already have a developed political sense, a feeling of the new, an understanding of the need to end Argentina's dependence, to move forward to national liberation and social emancipation. Such a store of ideas and feelings is complemented by what is most important — an overriding desire directly to participate in the realization of these objectives. The CPA owes what it has achieved and continues to achieve to the new members from among rank-and-file workers, whom we accept just as they are in everyday life, without engaging in wishful thinking. We realize: it is at the large enterprises that the success of the campaign for the creation of a mass party is being decided.

Improving organization

The Argentine communists are actively discussing the question of party structure. We believe it essential to have an organization that would ensure closer contacts of the leadership with the grass-roots organizations, and at the same time unbreakable daily ties of the latter with the proletarian and popular masses.

New regional (by the end of 1983 their number will reach 33) and local committees have been formed. This, understandably, is an important development, but now our efforts are directed at setting up hundreds of intermediate leading bodies at the level of neighborhoods

and settlements, enterprises and trade unions. This is designed to help raise the number of cells to 5,000 this year, moreover, the center of this activity should be transferred to the factories, professional and neighborhood organizations.

The CPA is acting in accordance with the Leninist principle of uniting all party members in cells. On this road many hurdles must be surmounted that stand in the way of grouping all communists in primary organizations. So we plan at first to gather in cells the most advanced and dynamic part of the party membership who will conduct the party's line among the masses. Accordingly, the methods of activity of the grass-roots bodies should be adjusted to these conditions. Direct and patient contacts with new entrants are required; it is important to root out the bourgeois-nationalistic survivals in the consciousness of the working people, to educate young communists in the spirit of revolutionary ideas and as true Marxist-Leninist leaders of the working-class movement.

Only on the basis of a goal-oriented policy envisaging assistance to party cells in coping with various difficulties can we appropriately carry out activity among the industrial workers. Experience urges the need to set up enterprise committees wherever there is a sufficient number of primary organizations, and to involve auxiliary forces which, while remaining outside the enterprise, would cooperate for a definite period with the communists working there.

We should search for better forms and methods of work of the cells that would help overcome narrow practiciness, instill in people the habit of reading, solve problems linked with the shortage of free time and material resources, so as to ensure the normal functioning of primary organizations and the training of party cadre, and drawing young communists into active work in the cells.

The creation of a mass communist party begins with the recruitment of new members, but it by no means ends there. The 14th congress of the CPA (1973) stressed that implementation of the objective before us will be facilitated if all comrades realize that recruitment into the party, and integration and education of communists, especially the young, are links of a single process. In our party recruitment of new members goes through several stages as it were — a preliminary talk; a lecture course; a meeting at which the new member receives his party card, the new member takes out a subscription to the party press. This helps in getting better acquainted with new comrades, assessing their knowledge, and in involving them in party

assignments. It is extremely important to coordinate the work of the organizational group (presenting of party cards), financial organs (the mechanism of regular collection of dues) and the propaganda apparatus (circulation of the press).⁷ As practice has shown, such an approach helps young communists in entering the life of the cell and the party as a whole.

Learning and fighting

The primary organization is the place where party cadre, its future activists are trained and steeled. The forthcoming battles and the needs of the party and the working class demand an increase in the number of cadre workers, those of them who, daily and selflessly, are willing to carry out their far from easy revolutionary work. It is essential to advance candidates to leading posts more boldly and at the same time continuously to watch the social composition of cadre, take account of the political experience, personal qualities, and militancy of those who come to the party.

"Learn and Fight, Fight and Learn" — such today is the slogan of the Argentine communists. The party regards educational work as being of paramount importance. Our aim is to organize mass education, send more activists to party schools, in short, to expand the front of education, above all for the political and ideological training of leaders for grass-roots organizations. Much effort will go into the training of 10,000 new leaders for our grass-roots and intermediate-level organizations that is planned for this year. The streamlined system of party education existing in the CPA has proved its effectiveness. However, this does not exclude a search for new forms, ensuring a correct selection, placement, advancement and training of cadre.

The organizational work of the party is not free of problems or errors. Among them, for instance, is the tendency to rely only on a small circle of well-trying activists, substituting their efforts for the collective efforts by the entire primary organization. In this case it is a matter of seeking to turn the intermediate-level leadership into a kind of cell, staking on a "one-man orchestra," capable of solving all problems by sheer physical presence. There is also another tendency — to work only with "active" cells, leaving the rest to their fate. Both these approaches are harmful, and essentially stem from the sectarian idea of "few but good."

Seeking to be wherever the masses are, to build up strong and trustful daily links with them, the communists are constantly improving the style and methods of their work. To draw the working people into the struggle,

agitation and propaganda alone are not enough, though in this sphere, too, we should seek to achieve greater militancy, improvement of form and content bearing in mind the new requirements. What is most important is to get the people to understand the contradictory dynamics of social development and draw the correct conclusions. Here, the party takes a differentiated approach to various social strata, directing its cells at elaborating concrete demands, and waging an active struggle for their satisfaction; demanding that the primary organizations explain to the working people the link between such actions and the struggle for the solution of deep-going social problems. The growth of party and YCL ranks is not an end in itself, but a means of achieving unity from bottom to top, an important factor in the struggle for the satisfaction of the demands of the workers, peasants, middle strata, women, youth, in defense of civil freedoms, for peace and anti-imperialist solidarity.

* * *

There is no ready recipe for organizational forms. They must be found and used with account for local conditions. In our view, such a creative search, to which we urge party leaders at all levels, does not contradict but, conversely, facilitates the correct realization of Leninist organizational principles. The necessary adaptation to changing circumstances does not imply either time-serving or rejection of fundamental principles, fidelity to which must be preserved by the revolutionary vanguard.

Theoretical knowledge, reliance on the masses, the organic unity of theoretical and practical activity, ideological cohesion, scrupulous adherence to the principle of democratic centralism, patriotism, internationalism — all these and other features of the party of a new type helped the CPA to re-enter the political arena, despite the efforts of reaction and the blows dealt the party. In building today a mass communist organization, we are creating a force that is essential for the steady development of positive processes in Argentina. An opportunity is opening up before the CPA to make itself known as the hub of all the left and progressive forces. And we say with confidence: the entire moral and material potential of the party serves and will continue to serve the broad democratic and anti-imperialist unity.

1. Victorio Codovilla, *Trabajos escodigos* (2 edicion), t.4, Buenos Aires, 1964, p. 157.

2. Athos Fava, *Lucha y programa para la transicion a la democracia*, Buenos Aires, 1982, p. 28.

3. For details see the article by Mario Jose Grabivker in *WMR* No. 2, 1983. In June the CPA was officially registered for participation in the October elections. Simultaneously, the party's constitution and declaration of principles were accepted. Thus, for the first time since its foundation in 1918, the CPA has been officially granted political party status. — Ed.

4. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 426.

5. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 422.

6. See V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 446.

7. The party press is a national weekly the printing of which has never stopped for a moment despite persecution, provincial, regional and local newspapers, area bulletins, including 130 factory newspapers; and also various theoretical and political periodicals.

Democratic character of the party press

The above heading was the theme of a meeting at the *Rude pravo* editorial office between representatives on *WMR* of the communist and workers' parties of Argentina, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Jamaica, Paraguay, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Uruguay, and the USA with the leadership of the newspaper of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. This meeting was organized by the *WMR* Commission on the Communist Press, Reviews and Bibliography.

"In your person," said Oldrich Svestka,* the

* At the same time of printing the sad news was received that Oldrich Svestka had died suddenly.

newspaper's Editor-in-Chief and member of the CC Secretariat of the CPCz, "we welcome not only representatives of the journal *World Marxist Review* but also our comrades-in-arms in the class struggle. Taking this opportunity, the staff of *Rude pravo* requests you to convey comradely militant greetings to the communists of your countries."

The Editor-in-Chief briefly reviewed the newspaper's main tasks as set out in the resolutions of the 16th CPCz congress. "The present stage of socialist construction in Czechoslovakia," he said, "is characterized by a growth of the party's leading and guiding role and, consequently, by an upgrading of the importance of its mass media. The mass media are one of the central elements of the system of

communist education and serve the party as a dependable ideological weapon, an effective proponent of its policy, and spokesman of public opinion, which they help to mold.

"The theme of this meeting," the Editor-in-Chief said, "is, we feel, exceptionally important because it meets a long-standing tradition of *Rude pravo*. Indeed, can a party newspaper successfully fulfil its mission without knowing its reader audience, without knowing the thoughts and sentiments of its readers? For us, representatives of the communist press, who have openly and consciously placed their pens in the service of the working people, closer links to the people are the basis of our work. Let us recall that alongside party commitment Lenin regarded national roots as the main principle of the communist press.

"The comrades from fraternal parties wish to know how these two principles are combined in our day-to-day work or, speaking more broadly, they want to know how democracy, including the link between a newspaper and its readers, functions in the communist press under conditions of triumphant socialism. Present here are leading members of the editorial staff and they can give competent replies to these and all other questions."

Members of the commission wanted to know much about Rude pravo: the structure of the editorial apparatus, the functions of the various departments, the size of the staff, the network of correspondents, and so on.

"*Rude pravo* has a writing staff of 126, including 10 foreign and 25 correspondents around the country," said Zdenek Horeni, First Deputy Editor-in-Chief (now the newspaper's Editor-in-Chief). "We have 12 departments, including the Secretariat. These are departments of party life, economic and social policy, propagation of Marxism-Leninism, international affairs, culture, science, education, letters, physical culture and sport, and the correspondent network. In addition we have a department that prepares and issues *Hallo sobota*, the weekly Saturday supplement of *Rude pravo*. Lastly, we have a group of special correspondents and columnists directly under the Editor-in-Chief. Our newspaper is an eight-page publication.

How big is your annual mail bag?

"In 1982 we received close to 50,000 letters," replied Jaroslava Janackova, head of the letters department. "Our work increases with each passing year, and we welcome it."

Sociologists are of the opinion that letters do not entirely reflect the composition of the reader audience, that they are only indirect evidence of the efficacy of the work of a party newspaper. Do you strive to learn exactly how

many people and what categories read your newspaper, and how widely it is read? What is your total circulation?

"On weekdays," said Miloslav Vitek, Executive Secretary of *Rude pravo*, "we have a circulation of 980,000 copies, while on Saturdays, when we bring out our supplement, our circulation rises to nearly 1,400,000 copies. To the first part of your question I can answer that jointly with the Public Opinion Institute we compiled a questionnaire and requested our readers to answer it. This poll has now been processed. It showed, for instance, that our newspaper is read regularly by 62 per cent of the people in Bohemia (total population — 10 million) above the age of 15. In Slovakia, where the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Slovakia has its own newspaper (*Pravda*, circulation — 400,000 copies), *Rude pravo* (which, let me remind you, is published in the Czech language) has between 20,000 and 25,000 readers.

"Let me give you other interesting statistics. *Rude pravo* is read by over 4,500,000 people; the CPCz has 1,500,000 members. This means that most of our readers are not communists. But in a socialist society this is not a paradox but evidence of the great prestige enjoyed by the communist press. An absolute majority in the poll highly assessed the newspaper's work.

"Of course, the poll was taken not in order to learn how good we are. Bourgeois newspapers likewise regularly sound their reader audience. What aims do they, our class adversaries, set themselves? And what are our communist aims? The results of polling prod owners of bourgeois newspapers to invent increasingly more subtle ways of attracting new subscribers, for profits and influence grow together with the circulation.

"The very nature of communist journalism is incompatible with mind-manipulation. We have to know reader opinion in order to convey it accurately and to improve the art of persuasion with truth."

Commission members representing communist parties of capitalist countries on the journal wanted to know whether Rude pravo is a paying operation, whether it makes a profit, and who finances it.

"In capitalist countries," said Miroslav Vitek, "the revenues from the sale of newspapers do not usually cover production costs. Most of the money comes from advertisers and, in that way, the latter exercise their influence: if they do not like a newspaper's political orientation they 'cut off its supply of oxygen' by refusing to place advertisements. This leads to bankrupt-

cy. There have been many such instances in the history of the bourgeois press.

"As you could have noticed, *Rude pravo* likewise runs advertisements, but these tie in with the overall context of the newspaper's content: state enterprises offer jobs, state and cooperative retail networks offer new commodities, and the services industry offers various services. These advertisements do not play a big commercial role. And the income from private advertisements by citizens is by no means large. *Rude pravo* is financed from the revenues from the sale of the newspaper itself and of many other publications printed by the *Rude pravo* publishing facility. This party publishing activity is not only self-paying but brings a large profit."

The talk returned to the "newspaper-reader" theme. What do people write about to the newspaper? Are many critical letters received? What are the forms of work with letters?

The viability and militancy of a proletarian newspaper depends chiefly on the creative participation in its work by the working people themselves," noted Antonin Zazvorka, Deputy Editor-in-Chief. "We attach enormous importance to responses to published material and various events and reports, to letters with wishes and suggestions on the most diverse matters, and to letters in which people write of their joys and sorrows. *Rude pravo*'s steadily growing links to its reader audience are striking evidence of the democratic character of the socialist press."

"We," Jaroslava Janackova said, enlarging on this point, "regard letters as a source for generalizing the people's collective experience and one of the most democratic ways of articulating public opinion. Let me add that by writing to the newspaper, citizens exercise their lawful right to participate in the administration of the country's affairs. In turn, the mail that comes to us helps our staff to find interesting themes for articles. Sometimes just a single line in a letter gives the impetus for raising an important problem or developing a theme for a broad information campaign. That is why *Rude pravo*'s leadership and party organization require all staff members to be attentive to every incoming letter. Let me begin by saying that all the incoming mail is registered, sorted in accordance with the themes, and then forwarded to the departments concerned. If a letter touches on a question that requires concrete measures, we forward it to the relevant party or state body. Moreover, the newspaper makes sure that the writer of the letter gets a reply not later than within a month. We run a special bulletin reporting the move-

ment of letters through the various channels. The newspaper gives no rest to executives who try to get away with a formal reply or to shelve a letter.

"The most interesting, socially significant, and topical letters are published in the newspaper. Last year, for instance, we published 1,557 letters. We present them in diverse forms. On the front page you can often see a 'Letter of the Day' on something topical. Our department is given several columns. Then there are quotations from letters, references to them, and thematic surveys. All departments use letters in their work in one form or another. For example, features are carried under general headings like 'Following Up Unpublished Letters,' 'Our Advice Is Solicited,' 'Replies to Readers,' and 'Talks With Readers.'"

What part does *Rude pravo* play in forming public consciousness? How is the sense of master of one's country fostered in people? To what extent are critical comments from readers taken into account?

"The newspaper's principal task," replied Antonin Zazvorka, "is not only to provide accurate and exhaustive information about the situation in Czechoslovakia and the whole world. In our day-to-day work we are guided by Lenin's definition that a party newspaper is a collective propagandist, agitator, and organizer. The CPCz Central Committee requires us to show the prospects of socialist construction with a high level of political and professional skill, and from Marxist-Leninist positions to explain the main trends of society's development, generalize the people's experience, openly discuss the reasons for shortcomings and difficulties, and look for ways of surmounting them. Our principal duty today is actively to help the party mobilize the people for the fulfillment of the decisions of the 16th CPCz congress.

"I'll give you a few examples of how this is done in practice. One of the newspaper's leading thematic headings is: 'Together for the Fulfillment of the Congress Program: Know-how, Suggestions, Polemic, Criticism.' The articles under this heading disseminate innovation and criticize what hinders progress. It may be said without exaggeration that the section under this heading has become a reader rostrum. Contributions come not only from communists but also from members of other parties, non-party people, and people of different professions and ages, women and youth. The articles published under this heading get a wide response.

"Take any issue of *Rude pravo* and you will see that it gives unflagging attention to virtually

all aspects of society's life: economics, social problems, science, culture, health, education and sport. Through the prism of people's lives the newspaper tries to show how people themselves change in the course of socialist construction in Czechoslovakia. Reader interest is particularly high in articles about foremost, conscientious people who work with initiative. Articles of this kind help to educate young people in a spirit of devotion to socialist ideals, prompt them to adopt an active position in life and to respect those who give priority to society's interests. In keeping with the party's instructions, we strive to maintain a good climate for criticism and self-criticism, creative initiatives, socialist emulation, and the introduction of progressive methods of management and planning and of the latest achievements of science and technology in production.

"Reader response shows that articles run by the newspaper exercise a strong ideological and moral influence. People write to us for advice, share their thoughts, inform us of valuable initiatives in production collectives, and name new heroes of labor."

"To foster in every person the sense of master of the socialist homeland is an important and honorable task," said Svatopluk Smutny, head of the department of economic and social policy. "I would say our newspaper is making quite a big contribution to this. To bring people into the administration of the country's affairs is one of the central directions of the work of our collective."

"I'll give you just one example. Every week we meet with representatives of different enterprises and they tell us of their experience and of their considerations on how to improve work in one sector or another. It has already been said here that in *Rude pravo* prominence is given to articles on foremost people in production. This is not accidental. Day-to-day productive work is the decisive factor raising the people's living standard and strengthening the country."

"Now a word about critical comments. Indeed, we get thousands of letters from people who urge more resolute measures against infractions of labor discipline and against other negative phenomena. Principled measures against shortcomings reinforce the people's faith in the policy of the CPCz. That is why we regard exposure of cases of bribery, embezzlement of socialist property, and abuse of office as an important sector of our work. Although the mail with critical comments is big, only a politically short-sighted person or a person motivated by hostility can draw the conclusion that

everything 'is wrong' in our country. The very tone of the critical letters is evidence of their constructive character. As a rule readers write not to run down socialist reality but out of a desire to help the common cause and draw attention to omissions, faults and shortcomings.

"The basic requirements that the newspaper makes of criticism is that it should be specific, correctly addressed, constructive and, above all, accurate. This sort of criticism will always be given space. Critical comments by the people in the press are not only one of the most effective mechanisms of people's control but also further convincing proof of the democratic character of the socialist press."

"Let me illustrate. A little while ago we received a letter about serious shortcomings in a home for elderly people. A staff member was sent to the home and with the assistance of a representative of the local party control committee found out that the home's management had indeed 'forgotten' its duties. The newspaper printed a barbed critical article. The reply came quickly. Judging by everything the article was on target and, we hope, will help to improve matters with homes for elderly people nation-wide."

Representatives of some fraternal parties spoke of the festivals of their newspapers. In capitalist countries, it was noted, these festivals, organized by communist parties, not only help to enlarge the reader audience, to win more subscriptions for the communist press, but also give the parties the opportunity to explain their policies to the people.

"*Rude pravo* also holds annual festivals," said the Editor-in-Chief Oldrich Svestka. "Our newspaper was founded on September 21, 1920. And we are very proud that this day is marked in Czechoslovakia as Press, Radio and Television Day. Up to a hundred thousand people come to our festivals. These are held in Prague's Julius Fucik Recreation Park, and there people can meet and talk with the newspaper's staff members, state their comments and wishes, or simply enjoy themselves."

Jaroslava Janackova added that *Rude pravo* holds an annual conference for non-staff contributors — people of different professions who write regularly for the newspaper. The talk at these conferences is about the newspaper's tasks and plans. Further, these conferences help to raise the ideologico-political and professional level of non-staff contributors. It is now a long-standing practice for journalists to meet with readers at factories, cooperatives, and scientific and cultural institutions. "At the entrance," said Jaroslava Janackova, "you

probably noticed a plaque with the words: 'Public Reception Room.' Any citizen can come here with a request or for advice and consultations."

Members of the commission asked to be told about *Rude pravo's* role in explaining the CPCz's policies and in carrying out these policies, and also about how the press is managed.

"The party," said Stanislav Oborsky, head of the party life department, "makes sure that the mass media express and champion the interests of the people. In this lies the substance of the party's leadership of the press. That is why far from coming into conflict with democratic norms, as our class adversaries allege, the party commitment of the communist press is a dependable guarantee of compliance with these norms."

"In our day-to-day work we proceed from the tasks set by the 16th congress of the CPCz. Every Monday the newspaper carries a selection of materials on party life under the heading 'Party and Society.' On Fridays a whole page is devoted to materials on the communists' vanguard role in work collectives. Here we rely constantly on contributions from party organs, including the CC, and regional and district party organizations."

"Our newspaper," the Editor-in-Chief said, "is seen as a key participant in the party's work. This naturally pre-supposes leadership by the CPCz Central Committee. The forms of this leadership are manifold. But they provide no room for armchair management, instructions in the shape of directives, or petty tutelage. The party determines our ideological bearings, and it is our professional task to embody its policy on the pages of our newspaper. Party leadership is also implemented through the communists working in the newspaper. The party attaches great importance to having the mass media staffed with people who abide by the Marxist-Leninist world view, have the courage of their convictions, and are ardently interested in the attainment of the aims of socialist construction."

"In our work we are guided by long-term and current plans. The long-term plan is drawn up for half a year and submitted to the party CC for consideration and endorsement. On the basis of the long-term plan we draw up our current plans — for a month and for a week. Of course, we consult in the CC on various questions. But this is not, I repeat, petty tutelage. The CC guidance helps to raise not only the newspaper's political level but also its professional standards. The party directs journalists toward constant creative quests and reminds them that

formalism and stereotypes are alien to the communist press, that only accurate, topical and stirring articles find their way to the hearts and minds of people. The party's attention to and concern for the newspaper is manifested also in the fact that our party and production meetings are often attended by senior officials of the CPCz Central Committee.

Does your newspaper write of the ideological problems encountered by the world communist movement?

"*Rude pravo*," replied Zdenek Horeni, "keeps its readers informed of the positions held by fraternal communist and workers' parties and willingly gives space on its pages to contributions from their leading personalities, including representatives of the journal *World Marxist Review*. Residing here in Prague you will have noted that *Rude pravo* gives considerable coverage to united actions by communist and workers' parties in, above all, the struggle for peace, against imperialism's aggressive designs. The CPCz urges the convocation of another international meeting of communist and workers' parties. We show and guard the achievements of existing socialism, exposing those who allege that the Great October Revolution has exhausted itself as a motive force and that socialist countries "copy" what they term the "Soviet model." Although the slogan "Hands off Russia" is not very topical today because the USSR is itself capable of giving a crushing rebuff to any aggressor, we nonetheless feel that it is our internationalist duty to support the Soviet Union, which is the leading force in the struggle against imperialism. We never forget that had there been no Soviet Union there would not have been a socialist Czechoslovakia. Our party and people see any attack on the USSR as an attack on the common socialist hearth."

"*Rude pravo* has sharply criticized Maoism, its subversive role in the international communist movement, and Eurocommunism. We have always come forward in defense of the right of revolutionary forces to appeal in a period of difficulties for assistance to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. In this context our party has its own experience. We accord much attention to the non-aligned movement and the developing countries and support their struggle against imperialism, against internal and external reaction."

"The poll that was mentioned here showed that foreign news gets prior reader attention," said Zdenek Porybny, head of the international affairs department. "This news gets one-fourth of the space in *Rude pravo*. With the struggle between the forces of peace and war, of pro-

gress and reaction growing ever sharper because of the stand taken by the imperialist powers, in a psychological war situation created by the imperialist mass media, the communist press has a steadily increasing role to play. You know, of course, that the whole of Czechoslovakia is within the range of hostile radio and TV stations. This compels our newspaper to respond very quickly to developments. The struggle for peace, the exposure of imperialism's aggressive plans, and the propagation of the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are now a major orientation of our newspaper's work."

"It is not fortuitous that *Rude pravo* is called a people's newspaper," *Oldrich Svestka* said in conclusion. "This stems not only from the fact that in proportion to the size of the population it has one of the largest circulations in the world. Its history is part and parcel of the history of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, of our people's heroic struggle for socialism, against bourgeois rule, fascist invaders, and the internal counter-revolution. From the day it was founded *Rude pravo* has unflinchingly championed the interests of the revolutionary proletariat, of all the working people. With it are linked the names of personalities of the communist movement like *Bohumir Smeral*,

Klement Gottwald, and *Antonin Zapotocky*. During the bitter years of the nazi occupation, the Hitlerites did not succeed in silencing the voice of the party. New fighters took the place of those who fell. The newspaper's editorial staff was arrested, but the underground newspaper soon resumed publication. Its staff included national heroes of Czechoslovakia *Jan Sverma* and *Julius Fucik*, whose names symbolize unbreakable staunchness and devotion to communist ideals. *Rude pravo* was a school of revolutionary struggle, a school of revulsion of fascism, and a school of courage. It fostered love of country and friendship with the Soviet Union. The present generation of the newspaper's staff sees a sacred duty in preserving fidelity to our revolutionary traditions, in carrying out the behests of those who founded the communist press in our country, and in serving our people faithfully."

At the meeting the consensus was that such exchanges of experience of the communist press are today of special importance to the fraternal parties in view of the intensification of the ideological struggle on the international scene.

Working Group of the WMR
Commission on the Communist Press,
Reviews and Bibliography



Social democracy and Latin America

A symposium on the theme "Social Democracy and Latin America" has been sponsored by the WMR Commission on Problems of Latin America and the Caribbean. It was attended by *Mario Grabivker*, CC member, Communist Party of Argentina; *Filipe Rodriguez*, CC member, Communist Party of Bolivia; *Ari dos Santos*, CC member, Brazilian Communist Party; *Jack Phillips*, CEC alternate member, Communist Party of Canada; *José Oyarce*, Communist Party of Chile; *Raul Valbuena*, CC member, Colombian Communist Party; *Manuel Delgado*, CC member, People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica; *Raul Valdes Vivo*, CC member, Communist Party of Cuba; *José Riva*, CC member, Dominican

Communist Party; *Luis Veintimilla*, CC member, Communist Party of Ecuador; *Helma Chrenko*, senior researcher, Academy of Social Sciences of the CC, Socialist Unity Party of Germany; *Wolfgang Runge*, Board functionary, German Communist Party; *Niall Farrell*, representative of the Communist Party of Ireland on the WMR Editorial Council; *Felix Dixon*, CC member, People's Party of Panama; *Raja Collure*, CC member, Communist Party of Sri Lanka; *James West*, CC Political Bureau member, Communist Party USA; *Samuel Behak*, Communist Party of Uruguay; *Jeronimo Carrera*, CC member, Communist Party of Venezuela.

The following summary of the main points

raised in the discussion — the history and present state of the social democratic movement in Latin America — is by *Carlos Zuniga*, representative of the Communist Party of Chile on the *WMR* Editorial Council.

Background

In Latin America the first social democratic organizations sprang up at the close of the 19th century. However, and the participants in the symposium were agreed on this point, despite the long existence of these organizations the socio-economic and political situation that prevailed over long decades restricted the spread of their doctrines. In most countries of the region social democracy was unable to strike root either in the main social classes or in the intermediate sections of the population, and suffered setbacks in its attempts to transplant European "formulas" mechanically to the soil of Latin America.

Capitalist development has made considerable headway in Latin America during the past 20-30 years even though there has been no diminution of dependence on imperialism. A swift numerical growth of the proletariat has begun, and this is seen in its heterogeneity in terms of social composition and politics. It was noted at the symposium that as a consequence of imperialist domination in the economy and of the cyclic crisis the revolutionary struggle has been joined by large numbers of people not only from the working class but also from the petty and even middle bourgeoisie. Social democracy recruits most of its supporters from this milieu. This, many of the speakers felt, is a specific of its social base in most Latin American states.

At the symposium it was pointed out that an analysis of the present situation makes it evident that social-reformist leaders not only seek to resolve all problems solely by political means that limit the possibility of any new break appearing in the capitalist chain, but are afraid of independent actions by the working class. Further, social reformism inevitably comes into transient and sometimes long-lasting conflict with the strategy of the local oligarchies and U.S. imperialism. The various reformist programs get no support from oligarchical and imperialist circles in a situation where the Reagan administration has embarked on a policy of intervention and aggression. This is what partly explains the eagerness of the Latin American reformists to strengthen their links with Western Europe, with its social democratic parties and the Socialist International.

The Socialist International steers a new course

The upswing of the struggles of colonial and dependent nations that hit imperialism's positions in Asia, Africa and Latin America — manifestations of which on the Latin American continent are the victory of the Cuban revolution, the establishment of socialist relations in Cuba, and the growth of the influence of its example throughout the region — induced the Socialist International to reassess Latin America's role and place in the world. In the view of the participants in the symposium, the Socialist International hopes to create a base in Latin America for the so-called "third way" through the social democratization of the bourgeoisie's traditional national-reformist parties, the extension of contacts with revolutionary-democratic movements, and a growth of its own influence over the working class. This means eroding the positions of the exponents of scientific socialism.

In many instances, it was said at the symposium, the Socialist International's political aims objectively dovetail with the interests of West European monopolies, chiefly the West German monopolies, which are trying to strengthen their positions in developing countries and looking for areas of profitable investment, new sources of raw materials, and markets for manufactured goods. Of course, in some cases aspirations of this kind collide with the interests of U.S. corporations. In their struggle with the latter, the West European monopolies can count on success only if the USA's possibilities for dominating the continent without hindrance are restricted. Hence the attempts of West European big business to combine economic aid to Latin American states with support for a political alternative that is allegedly free of the "shortcomings" of both "classical capitalism" and "totalitarian socialism." However, the monopolies have not the least inclination to refrain from further investments in countries oppressed by dictatorships.

The speakers considered the most significant stages of European social democracy's "Latin American offensive." *Wolfgang Runge* reminded the symposium that as early as the beginning of the 1970s, when the Alliance for Progress fell apart and the expansionist interests of the West German monopolies increased, the Social Democratic Party of Germany began developing a new Latin American policy. On the initiative of the SDPG the Socialist International set up a study group called "Strategy Toward the Third World." A Council on Development Policy was formed in

1971 to accommodate social democracy to the new requirements of the international situation.

In order to win support for its ideas in Latin America the international social democratic movement had to reconsider some of its postulates. Attention was drawn at the symposium to the following pronouncement by J.F. Pena Gomez, General Secretary of the Dominican Revolutionary Party: "When the European parties tried to force on us ideological concepts and political programs highlighting Eurocentrism and bellicose anti-communism, the Socialist International had few supporters among the Latin American masses." But the situation changed radically in 1976.

That the Socialist International had significantly modified its policy toward Latin America came to light at the Caracas conference at which 13 leaders of the European social democratic movement met with representatives of 16 Latin American reformist parties. They passed a resolution denouncing dictatorships, proclaiming the solidarity of the social democrats with victims of repression, raising the need for combining political and social democracy, and urging the maximum equality in the distribution of benefits and incomes. It was accentuated that there was no universal formula for achieving full democracy and that each region or country had to pave its own way to freedom and social justice. Further, this resolution said that every nation had the right to be in control of its natural resources; the developing countries were in need of fair prices for raw materials and for credits free of political strings; foreign states and transnational corporations had no business interfering in the internal affairs of sovereign nations. The European social democratic parties thus came to a compromise with their Latin American partners, whose posture is more radical because the Latin American peoples are in constant confrontation with U.S. imperialism.

At its sitting in Madrid in 1977 the Bureau of the Socialist International set up a Latin American Committee to study the political situation, organize solidarity campaigns with the liberation movements, and draw up recommendations for "democratic and socialist" changes in the region.

It was noted at the symposium that the joint ideologico-theoretical work of European and Latin American social democratic parties had to be regarded as *part of the process of spreading reformist ideology in the continent*. This work is conducted by the journal *Nueva Sociedad* (which is, in fact, an unofficial organ of the Socialist International) and the Center for

the Study of Problems of Democracy in Latin America, which functions with financial support from the West German Friedrich Ebert Fund. One of this center's aims is to substantiate theoretically that social democratic postulates express the aspirations of the Latin American peoples and to develop ways and means of adapting social democratic doctrines to regional and national reality.

Much attention was devoted at the symposium to analyzing the spectrum of political parties and movements representing social democratic ideology in Latin America.

As Helma Chrenko pointed out, the social base of the social democratic movement in the region consists of elements of *heterogeneous origin and developing in different directions*, and this predicated the extraordinary diversity of its organizations. In the interpretations of keynote ideological and political concepts there are perceptible and sometimes substantial distinctions in the parties themselves and between them.

The Latin American social democratic parties grow chiefly through the *evolution of the political forces of bourgeois reformism* (the Venezuelan Democratic Action Party or the Costa Rican Party of National Liberation) or petty-bourgeois reformist organizations (the Ecuadoran Democratic Left Party or the Bolivian Left Revolutionary Movement). There are, however, other examples. These are degenerated workers' organizations that have been unable to shed the influence of reformist ideology (the Brazilian Working People's Party), or the drift of the revisionists to an undisguisedly social-reformist posture (the Venezuelan Movement to Socialism). The leadership of the Socialist International has, accordingly, framed a *pragmatic policy* relative to Latin America. Its Chairman, Willy Brandt, has stressed that although there may be disagreement it is necessary to display flexibility in the contacts with these forces and open up new areas for joint activity.

The ideological diversity affects the policy line and activity of the various contingents of social democrats. In individual conflict situations the European parties affiliated to the Socialist International side with imperialism, thereby evoking dissatisfaction and even protests among Latin Americans. However, the general tendency toward closer ties between Latin American and West European social democrats continues. To illustrate. In 1971 only two parties in Latin America and the Caribbean were members of the Socialist International — the People's National Party of Jamaica and the People's Socialist Party of Ar-

gentina. The Party of National Liberation of Costa Rica, the Venezuelan Democratic Action Party and People's Electoral Movement, the Radical Party of Chile, the Peruvian APRA, and the Paraguayan Revolutionary Febrerist Party had observer status. But the Socialist International congress in Vancouver, Canada (end of 1978), was attended by 21 organizations from the region. At the 16th congress in Portugal in April 1983 the Working People's Alliance of Guyana, the Party of Independence of Puerto Rico, and the People's Party (APRA) of Peru were admitted as members with a deliberative vote.

However, as was pointed out at the symposium, it must be remembered that the ideologico-political bonds linking the various Latin American parties to the Socialist International are very far from being identical. Some of these parties are active in its operations and give it their total support; others subscribe only to individual aspects of its ideology and policy. Also, there are in Latin America parties and movements that are only beginning to adopt a social democratic orientation.

Is the social democratic alternative realistic?

The growth of social democracy in the continent has led its proponents to claim that the entire continent or a large part of it can be "social-democratized." There is talk of some Latin American parties and movements drawing closer to the Socialist International ideologically and politically, and also of the practical implementation of the notorious "third way." Lastly, the term "social-democratization" is sometimes used to designate a variant of the course followed by the most highly industrialized West European countries. Practice is the criterion of any concept, and it is in practice that the "third way" invariably fails. In this connection, a reference was made at the symposium to words spoken by Narciso Isa Conde, General Secretary of the Dominican Communist Party, who stressed that where reforms are concerned "social democracy has never gone beyond the boundaries of the capitalist mode of production."²

A conclusion drawn at the symposium is that there are very limited possibilities for the social-reformist way of development in Latin America. And serious difficulties await its proponents.

A dirty anti-communist and anti-Soviet campaign has been started by bourgeois ideologues in an effort to isolate the communist parties and smear the inspiring example of social progress in the Soviet Union and other

countries of existing socialism. A large contribution to this campaign is being made by the already mentioned Ebert Fund. However, socialism's adversaries will not achieve their aims. Much of the Latin American proletariat has a high level of class consciousness and solid traditions of anti-imperialist struggle, and this is fostering the political maturing of the masses.

The social democrats, it was said at the symposium, will inevitably have to choose between two lines of development predicated by political practice. Either the "traditional" way linked to the preservation of oligarchic rule, or progress toward a democratic revolution oriented on socialism. The experience of the past few years has shown conclusively that whatever the social democrats say and try to do in their efforts to find a "third way," they cannot go beyond the limits of these two possibilities.

By virtue of their ideology, policy, and desire to avoid revolutionary changes, social democratic organizations are usually more inclined to favor the first option. This option was adopted, for example, in the Dominican Republic, Venezuela, Costa Rica, and some other countries. But the communists are aware that many proponents of social democracy are critical of U.S. imperialism, oppose the arms race, interventionism, and interference in the internal affairs of other nations, and come out in defense of peace and democracy. Contradictions of this kind are not accidental. Many social democrats are joining the struggle against Washington's adventurism and this is speeding up the radicalization of the masses influenced by them.

On the whole, although the activities of the social democrats adversely affect unity of the working class and the other working people, they simultaneously help to promote the organized struggle for the satisfaction of individual grievances and awaken the masses to political action. The actions of the social-reformists against oligarchic dictatorships ultimately and objectively contribute to the struggle against tyrannies despite the anti-communist propaganda that often accompanies these actions.

Possibilities for cooperation

It was noted at the symposium that the relations between the communists and the social democrats are shaping out differently in the various Latin American countries. In some cases they march together and become allies, and in others they face each other on different sides of the barricades.

The exchange of views at the symposium allowed identifying the chief criteria for co-

operation between and joint action by communists and social democrats. Any genuine step in defense of peace, toward the attainment of democracy and social progress, it was said at the symposium, always gets the understanding and support of the communists. In this respect the Latin American communist parties are able to draw upon the experience of parties whose relations with social democracy have long traditions.

Niall Farrell, Jack Phillips, James West, and Raja Collure said that the practical application of the policy of communist parties toward social democracy depends to a considerable extent on the specific conditions obtaining in different countries, on the level of public consciousness in these countries, and on the correlation between the forces of revolution and counter-revolution.

In considering this problem in Latin America, Raul Valdes Vivo said, one must bear in mind, in the first place, Reagan's bellicose policies. In the opinion stated by the Communist Party of Cuba some months before the last presidential elections in the USA, the present cabinet is not merely another White House administration. Reagan's adventurism and extreme aggressiveness are evidence of significant changes. U.S. imperialism no longer rests content with the preservation of its domination and the extension of its interference in Central America. It is now trying to kindle local wars throughout the continent. This situation gives the communists more reason to say that the most pressing, paramount task today is to achieve broad anti-imperialist unity. We believe that social democracy can play an important role in this unitary process, the possibilities for which have grown as a result of the crisis of relations between Latin America and the USA, a crisis that was aggravated by the Malvinas conflict.

Experience bears out this conclusion. The Sandinist victory in Nicaragua was forged by broad internal unity and also, as Fidel Castro pointed out, by the fact they had on their side "a latent force that may be defined as the Latin American front of struggle for democracy and independence, against imperialism. This fact is of immense importance. It is of great historical significance."³ As other triumphant revolutions of our epoch, the Nicaraguan revolution drew a practical lesson from the changed world balance of strength, channelling the various movements of the national spectrum into a single stream and inducing the social democrats to demonstrate by deeds their ability for solidarity.

This tendency is seen clearly in the stand of

the social democrats and other forces opposed to imperialist interference in Nicaragua's affairs. If we look at the region as a whole, said Samuel Behak, we shall quickly find that this is true in other countries and under other circumstances. In Uruguay the struggle is being conducted under conditions of a fascist dictatorship. All genuinely democratic circles, including traditional bourgeois parties and the social democrats, participate in the resistance in one way or another. Many members of these circles are subjected to brutal repression and denied political rights. They are treated as second-rate citizens and forbidden to hold posts in the state apparatus, the education system, and so forth. Some have been compelled to emigrate. Unity among all democrats in the Broad Front is the keynote of the policy pursued by the Communist Party of Uruguay, which always sees the distinction between unity in the anti-dictatorship struggle and ideological differences over the society that is to be created in the future. Thus, over the years, the foundation has been laid for achieving understanding in Uruguay between the communists and the socialists.

The socialists and the communists have not only joined the Broad Front but become influential factors in it. Our alliance is not transient: it has deep roots, a glorious history and, unquestionably, big prospects. The Communist Party of Uruguay hopes that its joint work with other political forces will not cease after the dictatorship falls (this is now the central and decisive aim), that this work will continue, and that together we shall find the road of patriotic, popular, anti-oligarchic and anti-imperialist decisions, and a democratic way out of the country's serious social crisis.

In Argentina, said Mario Grabivker, the social-reformist doctrine has acquired a considerable following. The forces influenced by social democratic ideology are heterogeneous, some moving to the left and increasingly coming under the influence of Marxism-Leninism, of the achievements of existing socialism. Most of them are our allies in the struggle for democracy, against imperialism, for world peace. They play a large role in the mass movement demanding the restoration of democracy in Argentina. Understanding that revolutionary consciousness comes only with experience, the communists combine an ideological struggle against social-reformist concepts with the organization of joint actions with the social democrats for common concrete aims.

In the case of Chile, said José Oyarce, the international social democratic movement is

constantly in solidarity with the people's struggle against the fascist dictatorship. This spells out considerable assistance for the attainment of the aims of the revolutionary forces. However, by acting through organizations such as the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the social democrats erode the unity of the working class and all other working people.

Joint actions with social democratic organizations and parties are a major task in the struggle against the tyranny. In Chile there is extensive experience of such actions. The Radical Party, the most influential social democratic organization in Chile, participated in the formation and work of the Allende Popular Unity government. Today, alongside the communists, the Radical Party is fighting more and more actively to restore the unity of the left forces on a broader base, with the participation of all the circles opposed to the regime, to awaken the insurgent spirit of the people, overthrow the tyranny, and establish a democratic, people's, anti-imperialist government.

In Brazil, said Ari dos Santos, the situation differs to some extent from that in other Latin American countries. Until recently there was no social democratic party of the European type on account of the weakness of the organized working-class movement and the lack of bourgeois-democratic freedoms (for more than 30 of the past 50 years the country has been ruled by reactionary military dictatorships). However, as soon as signs of democratic changes appeared in 1979, the Working People's Party and the Democratic Labor Party were formed. The former relies on the Sao Paulo trade unions, and the latter draws its support chiefly from the middle strata. Both parties are strengthening their links to the Socialist International. Together with other political movements, including the communists, they are now working to extend and reinforce democracy. The communists have many fundamental differences with both these parties, but we hope that persevering work, the specific conditions prevailing in Brazil, and historical traditions will enable them to play a positive role in the national-democratic revolution.

Parties adhering to social-reformist ideology and policy have sprung up in Ecuador during the past 10 years, said Luis Veintimilla. This is the outcome of three closely related reasons: dramatic changes in the social structure as a result of the development of a capitalist economy, the aggravation of the class struggle, and the fading of the traditional bourgeois parties — the conservative and the liberal. In this way the road to reformism was cleared, and various

social-reformist organizations came into being, including the Democratic Left Party, which has joined the Socialist International. This party champions the interests of the politically active petty bourgeoisie and middle sections. Its posture may be defined as follows: it wants democratic development and social justice in Ecuador and urges smashing the fetters of dependence. At its 10th congress in 1981 the Communist Party of Ecuador decided to establish closer cooperation with the Democratic Left Party as consistent with the aims of popular unity.

However, it is not always and not in all countries of the region that the social democrats are prepared to cooperate effectively with the communists, said José Riva. This is borne out by the course of events in the Dominican Republic and by the development of the Dominican Revolutionary Party. In 1965 it was a progressive organization and took part in the popular rising.⁴ Following the imperialist interference and the island's invasion by U.S. Marines the party reiterated its course toward a democratic revolution. However, subsequently, as a result of its contacts with the Socialist International, a change occurred in its policy: its leaders aligned themselves with right-wing forces and established contacts with the "liberals" in Washington, abandoning the ideals of revolutionary democracy. In 1976 the DRP began to deepen its links to the international social democratic movement, and today it is the proponent of social-reformist ideology in the Dominican Republic. Right-wing elements, who are rabidly anti-communist, predominate in its leadership.

The DRP government, which came to power in 1978, has not brought "general prosperity" to the Dominican Republic. On the contrary, in this period the republic has been pushed deeper into dependence and there has been a growth of the power of oligarchic circles that flung the country's door wide open to foreign capital. Under these special circumstances we defined a policy toward the DRP in keeping with our underlying principles: "In all cases the communists should encourage steps leading to an extension of democracy and to reforms, offer resistance to the most reactionary circles of the present socio-economic system, and facilitate the shift to the left by the adherents of this social democratic contingent while curbing the attempts of the Socialist International to influence potentially anti-imperialist forces."⁵

In Costa Rica, too, said Manuel Delgado, social-reformism has specific features of its own. After the upheavals of 1948⁶ the

Party of National Liberation was used by the reformist bourgeoisie to check any further assault from the working people. Far from seeking to awaken the working class to political activity, it fought the communists. The years the social democrats were in power brought the people nothing but adversity. This is seen distinctly today with the country in the grip of a paralyzing political and economic crisis. The PNL came still further under the influence of U.S. imperialism, and this explains its present links to the Reagan administration and support for Washington's policy in Central America. However, in the interests of the nation the communists have stated that they were prepared to cooperate also with the PNL in order to take the country out of the crisis and ensure its independent development. Our aim is to isolate the reactionary circles and cut short their influence over those adherents of social democracy who are ready to join the revolution.

The facts cited at the symposium, said *Jeronimo Carrera*, testify to the dual character of the relations between the communists and the social democrats in Latin America. The social democrats are competing with our parties for influence in the trade unions. At the same time, they are our allies in the struggle to resolve some important political issues, while sometimes they are concurrently allies and adversaries. There are deep, fundamental differences between us on key problems of the revolution, for instance, the question of the state. These differences, naturally, find their expression also in practice.

But we would be making a mistake if we ignored, for example, the fact that social democracy is an essential element of the great anti-war coalition needed so much by humankind today to avoid self-destruction in a nuclear holocaust. Naturally, in each individual country the communists are developing relations with the social democrats in accordance with the latter's stand on domestic matters. Nevertheless, we have to say that in every case priority must be accorded to the immediate unity of the forces that can halt the arms race and give a fresh impulse to détente. Concrete manifestations of the duality of our relations with the social democrats will ultimately depend on the specific historical situation. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that our relations are sometimes influenced by prejudices and mutual distrust. El Salvador provides an illustration of how prejudices and distrust can be overcome. In the Salvadoran revolutionary process the communists and social democrats are active in a broad patriotic front.

Proof of the duality mentioned here, said

Felipe Rodriguez, is to be observed also in Bolivia. The dialectics of this duality depends on some factors, one of which is the flexibility shown by the communists in questions concerning unity of action and setting the ideological boundaries with the social democrats. While pursuing a policy that contributed to the appearance of the progressive Democratic and Popular Unity alliance⁷ the Bolivian communists did not retreat from their principles. It was quite natural that when the joint program of this alliance was drawn up, differences were felt in the approach of the communists and the social democrats to the question of political and civil rights and to imperialism's strategy. However, our perseverance in driving for joint actions and the well-argued debates around these vital issues have made it possible to agree on the program planks for national liberation and for bringing democracy to the masses, and to map out concrete measures that are now being put into effect by the DPU government.

Panama's development along the road of national democracy that began in 1968, said *Felix Dixon*, depended largely on the infighting in the government between proponents of the revolutionary changes and elements that wanted nothing more than reforms. Today the revolutionary and patriotic sections of the petty bourgeoisie, supported by anti-colonialist segments of the local bourgeoisie, are the main force of the political power in Panama. The petty bourgeoisie is eager to "preserve the balance" — on the one hand, to prevent changes from destroying the old structure and, on the other, to create the conditions that as time goes on would give this structure a new content. It is thus constantly balancing between bourgeois reformism and revolutionary changes. The important political task of formalizing in the constitution and legislation the actual changes that have taken place in the country can only be carried out by progressive forces capable of influencing the state power and actively relying on the people, chiefly on the worker-peasant alliance. This would guarantee the further development of the process of democratic changes, especially in the present tense international situation when Reagan is threatening all Latin American peoples and flouting the Panama Canal treaty, which is vital to Panama. The communists give this task high priority.

I should like to draw your attention, said *Raul Valbuena*, to the contacts that the communists and other revolutionaries are establishing with members of social-reformist movements in mass organizations. In these organizations we exchange views, discuss the style and

methods of work, and cooperate. It is here that the ways of achieving unity, and the character and aims of joint actions are determined. These are permanent contacts. We feel it is our duty to work in such organizations, believing that in order to achieve common aims it is not at all mandatory to demand ideological or strategic unity. The Colombian communists stand by their principles and show maximum flexibility in order not to narrow down but, on the contrary, enlarge the spectrum for forces capable of accomplishing revolutionary changes and safeguarding the people's gains.

In the exchange of views it was noted that unlikely as it may seem, it is not to be ruled out that the European social democrats may abandon their present Latin American policy. Indications of this are the disagreements over the attitude to the Nicaraguan revolutionary process and over the assessments of imperialist

PRISMA

Now available in English

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

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

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

interference in Central America that came to light at the sittings of the Socialist International's Bureau (September 1981, Paris) and its Presidium (April 1982, Bonn). The disagreements were so sharp that the Presidium of the Socialist International had to cancel its sitting planned for February 1982 in Caracas because three Latin American parties were opposed to the Sandinist Front of National Liberation (Nicaragua) attending as an observer. The same tendencies came to the fore at the 16th congress of the Socialist International.

However, the participants in the symposium agreed that in considering this or that prospect for the evolution of social democracy the decisive importance of reinforcing the influence and strength of the communist parties themselves must always be borne in mind. Great importance is attached also to the ideological struggle in the course of which more and more social-reformists begin to realize that the political future of any organization depends directly on its ability to occupy a worthy place in the struggle for democracy, against imperialism, for world peace.

In conclusion, it was forcefully emphasized that *no task is more important today than to halt humankind's slide into nuclear war*. The time left for resolving the problems of disarmament and security is limited and diminishing. The arms race threatens to go out of control. The participants in the symposium declared their solidarity with the Address of the CPSU Central Committee to the 16th congress of the Socialist International, whole-heartedly subscribing to the appeal in the Address to Socialists and Social Democrats, the working-class, democratic movement linked to them, to make a larger contribution toward saving humankind from nuclear catastrophe, enhancing the militancy of the masses and their organizations in the struggle for peace and détente, and reinforcing the efficacy of their actions on specific issues of international security and ending the arms race.

1. *Le Monde*, March 29, 1980.
2. Narciso Isa Conde, *Communismo vs. Socialdemocracia*, Santo Domingo, 1981, p. 19.
3. *Ediciones OR*, July-August-September 1979, p. 41.
4. This is a reference to the April uprising against the reactionary triumvirate. — Ed.
5. Narciso Isa Conde, *op. cit.*, p. 66.
6. Frightened by the magnitude of the working people's actions the local oligarchy, with backing from U.S. imperialism, provoked a civil war that ended with a victory for reaction. — Ed.
7. For details see Felipe Rodriguez, "A Result of the People's Struggle," *WMR*, No. 1, 1983.



The Caribbean danger zone

Cheddi Jagan
General Secretary of the
People's Progressive Party of Guyana

The Caribbean has been traditionally a region of inter-imperialist rivalry. With the Monroe Doctrine and Roosevelt Corollary, the United States has long regarded it as its natural and legitimate sphere of influence, referring to it as "our lake," "our backyard" and "third border." More recently, with the intensification of the peoples' national liberation struggle, the terms "Achilles' heel," the world's fourth "trouble spot," and the "circle of crisis," have become current.

The importance of this sub-region was highlighted by President Ronald Reagan in his address to the Organization of American States (OAS) on February 24, 1982, when he stated: "The Caribbean region is a vital strategic and commercial artery for the United States. Nearly half of U.S. trade, two-thirds of our imported oil, and over half of our imported strategic minerals pass through the Panama Canal or the Gulf of Mexico . . . The well-being and security of our neighbors in this region are in our own vital interest."¹

U.S. concern in the Caribbean was heightened after the Cuban revolution and the emergence of what Washington calls a "political vacuum." This concern grew still more as a result of further progressive developments: first and foremost the Grenada revolution; the 1979 Declaration by the Heads of Government of Grenada, Dominica and St. Lucia calling for a new type of Caribbean unity, anti-imperialist in content; the removal of the bloody dictatorship of Somoza in Nicaragua; and the Surinam revolution of February 25, 1980.

All these positive changes took place in the context of the deep crisis of world capitalism, on the one hand, and, on the other, the strengthening of the world socialist system, intensification of the national liberation and class struggles, and a favorable international climate of détente. Coupled with similar developments in Asia and Africa at the end of the 70s-beginning of the 80s, they resulted in a decisive shift in the world balance of forces against imperialism and local reaction.

Responding to these positive developments, U.S. imperialism effected a big shift in its pol-

icy from the guidelines laid down in the middle of the last decade, guidelines which had emphasized "ideological pluralism" and a "human rights doctrine." The attentive "big brother" policy, "with smiles" and trilateralist aid,² reformism and more subtle methods of control gave way to gunboat diplomacy.

Having replaced the Carter administration, Reagan, deeming his predecessor's policies "soft" and accusing it of sacrificing U.S. vital interests, embarked on a "get tough policy," shifting emphasis toward a confrontationist-interventionist direction. With "security" and strategic interests its main preoccupation, the USA launched a comprehensive offensive — military, political, economic, ideological and cultural. The main objectives are: to halt, if not reverse, the revolutionary process; to recolonize the sub-region with the Puerto Rican model;³ and to create a more congenial climate for the U.S. monopolies.

As ideological insurance for this policy, the Reagan administration has launched an anti-Cuba and anti-Soviet propaganda campaign. Lies are being fabricated on the basis of the cold war spirit, and hysteria is being mounted about "Soviet expansionism" and Cuba's support for "terrorism," which allegedly threatens the vital interests and security of the United States. To justify what the bourgeois press acknowledges to be the "most expensive peacetime military buildup in U.S. history," the White House has resurrected the "domino theory," which was used effectively to heighten U.S. interference in Vietnam.

In its report, "A New Inter-American Policy for the Eighties," the ultra-conservative Committee of Santa Fé,⁴ made up of the hawkish advisers of President Reagan, tried to present the changes in the Caribbean as the result of some "Moscow intrigues" and outrightly declared that the United States must correct the situation.⁵ The report urged that Washington must "take the strategic and diplomatic initiative by revitalizing the Rio Treaty⁶ and the Organization of American States . . ."⁷

In the 1960s, for Washington correcting the situation meant "no more Cubas in the Western

Hemisphere." Now it is not only a matter of ensuring that there are "no more Grenadas and Nicaraguas": the armory of the USA's present Caribbean policy includes crude pressure, military intimidation, and economic aggression against Cuba, Nicaragua, Grenada, Surinam and other progressive states.

The White House and the Pentagon believe that, "if necessary," they have a right to transfer to the Caribbean a Contingency Joint Task Force of airborne troops, naval strike units, the Marines, or any other units. Military exercises in the sub-region have become more frequent, and the U.S. secret service has stepped up its activity.

The continuous attempts to intimidate and isolate Grenada and to pressure and even assassinate its leaders are common knowledge. Washington also seriously considered blockading Grenada.

At least six counter-revolutionary attempts have been made in Surinam since the revolution to liquidate the progressive military leadership and restore the right-wing administration.

Cuba is threatened with intervention. The Symms Amendment, adopted by the Senate (like the "resolution" permitting the USA to begin open military aggression against Vietnam) empowered the president to resort, without Congress sanction, to all means available, including the use of troops, to oppose the alleged "Cuban threat."

U.S. "economic development" strategy in the Caribbean is integrally linked with its military intimidation and provocation. Its aim is to safeguard the interests of world capitalism in general and maintain the dominance of the region by U.S. monopoly capital in particular.

Emphasizing the social problems of the developing countries and the necessity for the U.S. "to get on the side of change," the Carter administration resorted to reformist solutions, namely, to adjust to the great changes sweeping the world using different methods while having the same capitalist-imperialist goals in mind. The Reagan administration shifted the emphasis of aid from reform and social needs to "pacification through development," meaning the creation of the best climate for private investment. This was the real reason behind the administration's proposal to the OAS on February 24, 1982, of the long-awaited "Mini-Marshall Plan for the Caribbean" (later called the Caribbean Basin Initiative).⁸

As an economic recovery plan, the CBI, being a combination of "Reaganomics," the Puerto Rican model and the Alliance for Progress, cannot be taken seriously. Reaganomics has

meant additional billions of dollars for war preparation, huge tax reductions on the profits of the monopolies, the lifting of state regulations and restrictions, the curtailment of allocations for social needs and an offensive against the vital rights of the working people. The Puerto Rican model of development was discredited many years ago. The Alliance for Progress (John Kennedy's ambitious reformist plan for the entire Latin American and Caribbean region) "lost its way." And unlike the latter, the CBI has a limited anti-communist focus. In actual fact it is merely an excuse to give more military and economic aid to the reactionary dictatorial regime in El Salvador.

What kind of "economic development" can there be when only 15 per cent of the CBI aid is earmarked for that purpose? The rest will go mainly to military spending and primarily to support reactionary regimes. The amount proposed as aid is "a drop in the ocean." It will meet only about nine per cent of the region's debt payments, made largely to the United States.

The CBI is "old wine in a new bottle." Its economic vision, limited to high energy costs and balance of payments difficulties, and linked to the proposition that foreign investment is synonymous with social justice, is myopic. It does not take into consideration the structure built over many decades under dependent capitalism, including a deformed industrialization based on capital-intensive technology, a one-crop export-oriented agricultural economy dominated by transnational agro-industrial monopolies, a semi-feudal land tenure system which leads to pauperization of the peasantry, a trek to the urban areas, overcrowding and unemployment.

As they were throughout the capitalist world, the last few years were ones of severe crisis for the countries of the Caribbean Common Market (CARICOM).⁹ The majority of the states are in the red, faced with serious balance of payments deficits and foreign exchange difficulties. The region has a huge food import bill of U.S. \$800 million a year.

Like other large oil producers, Trinidad and Tobago is also facing difficulties. Jamaica's trade deficit has increased several times over in comparison with the 1980 level. Despite all the assistance given by the Reagan administration to that country, "deliverance" has not come about. Barbados, not too long ago mooted as the model for economic viability and political stability, is in trouble. Experiencing difficulties are its main income earners — sugar and tourism. St. Lucia is a good example of the problems in the smaller Eastern Caribbean English-

speaking states. Here, coupled with an archaic land-holding system, wages are extremely low and unemployment is high.

Things are no better in Guyana. The government has been forced to admit that it is no longer credit-worthy and that the performance of the economy has been disastrous. The country's economic activity is depressed, the gross domestic product is declining and the rate of inflation increasing. Almost all essential commodities are scarce and can be purchased only on the "parallel market" at black market prices far above the official.

All the Caribbean countries still in capitalist bondage have been drawn into an inflationary spiral. The wage freeze policy adopted by the ruling élite has done nothing to check rising prices. The working people's living conditions continue to worsen. A typical example is Guyana. The economic pressures on the working class, taken in the context of the wage freeze, have become unbearable. Many children are sent to school with only a cup of tea in the morning, and workers are only able to afford one meal a day. Expenses for the basics for a family of four are more than twice the minimum monthly take-home pay of an unskilled government employee. Workers' real wages declined by about 24 per cent in the short period from January 1981 to July 1982. Many more families have fallen below the poverty line.

The situation in the sub-region is becoming acute because of the fall in the percentage of the labor force in agriculture and the drift from the countryside to the urban areas. However, because of the very small accretion of the labor force in the industrial sector, including construction, electricity, gas and water, the trek to the cities means a substantial increase in the services sector — domestic service, petty trading, marginal and unproductive jobs, public sector jobs and government "make-work" projects.

Summarizing the grave situation facing the CARICOM countries, a "Group of Wise Men" appointed by CARICOM to examine the fragile nature of the Caribbean economies and the challenges facing them in the 1980s, reported: "As some countries which already have an unemployment rate of 30 per cent — which by any standard is unacceptable — are in serious trouble, the prospect of a 40 per cent unemployment rate would be nothing short of a catastrophe. To unemployment must be added extensive underemployment ... (and) seasonal unemployment."¹⁰

Thus, under conditions of dependent

capitalism, the way of "development" proposed by Washington creates a vicious circle of backwardness, poverty and instability, and only leads to our peoples' further enslavement. Like all previous palliatives, Reagan's CBI will also fail.

The political objective of the United States is to keep as many of the Caribbean and Latin American countries as possible as neocolonial appendages and client states. This is facilitated by the petty-bourgeois leaders with a Christian and social democratic outlook who are in power in many Caribbean states. Faced with a grave economic situation, these leaders, under imperialist pressure, generally adopt a pragmatic, dependent capitalist course.

Soon after the Grenada revolution, the removal of the Patrick John regime by the mass upsurge of the people of Dominica, and the Labor Party victory in St. Lucia, the imperialists and their collaborators proposed the establishment of a Caribbean Defense Force.

In October 1982, Barbados, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica and St. Lucia created a pro-imperialist military bloc, the so-called regional security and defense system, in which a joint coast guard is to play an active part. The U.S. is seeking to expand this bloc to include the other Caribbean countries — Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, and Guyana. Imperialism's aim is to circumscribe Cuba and Grenada and to use Guyana against revolutionary-democratic Surinam, in the same way as Brazil and Venezuela previously pressured Guyana. It is not improbable that Guyana can be "persuaded" to play this reactionary role. Already, imperialism has caused Guyana to pursue a policy at the international level which is corresponding more and more with its designs. It lined up with Great Britain and the United States in the Falklands (Malvinas) war.

Sorely in need of financial aid, the Guyana government stated in a letter to the World Bank in mid-1982 that there would be no more nationalization; certain state sector entities would be liquidated by a policy of divestment; state sector entities would provide for appropriate involvement of foreign and local enterprises in order to obtain managerial, technological and marketing assistance; wherever deemed desirable, the government would permit equity participation by such foreign and local enterprise.

It should be recalled that U.S. imperialism was instrumental in destabilizing the progressive Labor Party governments of Dominica and St. Lucia, which signed the 1979 Grenada Declaration, and also the social democratic

Michael Manley-led government of Jamaica.

An attempt was made to expel Grenada from CARICOM in the same way that Cuba was expelled from the OAS in 1964. Barbados' Prime Minister Tom Adams proposed that the 1973 Treaty establishing CARICOM be amended to include in its preamble wording committing member countries to parliamentary democracy and human rights. This proposal was supported by Edward Seaga of Jamaica, who declared that within CARICOM there had appeared "something called people's democracy, and this was the Cuban model which we reject."

Grenada has been consistently attacked by Anglo-American imperialism and its Caribbean clients for violating human rights and not holding elections. On the one hand, this is a crude insult to a country which has a genuine, grass-roots people's revolutionary democracy. On the other hand, it is justification of the human rights violations by the dictatorial regimes in the region.

Jamaica is being set up as a model for the Caribbean based on the example of Puerto Rico by completely subjecting it to the U.S. monopolies. This country has moved from the self-reliant, non-aligned policy of the former Michael Manley government. Through Edward Seaga's Jamaica, the United States is normalizing relations with the dictatorial regime of Duvalier in Haiti. In February 1981, soon after taking office, Seaga dispatched his Minister of State in the Foreign Affairs Ministry to Port-au-Prince. President Jean-Claude Duvalier enthusiastically welcomed him and made an appeal for a "chain of unity" centered on Haiti and Jamaica, while his foreign minister reiterated the "urgent need" for a firm front against "international communist expansion."

Apart from the creation of a pro-imperialist axis in the Caribbean, imperialism has resorted to other maneuvers to "contain" the revolutionary process. During the election campaign, presidential candidate Ronald Reagan suggested the idea of a North American Community. In his speech to the OAS in February 1982, he repeated his idea for "an accord with our two neighbors here on the North American continent."¹¹ Ideas for the accord include an energy alliance of Canada, the USA and Mexico, and a regional common market with the possible inclusion of Central America and the Caribbean.

Washington's interest in such integration stems from the weakening of its political and economic positions in the world. The White House also seeks to control the foreign policies of Canada and Mexico, and subject them still

further to its influence. The U.S. hopes that with Canada's traditional links with the Caribbean countries and Mexico's ties with Central America, it can bring about political stability (as they understand it) in, and control over, the region.

The attempts of imperialism and local reaction to arrest the development of the national liberation movement in our region is meeting growing resistance. Limits to the arrogance of U.S. coercive power are set by the sharpening class struggle. Diverse political and social forces are participating in the anti-imperialist movement, and the governments of many countries are opposing the White House's hegemonistic plans.

There is growing concern throughout the world that the USA's aggressive policy in the Central American and Caribbean zone could lead to an armed confrontation fraught with far-reaching consequences. The socialist community states, the international working-class and national liberation movements, and the democrats of the world oppose Washington's interventionist course. The Socialist International, too, is now playing a positive role in the sub-region, supporting the Grenadian and Nicaraguan revolutions and calling for a negotiated settlement in El Salvador.

Canada, Mexico, Venezuela and other countries in the hemisphere do not agree with Washington's plan to resolve militarily the grave problems of the Caribbean. They objected to the exclusion of Cuba, Grenada and Nicaragua from the Caribbean Basin Plan. It will also be recalled that in October 1981 the Caribbean Foreign Ministers declared that this plan should be directed toward strengthening Caribbean integration and be open to all countries, without political or military considerations. Mexico, concerned about instability in Central America, has taken bold initiatives to improve the situation in the sub-region.

The White House is now scarcely able to count fully on the support of the majority of CARICOM countries in its adventurist policy. Through its close links with the dictatorial regime in Guatemala, Washington has alienated itself from them, as witnessed in CARICOM's support for Belize in her struggle against Guatemala's threats.

The Falklands (Malvinas) war, in which the United States supported its staunchest NATO ally, Great Britain, brought about a near-crisis in inter-American relations. It showed the fallacy behind the Rio Treaty, exposed it as an instrument of U.S. imperialism, and brought about a new correlation of forces against the U.S. Many Latin American countries once very

close to the United States assumed a strong nationalist, neutralist position and became critical of the policy of the "great northern neighbor."

Nicaragua's election to the UN Security Council was a diplomatic defeat for the United States and a slap in the face of imperialism. It proves that political and economic blackmail does not always pay dividends.

U.S. policy toward Grenada also continues to come up against opposition. Its pressure did not succeed in blocking EEC aid for the Grenada international airport, and the Caribbean Development Bank¹² rejected a U.S. loan which was to have been given on condition that it should not apply to Grenada.

Even the World Bank commented favorably on the economic performance of Grenada. It said that the Bishop government had inherited a deteriorating economy and that the government's objectives "are centered on the critical development issues and touch on the country's most promising development areas."¹³

Cuba, Nicaragua, Grenada and Surinam stand out as beacons of hope and provide an inspiration for the oppressed and exploited peoples of the Caribbean. The movement for national liberation and social emancipation has been strengthening and developing in our sub-region. The working class, peasantry, radical intelligentsia and other social strata and forces (including the clergy) have demonstrated their capacity to struggle.

The Caribbean has come a long way since the imperialist counter-insurgency in the 1960s. A lot has changed. Then there were various ideological currents — New Leftism, Maoism, neo-Trotskyism, black cultural nationalism — side by side with Marxism-Leninism. Now in almost every single country there is a Marxist-Leninist or revolutionary-democratic party or group. Though still organizationally weak, they play an important vanguard role and express the working people's aspirations.

The August 1982 Georgetown consultative meeting of 11 communist, workers' and revolutionary-democratic parties and organizations of the Caribbean demanded the sub-region's final decolonization. Solidarity with the struggle of the peoples championing their freedom and independence was expressed, and also strong support for revolutionary Grenada. The meeting condemned Reagan's Caribbean Basin Initiative as a further move to enslave our countries. The participants underscored their unswerving will actively to fight for peace throughout the world, for disarmament, and for the turning of the Caribbean and Central America into a zone of peace.

1. See *Cuba's Answer: Reagan Before the OAS Council*, Havana, 1982, p. 52.

2. The policy formulated by the Trilateral Commission — a non-government organization formed in 1973 by the ruling circles of three imperialist centers: the USA, Western Europe and Japan. — Ed.

3. The development model forced on Puerto Rico by Washington is based on complete political and economic dependence on the USA. — Ed.

4. For details see Rodney Arismendi, "Global Madness Once More," *WMR*, No. 7, 1981. — Ed.

5. See *A New Inter-American Policy for the Eighties*. Prepared by The Committee of Santa Fé. Council for Inter-American Security, Washington, 1980.

6. The Inter-American Treaty on Mutual Aid signed in Rio de Janeiro in 1947. — Ed.

7. See *A New Inter-American Policy* . . .

8. For more on the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI) see Trevor Munroe, "When the Oligarchy Is In Power," *WMR*, No. 3, 1983. — Ed.

9. This political and economic grouping includes the majority of the English-speaking Caribbean countries. — Ed.

10. *The Caribbean Community in the 1980s. Report by a Group of Experts*, Caribbean Community Secretariat, Coles Printery, Barbados, p. 41.

11. See *Cuba's Answer* . . . , p. 52.

12. An inter-state financial organization serving the CARICOM countries. — Ed.

13. *Free West Indian*, St. George's, October 16, 1982, p. 7.

Special Edition

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

In Canada:

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.

Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6

cloth \$4.25

In the USA:

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

381 Park Ave. S.

New York, N.Y. 10016

cloth \$3.25

Acting vigorously today

Miroslav Stepan
President,
International Union of Students (IUS)

In the second half of the 20th century, there has been a marked growth of interest in the role and place of higher education in the life of society. This is due to the rapid development of science and technology, which posed the acute problem of putting their advances to use. On the one hand, the revolution in the sphere of production has created unheard-of prospects for improving the people's material life and enriching their spiritual life. On the other hand, scientific and technological progress, placed at the service of monopoly capital and imperialism, led to more intense exploitation, aggravated the social ills and, what is more, has pushed civilization itself to the very brink of destruction. To avert the self-destruction of the human race is a task of truly historic importance.

Young people have an important place in the struggle to avert a thermonuclear cataclysm and ensure lasting peace. Those who are now in the lecture-halls will live and work in the coming century. Their creativity will flower and their minds mature at the beginning of the 21st century. But for that which will largely determine on whose side today's students will be in the confrontation between labor and capital, a contest on whose outcome the very future of this planet of ours depends, foundations are being laid just now. That is why it is so important to try to examine how the current socio-political processes are reflected in the minds of students and what is the response to these processes on the part of the International Union of Students (IUS), one of their most active and massive organizations.

The voices of students have long been heard in the social arena. However, they have not always rung in unison. The power-lines of political confrontation frequently tend to group students at opposite poles. Students will be found not only in the ranks of fighters against exploitation and predatory wars, but also, regrettably, among those who advocate an unjust order. Political inexperience frequently carries students into diverse ultra-leftist and ultra-rightist outfits.

Still, every stage in historical development has its main trend, and it can be brought out

through a thorough analysis of the student body as a special socio-demographic group: its numerical make-up, age and sex structure, social origin, social status, and stage of socialization. These parameters must naturally be scrutinized together, against the background and in the context of the social system of a given country or a group of countries.¹

At the present stage, the social portrait of students is determined by the fact that the acute demand for skilled specialists generated by the scientific and technological revolution has led to an accelerated development of higher education. From 1965 to 1977, the student body has more than doubled, from 19.5 million to 42.0 million. In the capitalist world, this quantitative change has led to a qualitative change in the structure of the student body. There has been a growth in the stratum of those coming both from the petty bourgeoisie and from the midst of the workers, farmers and artisans.² This has gradually eroded the caste character of bourgeois higher education, which is becoming socially multi-layered and is ceasing to be a male privilege.³

The deepening political differentiation of students is a direct outcome of these changes. At the same time, the young people's common pursuits, together with their territorial concentration, produce a manifest community of interests, which is expressed, in particular, in the emergence of purely student organizations: political, cultural, educational, athletic, etc.

That does not, of course, suggest that higher-school students have some "supra-class" position. Their political orientation is hardly ever shaped spontaneously. But because of the mentality of their age and the ongoing process of socialization, students tend to express their political sympathies and antipathies much more emphatically than do full-fledged intellectuals. As Lenin once stressed, students are "the most responsive section of the intelligentsia."⁴

It is important to bear all this in mind because attempts have been made to hyperbolize the role of students in history. The Italian Professor Gianni Statera, for instance, insists that "a Bosnian student triggered off the First World War."

He also asserts that in the pre-Bismarckian period, Burschenschaft, a student union, had "influenced the social and political life of the German states." Finally, the Italian Risorgimento (the national movement for the country's unification and liberation from the foreign yoke) was fostered, he says, by students and young intellectuals.⁵

There is no scientific ground at all for such assertions. It is the working class that is the motive force of modern history, and it is the contacts and interaction with the proletariat and its political organizations that makes youth protest more effective and helps to develop that healthy democratic instinct which is so characteristic of the young generation.

Having said that, one must not ignore the social instability and vagueness of the ideological and political stand taken by some students, which produce an inclination for extremist solutions. Those are the weaknesses on which the ideologists of capitalism rely in their efforts to get the educated young person of our day away from the class struggle and, wherever possible, to recruit him or her for their own political reserve.

Thus, in the spring of 1983, a section of the French students incited by reactionary circles took part in demonstrations against a reform of the higher education system. However, it is the view of progressive public opinion that the proposed measures were designed to ensure social justice, democracy, a higher level of professional training and scientific research at the universities to meet the requirements of the country as a whole. That is why there is good ground to say that those demonstrations were effectively an attempt to convert the students into a tool for destabilizing the left-wing government coalition.⁶

The other, and equally dangerous side of the coin is the "de-politicization" and "de-ideologization" of students, which entail attempts to lead the young astray from acute social and ideological problems in the capitalist society and to damp down their protests against the existing order. Whenever their indignation cannot be contained or toned down, an effort is made to blame it on the "generation conflict." Everything is being done to strip the young people's protests of their anti-imperialist aspects, to isolate the students from the ongoing political struggle and to direct their efforts for the attainment of purely cultural or syndicalist goals.

Playing up the young people's love of freedom and "rebellious spirit," bourgeois ideologists seek to push them into "autonomous" action, so sending them along a channel

which poses no danger to the ruling circles. In the process, the students are frequently depicted as a separate class, which is even more "revolutionary" than the proletariat.

The idea of a "student revolution" has nothing in common with the young generation's true interests, which are closely bound up with the struggle of all the working people for the right to life, to work, and for social and economic justice. Those who talk about a "student revolution" want to keep the students divided, to confuse young minds and deliberately to send them into action that is doomed to defeat, isolating them from the progressive movements and frequently also compromising them in the eyes of broad public circles as a whole.

Let us recall, for instance, the stormy developments which occurred from 1968 to 1971 in the universities of the United States, France, the FRG, Italy, Japan and other developed capitalist countries. They showed how dangerous it is for the student movement to fall under the influence of left extremists (anarchists, Trotskyites, etc.). That is when there was a spread in popularity among young people of ideologists like Herbert Marcuse,⁷ whose purpose is to range youth action against the struggle of the working class and all the other working people.

One should reckon with the fact, of course that the "student riots" of that period did not spring from a vacuum. They were an *objective* effect of the further sharpening of the social contradictions in the capitalist world. A large mass of students feel the effects of inflation and the cuts in appropriations for social needs for the sake of further militarization. Indeed, many of them are faced with the prospect of unemployment while still in the lecture halls.

In the capitalist countries, students are increasingly aware that the intelligentsia, of which they are to become a part, is going to be a privileged stratum in society, that it is being subjected to the same kind of exploitation as the working class, and that is what carries it closer to the latter. A sizable part of it merges with the working class and takes a progressive stand. Spreading knowledge of the conditions in which students live and study in the socialist countries gradually gives them an awareness that the absence of antagonistic classes and the system of exploitation helps to assert the actual equality of all the members of society, gives free access to higher education and provides real guarantees that the acquired knowledge can be applied in practice.

It is natural, of course, that the awareness of the interconnection between capitalist exploitation and the arms race, on the one

hand, and the defects of the system of higher education, dwindling scholarship funds, etc., on the other, does not dawn on the student mass overnight. But as this process advances, the conservative and reactionary forces find it ever harder to distract young men and women from participation in public life in and outside the higher schools and to give them the wrong bearings.

All of this explains why it is so important to help the young overcome the effects of the demagogic flirtation of bourgeois ideologists and politologists with the young, and their fear of the repression to which the authorities frequently resort. It is quite realistic to expect this problem to be solved. Let us recall Lenin's idea that the bourgeois "policy of alternating brutal repression with Judas kisses is doing its work and revolutionizing the mass of students."⁸

Indeed, students have taken an ever more resolute stand for their rights: academic, material, national and democratic. They have gone into the broad arena of social life, merging their struggle with that of the other social strata. But if this still largely quantitative change is to develop into a qualitative one, the social causes underlying the student protest need to be analyzed in depth. This will help to overcome its frequently spontaneous character and show the students the role they could play in historical development.

Students are at the stage of socialization at which the formation of the individual as the object and subject of social processes is in the main completed. One could easily understand how important it is to inculcate in the minds of young people on the threshold of adult life the moral tenet that the very concept of "individual" entails a sense of responsibility for the destiny of the peoples and countries and to help them overcome the bourgeois idea that "the man in the street" is powerless. This should help young people to gain an insight into the substance of phenomena and be prepared to tackle many of the tasks which at first sight may appear to lie outside the ambit of their immediate interests. Active participation in social life can and frequently does help a young person to find the place for applying his capabilities in the present and consciously to shape his or her own future.

The defense of peace and the involvement of students in the growing and strengthening anti-war coalition is now undoubtedly the problem which induces the students to overcome the disarray in their ranks. Practice itself shows the promising perspectives of this

line. In the ranks of the students' anti-war protest are communists and social democrats, liberals and pacifists, a large part of the conservative-minded young people, that is, all those who have come to understand that the only way to get an increase in appropriations for education is to stop the stockpiling of the means of destruction.

However, those who oppose war are not always motivated by political or social considerations. Action in defense of peace is also taken by young people who are naturally fearful for their own life and for that of their kin. In other words, the cementing goal — to safeguard peace — is crystallized under the impact of diverse factors.

The present conditions, which are further complicated by the sharpening of the international situation, throw an even stronger light on the potentialities of the student movement. They make clear the capacity of the democratic forces to overcome the weaknesses and vacillations of young people from the petty-bourgeois strata, to neutralize the extremist trends, to unite the student body and to direct its energy to the struggle against the threat of war, and for social justice. The qualities which characterize the progressive students of our day are boundless dedication to this struggle, moral purity and an urge for constant humanistic activity.

Forward-looking young people have always sought to coordinate their actions. The earliest attempts were made at the end of the past century, when an International Congress of Socialist Students was convened in Geneva on December 8, 1893. In a letter of greetings, Frederick Engels called on its participants to develop among their comrades a sense, "an awareness that from their ranks must emerge the proletariat of mental labor that will stand shoulder to shoulder and in the same ranks with their brother workers... and play a considerable role in the imminent revolution."⁹

Today, the International Union of Students, which unites 109 organizations from 106 countries,¹⁰ is the biggest and most representative student body. It emerged in 1946, as the democratic forces were consolidated on the crest of the wave of victory over fascism and there was an ever more manifest urge of the peoples to cooperate for peace and progress. The IUS Charter, which was adopted at the time, says: "We students of the world, faithful to the example of the best of our members who died in the fight of the democratic peoples for their liberty, affirm our will to build again a better world desirous of liberty, peace and progress."¹¹

For nearly four decades now, the IUS has been true to that vow and has consistently and perseveringly worked to translate it into life. At every stage of social development, our Union has concentrated its efforts on the concrete tasks facing the students. Today, it was emphasized in January 1983 at a sitting of the IUS Executive Committee in Athens, the point is to increase "the contribution by the students world over to the struggle alongside their peoples against the danger of nuclear war and aggressive imperialist policies, and for peace, disarmament, national and social liberation, democratic education, and students' rights and interests." This idea has also keynoted the statements by the youth-movement delegates to the World Assembly for Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War, in Prague.

One of the IUS' important distinctions, as compared with most other international associations, is that it is not individual student organizations acting in this or that country, but their national unions *as a whole* that are usually members of the IUS. These national unions bring together students irrespective of their party affiliation, religious creed, property status, etc. This warrants the assertion that the IUS represents the standpoint of the broadest student circles, which makes it a truly universal organization.

The IUS actively cooperates with various democratic organizations: the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the World Federation of Trade Unions, the Women's International Democratic Federation, the International Organization of Journalists, the World Federation of Scientific Workers, the World Federation of Teachers' Unions, and many others. Since the program of our Union orients its activity toward problems in education, upbringing, culture and the social sphere, the IUS is involved in the work of UNESCO and the UN Economic and Social Council in which it has consultative status. At the Second Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament, a representative of our Union was given an opportunity to set forth the views expressed on this issue at numerous student conferences, symposia and discussions. All of this means that we have the right to put up the opinion of students for discussion by authoritative intergovernmental forums considering the global problems of our time.

The struggle to create optimal material conditions for study, to improve the quality of higher education, and to ensure job placement for graduates is the constant sphere of activity both of the national unions and the IUS as a whole. The differences in the higher-school

systems which depend on the specific features of the social systems naturally also differentiate the problems with which students and their organizations are daily faced. In the capitalist countries, there is, in particular, a shortage of appropriations — direct outcome of the "missiles instead of scholarships" policy. Despite the fact that, as I have said, the percentage of students from the middle and lower-income strata in higher education has lately been growing, the higher schools continue to be "citadels" of the children of the well-off.

Spokesmen for student organizations have noted that in the capitalist countries curricula are woefully inadequate to present-day requirements. In many cases they are not up to the modern level of knowledge and the advances in science and technology. Wherever efforts are made to raise the standards of the curricula, they are aimed to train specialists for concrete and narrow fields in production. This is often done under pressure from the various monopolies which are able to control the activity of universities and institutes by means of various instruments (membership of supervisory boards, funding, etc.).

The demand for genuine democratic education oriented toward the social interest is the thrust and content of the student action on the national and international levels for university reform, a campaign the IUS has conducted under this slogan: "Education — a Right, Not a Privilege!" A European forum on problems in the social condition of students was held within that framework last February. It was attended by representatives of national student unions and international non-governmental organizations, who discussed ways of improving living and study conditions, and job placement upon graduation. It adopted an address to UNESCO emphasizing the need to use the human and material resources now being wasted on the arms race for peaceful purposes, including higher education.¹²

Practice in the socialist countries shows that the higher education system can be restructured on democratic lines. In these countries, the students' social activity is a part of the working people's struggle to raise the economy and culture. Students combine study with work and research. They are involved in the administration of higher schools, and have a leading role to play in running organizations which deal with various aspects of study, everyday life, work and recreation. In the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, GDR, Czechoslovakia, and other socialist countries, students have actively joined in the volunteer labor drive in various sectors of economic construction.

A key feature of the student movement at the present stage, as I have said, is the steadily growing and ever more evident understanding of the incontrovertible fact that the right to study and a fitting place in life can be realistically safeguarded only in the conditions of peace, détente and disarmament. That is why the attention of the IUS is constantly centered on anti-war activity and efforts to arrange broad cooperation among students in the struggle for peace, both on the national and the international levels.

The IUS initiative in mounting the "Students for Disarmament" campaign has met with a broad response throughout the world: demonstrations and rallies in protest against the threat of a nuclear catastrophe staged within its framework have now rolled across all the continents. In 1981 and 1982, protests against acts which increase the danger of a nuclear war, and calls for the adoption of disarmament measures rang out at a number of major international meetings organized on the initiative, and with the participation and support of the IUS.¹³ The documents they adopted stressed that it is Washington and its allies that bear the responsibility for stepping up the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race.

Since the latter half of 1982, student anti-war action has become even more vigorous. Demonstrations, peace marches, conferences, festivals, concerts and similar other functions were staged in Austria, Bulgaria, GDR, Greece, India, Mexico, USSR, FRG, Japan and other countries, with the IUS acting as one of the initiators in many cases. There is growing popularity of such new forms of anti-war activity as the campaigns "For Non-Nuclear Universities" and "Medical Students for the Prevention of Nuclear War."

This year has been one of mass action aimed to frustrate NATO's decision to deploy new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. Young people in Britain demand: "Scholarships Instead of Missiles," while students in West Germany rally to slogans like "Better Active Today Than Radioactive Tomorrow" and "Death Will Be the Winner in the Next War." In the universities of all the European countries, there are militant calls: "No to Pershing-II and Cruise Missiles in Europe!"

The IUS backs the disarmament proposals put forward by the socialist countries and explains their meaning. That is also the purpose of the IUS information and propaganda work, as recently exemplified by anti-war pamphlets, special issues of the journal *World Student News*,¹⁴ *Disarmament Bulletin*, placards, posters, etc.

The ruling circles of the capitalist countries are seriously alarmed by the growing influence of the IUS¹⁵ and the massive scale of the action by progressive young people and students for peace and social progress, and they are trying very hard to contain and compromise the struggle of IUS-affiliated national unions, to undermine the emerging cooperation between young workers and students and dull the anti-imperialist edge of their actions.

Efforts are simultaneously being made to set up parallel international student organizations, as will be seen from the failed attempts to form a so-called International Student Association, whose "constituent congress" recently convened in Paris ended in the isolation of the sponsors of this splitting act: the Trotskyite Association of French Students, whose leaders preach "independence from all parties," but who actually serve the reactionary circles, and the leaders of the American Student Association, who maintain contacts with the Washington Establishment.

The basis of IUS day-to-day activity is vigorous participation in the offensive carried on by the common front of the peace forces. Progressive students regard themselves as an organic part of the popular anti-war movement of our day. Young men and women in the higher schools are aware that the way to the 21st century — the century in which they are to live, work and fight for the destiny of the globe — runs through peace, disarmament and mutually beneficial cooperation between states and nations. The sense of alarm for their future, for the future of the Earth is embodied in this call of the students of the world: "The Time to Act Is Now!"

1. This article considers the social portrait of students in the capitalist world. In discussing the problems in the practical activity of student organizations, there is also a description of their specific features in the socialist states, which are predetermined by the fact that there is no system of exploitation or antagonistic classes in these countries.

2. From 1957 to 1976, according to UNESCO the number of male students coming from the "professional class" in Britain (a category in which UNESCO includes skilled workers, artisans, engineers, employees and other "middle strata" of the gainfully employed population) went up from 25.7 to 57.5 per cent, and from non-skilled worker families, from 0.6 to 1.4 per cent. For female students, the figures for the former category were, respectively, 9.9 and 38 per cent. In 1957, no female students came from non-skilled worker families, and in 1976 the figure came to 0.8 per cent (see *Higher Education in Europe*. Published by the European center for Higher Education (CEPES) of UNESCO, July-September 1981, Vol. VI, No. 3, p. 54).

3. In 1977, women made up 42 per cent of the total number of higher-school students.

4. See V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 45.

5. Gianni Statera, *Death of a Utopia. The Development and Decline of Student Movements in Europe*, New York, 1975, p. 45.

6. Let us note that the right-wing forces managed to secure support in only 30 of the country's 69 universities, and that the demonstrations involved just over one per cent of the students (see *International Herald Tribune*, May 25, 1983).

7. An American philosopher of German origin, who claimed that the revolutionary role of the working class had passed to the radical strata of the students and the intelligentsia, to "outsiders" (the lumpen, the persecuted national minorities, etc.), a conception which largely determined the ideology of the left extremists in the capitalist countries.

8. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 81.

9. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 432 (Russian edition).

10. Data for December 1980. The Executive Committee has now recommended the admission of four new applicants from four countries at the forthcoming IUS Congress in 1984.

11. *This Is the IUS*, Published by the International Union of Students, 1979, p. 44.

12. Among the many measures put through within the framework of the campaign aimed to satisfy the basic students' demands were an "International Week of Action on Questions of Education" (November 15-21, 1982), an "International Round Table" (Beirut, March 1982), and a seminar at the Central American University in Costa Rica (August 1982).

13. A "Students for Disarmament" Round Table was held in Nicosia, Cyprus; an "International Student Meeting for Peace, Disarmament and Anti-Imperialist Solidarity" was held in Guadalajara, Mexico; a "Tribunal on U.S. Missiles" sat in Bonn, FRG; and a seminar on the role of students in the struggle for disarmament and socio-economic development was arranged in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

14. *World Student News*, the official organ of the IUS, published since 1948 in English, French, Spanish, German and Arabic (the Arabic edition has been temporarily suspended because its editorial offices in Beirut have been destroyed by the Israeli aggressors).

15. The growth of IUS ranks has been admitted even by *Taurus*, which expresses the views of an organization of groups of conservative-minded students from some West European countries (see *Taurus*, No. 1, 1982, p. 24).

Brazilian trade unions on the rise

Amaro Valentim do Nascimento

WMR Editorial Council member (Brazil)

A National Working People's Congress is to be held in Brazil in August 1983. This forum of trade unionists from every part of the country is to consider the problems which now agitate the minds of the broadest strata of the Brazilian people: the economic recession and unemployment, wages and inflation, the shortage of housing in the towns and of farmland in the countryside, the defects of the system of education and social security, and political rights and freedoms. The delegates to the congress are to decide on the establishment of a United Working People's Trade Union center, to approve its program and statutes and to discuss the character of its international ties. The significance of this event becomes quite clear in the light of the country's socio-political development over the past 15-20 years.

Since the overthrow with U.S. support of the legitimate Goulart government on March 31 and April 1, 1964, Brazil has been under a regime of military dictatorship, with suppressed democratic and trade union freedoms and the national economy geared to the interests of the local oligarchy and the U.S. monopolies. In an effort to vindicate their arbitrary rule, the authorities frequently refer to the relatively high indicators of GNP growth attained in the hey-day of the so-called Brazilian "economic miracle."¹ However, this growth stemmed from the super-exploitation of the working class, the

illegal expropriation of the incomes of the vast majority of the people,² the rapid growth of taxes and levies (which annually total about four monthly wages extracted from the pockets of every wage-worker), the high level of unemployment and brutal police reprisals against the working people and their trade unions.

The wage freeze, a policy imposed throughout these 19 years by the military governments, has led to a sharp reduction in the purchasing power of the working classes. From 1964 to 1975, real wages dropped by roughly 50 per cent. In the recent period, the living standards of wage-workers have continued to decline, while inflation has hummed along at 100 per cent a year.

At the beginning of this year, the official monthly minimum wage was 23,568 cruzeiros, or \$61. Actually, however, almost 40 per cent of the working people are paid even less than that ludicrous amount. Here is an eloquent comparison: per-hour earnings in the French steel industry come to \$6.30, and in the Brazilian, to only \$1.62. Meanwhile, the intensification of production and the absence of any labor protection in Brazil put the country among those with the highest incidence of shop-floor accidents.³ All of this taken together — the low wages and prices for raw materials, and the lack of any legal recourse for the working people in

the face of the employers' arbitrariness — ensures high profits for the monopolies.

The "Brazilian model," which has been imposed and is controlled by imperialism, has plunged the country into a grave economic and social crisis. Officially, the number of unemployed in Brazil stands at 8.0 per cent of the labor force, which is clearly a figure deliberately minimized by the authorities. A study made in 1981 by the Federation of Industry of the State of Sao Paulo showed that 29.2 per cent of the economically active population in that state was either fully or partially unemployed. Since then the situation has worsened.⁴

The government admits that every year it has to create 1.5 million new jobs, but it has even failed to keep employment at the 1970s level. At the same time, 30 per cent of the production capacities in industry are idle, and this is not only in the private sector, for in Brazil the state has developed into a major entrepreneur. It now directly exploits over a quarter of the wage-labor, and is involved in every sector of the economy, with the exception of the automobile and the ship-building industries.⁵

In this atmosphere of grave crisis, the government has turned for assistance to the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which has made the extension of loans contingent on the government's adoption of various restrictive measures fraught with grave economic consequences. Among these are: a cutback in capital investments and state spending, a devaluation of the cruzeiro, a lowering of wages, greater freedom of action for foreign capital, etc. The government is bending to the demands of the international banks, and has already issued a decree cutting wages and devaluing the cruzeiro by 30 per cent.

The process of social polarization has sharply accelerated at the state-monopoly stage in the development of capitalism in Brazil. The bourgeoisie and the working class have become the two chief classes of the society. In 1967, the country had 8 million workers, and today it has 23 million (6 million in industry, as many in the services, and 11 million in agriculture).⁶ There is an ever greater concentration of the proletariat: 37 per cent of the industrial workers are at large enterprises employing over 500 persons. The level of the working people's occupational skills, general culture and political awareness has noticeably risen.

The changes have also affected the urban middle strata. Today, these include technicians, engineers, teachers and lecturers, medical workers, bank and other employees, actors, musicians, artists and so on. Many of them work for a wage at large enterprises in industry,

in the services and in government institutions. In terms of labor relations, wages and economic status, they approximate to the working class.

Thus, virtually the whole of Brazil's working population has fallen victim to the self-seeking policies of the monopolies and the state which stands on guard of their interests. Those who are the objects of the super-exploitation are ever more aware of this and increasingly seek to put an end to their deprived condition.

One must say that even in the worst years of the military-fascist repression, the working people found ways and means of standing up for their rights and legitimate demands. Their action against the wage freeze has been eroding one of the pillars of the regime's financial and economic policy. The proletariat has moved from individual strikes to a powerful strike movement which has reached a high state of intensity over the past few years.

The strikes are becoming not only more massive and militant. They are assuming a new character, transcending the framework of enterprises, spreading to many factories in the same industry and involving working people in different cities. That is what happened during the strike staged by 400,000 steel workers in Sao Paulo, in which the workers of 15 municipal districts of the state took part. There were also the strikes at 40 sugar refineries in the State of Pernambuco and by 20,000 medical workers in various municipal districts of the State of Rio de Janeiro. The working people of 22 state capitals took part in a national day of struggle in October 1981. In March 1982, a national day of protest was staged against the government's intention to cut wages. May Day has become a day of mass demonstrations. Thus, in 1981, 20,000 persons attended a festival held in the State of Rio de Janeiro to mark the holiday.

In an effort to contain the scope of the working people's struggle and, above all, to prevent its class organizations from gaining in strength, the whole string of military governments has interfered in the activity of the Brazilian trade unions and attacked their militant leaders in a bid to control them and to turn them into a tool of some kind of "cooperation" between labor and capital.

The authorities have introduced a standard set of trade union rules spelling out the size of their leadership, the electoral system, terms of office for their governing bodies, procedures for the management of funds and the obligation to report to the Ministry of Labor. Every working person has to pay an annual trade union tax equivalent to one day's wages. The vertical corporative structure established by the law makes it impossible for workers to unionize at

their place of work or to set up one union of working people for the whole country. Government employees have no right to organize. Nor are Brazilian working people allowed to take part in international associations. The anti-strike legislation is a strait-jacket on trade union activity.

However, the Brazilian working class has never been reconciled to the suppression of its organizations. In the past decade, many of the trade unions struck down by reaction have been gradually re-established and the bureaucrats and servitors of the bourgeoisie expelled from their leadership. The powerful organization of agricultural workers has emerged, and representatives of the urban middle strata have united. Trade union membership has been growing rapidly, and now numbers more than 11 million.⁷ The conferences, congresses and meetings of various categories of wage-workers held over the past four years have adopted substantively similar decisions, and this opens up the prospect for hammering out a common platform for struggle by the working people. Such a platform, including both economic demands and political issues, could well provide the basis for a democratic alternative of all the opposition forces.

There is a growing awareness within Brazil's working-class movement of the need for international cooperation. Last year, 17 Brazilian trade union leaders visited Uruguay to voice their solidarity with the working-class leaders of that country who had fallen victim to brutal police persecution. A representative delegation from our country took part in the 10th World Congress of Trade Unions.

A steel workers' congress in Rio de Janeiro decided to study the question of joining international trade union bodies. There is now more need than ever before for stronger ties between the Brazilian working people and their class brothers in other countries because the proletariat is being increasingly exploited by transnational corporations, which have got hold of a sizable part of the country's resources.

The Brazilian trade union movement is gathering momentum, gaining experience and moving toward unity. A National Conference of the Working Classes (CONCLAT) was held with great success in August 1981. It was attended by 5,247 delegates representing 1,126 organizations and almost 20 million wage-workers. The conference was preceded by the institution of a National Commission for the establishment of a United Working People's Trade Union Center, which has actually become the embryo of the emerging organization. The Commission approved a platform for joint

struggle, including, in particular, the following demands: recognition of trade union independence and of the right to strike; a single national minimum wage ensuring the people a fitting existence; stable employment; freedom to set up class organizations at the enterprises; ensuring the rights of women and young people; democratization of the social security system; construction of housing for the people; a drive against the high cost of living; an agrarian reform; free and direct elections to all the representative organs of the federation and the states; the convocation of a national constituent assembly; a revision of the present financial, economic and social policies, and full democratization of life in the country.

But despite the obvious progress, the problem of unity of action in the Brazilian working-class movement has far from been solved. Differences remain on the forms of struggle for the attainment of the common goals. Some political trends within the trade unions seek to convert them into party enclaves, and this is one of the main reasons of the divisions.

The communists believe that the main task of the Brazilian trade unions is to defend the interests and rights of proletarians holding different ideological and political views, professing different religious creeds or being avowed atheists. We stand for a united, democratic, militant, independent, class and mass movement, and reject the attempts to substitute parties for trade unions. We do not believe that independence means absence of political commitment. Working-class organizations cannot be neutral with respect to the authoritarian military regime. In standing up for the working people's interests, they are bound to range themselves against the capitalist class and the bourgeois state.

The authorities have been trying hard to unhinge the trade union movement, to weaken it or, at any rate, to channel it into bourgeois reformism. In Brazil, efforts to attain the latter goal are being made through the so-called ideology of "trabalhim," which is a blend of social reformist economism, populism and government paternalism. The idea of class collaboration is being preached by political trends linked with social democracy. Spokesmen for these trends take discriminatory attitudes and level attacks against the communists. Life has repeatedly demonstrated, however, that anti-communism merely serves the interests of the enemies of the working class.

Sectarian trends among some trade union leaders are also an impediment to unity. These leaders refuse to work with politically backward masses or to have anything to do with

organizations which are still under the control of agents of the bourgeoisie, and try to establish some kind of parallel structure to include only "genuine" syndicalists.

In this situation, broad and solid unity within Brazil's working-class movement can be achieved, we believe, only if all the political trends within it try harder to overcome the present differences in the trade unions and shortcomings in their work. This calls for emphasis on factors stimulating unity and a consistent stand for the proletariat's class interests. There must be an end to the political and ideological discrimination; organizations at the enterprises must be strengthened; concrete economic and social demands must be tied in with general political problems and with the struggle against the arms race, and for world peace; the mobilization of the working class must be intensified and its political consciousness, organization and militancy enhanced; there must be greater solidarity of broad social strata with proletarian action. The forthcoming National Working People's Congress marks a new

and important stride toward the attainment of these goals.

1. In 1973, the growth of the GNP came to 11.4 per cent, but by 1975 the figure had gone down to 4.2 per cent. — Ed.

2. In 1960, 60 per cent of the economically active population took only 30 per cent of the national income, and in 1980, 18.4 per cent.

3. In 1979, the number of accidents in production reached 1.4 million.

4. Unemployment is a real curse for the Brazilian intelligentsia. Of the 80,000 engineers, 27,000 are now jobless, and 10,000 of them are in the state of Sao Paulo. In that state, 20 per cent of the doctors and 40 per cent of the architects are unable to find jobs in their field. Six in eight people applying to the National Employment Service have a university education.

5. In 1980, Brazil had 560 state corporations, with 52.2 per cent of the fixed capital, 24.3 per cent of other assets, and 25.4 per cent of the jobs.

6. Brazil's economically active population numbers 44 million, including 10.5 million in industry, 14.3 million in agriculture, and 19.2 million in the services.

7. In 1980, there were 4.2 million unionized working people in Brazilian towns, and 6.9 million in the countryside. There are 157 trade unions with more than 150,000 urban middle strata members.

Where are Maidana and Roa?

AGAINST REPRESSION AND PERSECUTION

Day after day goes by, month succeeds month — and three years have passed since Antonio Maidana, First Secretary of the Paraguayan Communist Party, was kidnapped. Yet nothing is known to this day even about where he is held.

Antonio Maidana and Emilio Roa, a labor leader, were taken into custody in a police raid. This happened at 12.30 p.m. on August 27, 1980, at the crossing of the Directorio and Lacarra streets in a central neighborhood of the Argentine capital. Once again this courageous man, a long-time victim of the class enemy, is denied freedom. He had been released shortly before from a Stroessner prison after 20 years of confinement.

In 1980 Argentina was ruled by a reactionary military junta under General Videla. It is the Videla government and its accomplice, the Paraguayan fascist clique (with the CIA pulling the strings) that are responsible for this kidnapping.

Several cabinets have replaced one another in Buenos Aires in the meantime. But each was silent about the "disappearance" of Maidana and Roa which indicates the Argentine rulers'

complicity in international terrorism carried on under a secret agreement with the Paraguayan dictatorship of General Stroessner.

Insistent protests from the democratic forces of our country and an international solidarity campaign forced the Asuncion regime to offer an explanation (on May 7, 1982) to the Organization of American States, which made inquiries about the fate of Maidana and Roa. However, the main purpose of the explanation, contained in Stroessner's note to the OAS, was to whitewash himself and put the whole blame on the Argentine government. The note says explicitly that Antonio Maidana "was detained" in Buenos Aires "along with Emilio Roa by Argentine security agents" (our italics. — R.G.).

The note avoids all mention of the responsibility of the Stroessner fascist dictatorship but confirms that the latter knew of the detention of Maidana and Roa.

Some time ago the Argentine military junta put up a smokescreen. This was a report, released in last April, announcing the death of all the detained and "missing" persons. We protest emphatically and reject the cynical maneuvers of the ultra-reactionary section of the Argentine military. By publishing such statements, which are shameless to say the least,

these people would like the tragic fate of thousands upon thousands to be forgotten.

Paraguay's communists want to know the truth about what happened to Maidana, Roa, and many of our other comrades who "disappeared" after their arrest in Argentina. In a statement published on September 2, 1980, the Paraguayan Communist Party served the following warning: Paraguay will never forget or forgive the extradition of Maidana and Roa to the bloody fascist regime of Stroessner. Nor will it forgive those who allow Argentina's security service to torture and ultimately destroy Maidana and Roa.

Although the Communist Party of Argentina has been the most emphatic in its denunciation of arbitrary rule, there have been strong protests from the leaders of many political parties, trade unions and public organizations.

The peoples of both countries, all progressives and democrats have demanded and will demand exposure of the crimes which the authorities are trying to conceal from world opinion.

Noted politicians, intellectuals and religious circles have joined in the international solidarity campaign. National committees for the defense of Paraguayan revolutionaries are being set up in various countries; similar organizations are springing up at factories and educational institutions. Prompted by a lofty sense of humanism and justice, participants in the international solidarity campaign are launching diverse actions to put pressure on those responsible for the kidnapping of Maidana and Roa and to secure their release. Petitions, letters and telegrams protesting against the dictatorship's arbitrary methods are pouring into Paraguayan embassies. Delegates from human rights defenders have repeatedly tried to enter Paraguay but Stroessner has invariably barred them from the country.

International solidarity is fortifying the strength of the democrats in our country. In spite of decades of terror the fascist clique has not broken the people's will, it has not uprooted the spirit of resistance. The latest developments indicate that disaffection has spread to broad sections of Paraguayan society and is now displayed even by those who formerly supported the Stroessner regime. There is mounting protest among the working masses, students and intellectuals. Anti-dictatorship feeling is spreading to entrepreneurial circles and the traditional bourgeois parties. The growing opposition is demanding the observance of elementary civil rights and the granting of freedoms that would allow parties, trade unions and public organizations to function normally.

One of the immediate aims of the democratic forces is to get the release of political prisoners, to break the conspiracy of silence over fighters for the happiness of the people, who, like Maidana and Roa, were kidnapped by the secret police.

The Stroessner regime, which is responsible for the lawlessness and the country's economic decline, is responding in its usual way to the increasing opposition — with repression, with the difference that these are conducted on a bigger scale and with even greater refinement than ever before.

Where the fate of people is involved there is no turning over a new leaf. Stroessner's demagogical reply to the OAS and the hardening of repression in Paraguay show that the lives of Maidana and Roa are really in danger. To save these fine sons of the Paraguayan people, it is necessary to mobilize world opinion, all democrats and all civil rights organizations, all fair-minded people.

Rogelio Gonzalez
CC member,

Paraguayan Communist Party

My Shaping-Up Years: The Early Life of Labor's Great Reporter

Art Shields

**The first volume of the auto-
biography of Art Shields,
veteran writer for the U.S.
communist press.**

In the USA:

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS
381 Park Ave. S.
New York, N.Y. 10016
cloth \$14.00 paper \$4.95

In Canada:

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst St.
Toronto M5V 2P6
paper \$7.50



CPSU: facts and figures

80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE RSDLP

The 80th anniversary of the second congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party (RSDLP) is being celebrated by the communists and the whole people of the Soviet Union. It is the congress at which the Bolshevik Party was set up when the revolutionary Marxist organizations of Russia united on Lenin's ideological, political and organizational principles. Armed with the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, it led the emancipation struggle of Russia's proletariat and its allies and carried the working masses to victory in the October Revolution. That is the party under whose leadership a developed socialist society has been built in the USSR.

The Soviet people's heroic record and all their outstanding achievements are inseparably bound up with the activity of the CPSU, which is the society's leading and guiding force, and the core of its political system and state and social organizations. "It is the party," says CPSU CC General Secretary Yuri Andropov, "that has been and continues to be the mighty creative and mobilizing force ensuring continuous advance along every line of social progress."¹

The following figures show how the CPSU has grown and developed, extending its ties with the masses, and increasing its guiding role in every sphere of life in the Soviet society and its influence in various sectors of communist construction.

The growth of the party

After the victory of the February 1917 Revolution, when the RSDLP emerged from the underground, it had only 24,000 members, but the Bolsheviks' policy, which expressed the vital interests of the working class and of all the other working and exploited people, soon won for them support from the broadest popular masses. The growing influence of Lenin's party also resulted in a rapid increase in its membership.

CPSU Membership

(On January 1 of each year)

	Total Communists
1917 (March)*	24,000
1917 (October)	350,000
1918 (March)	390,000
1920 (March)	611,978
1930	1,677,910
1940	3,399,975
1946	5,510,862
1951	6,462,975
1956	7,173,521
1961	9,275,826
1966	12,357,308
1971	14,372,563
1976	15,638,891
1981	17,430,413
1982	17,769,668
1983	18,117,903

*Until 1917, there was no scrupulous count of party membership, which is why no official data were published.

By the Great October Socialist Revolution, the party already had 350,000 members, that is, almost 15 times more than when it emerged from the underground. It was now a vigorous political organization, held together with bonds of iron discipline, and enjoying broad support from the workers, a sizable section of the peasantry and the army masses, and forward-looking intellectuals.

As the struggle to consolidate the Soviet power and build a socialist society proceeded, the party ranks were steadily replenished with fresh forces from the midst of the working people, and there was a steady growth of its influence in every sector of the country's economic and cultural life. The CPSU's deep roots in the people, in every section and social group of the population have never been stronger than they are today, as will be seen from its social make-up.

Social Make-Up of the CPSU
(On January 1 of each year)

	Workers		Peasants (collective farmers)		Office Workers, etc.	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
1966	4,675,379	37.8	1,999,138	16.2	5,682,291	46.0
1971	5,759,379	40.1	2,169,437	15.1	6,443,747	44.8
1976	6,509,312	41.6	2,169,813	13.9	6,959,766	44.5
1981	7,569,261	43.4	2,223,674	12.8	7,637,478	43.8
1982	7,775,271	43.7	2,231,968	12.6	7,762,429	43.7
1983	7,988,900	44.1	2,245,543	12.4	7,883,460	43.5

Workers and peasants (collective farmers) make up a majority of the party members — 56.5 per cent. After the 23rd congress of the CPSU in 1966, which emphasized that the working class was to go on having the leading place in the party's make-up, the working-class core of the CPSU increased by more than 3 million or 70 per cent. This means that the working class is the class which "founds the party, causes it to emerge and nurtures it."²

Compared with 1966, the number of collective farmers among party members increased by 246,400, although the number of collective farmers in the country had dropped. The number of communists among office workers and professionals went up by 2.2 million, almost 75 per cent of whom are engineers, agronomists, teachers, doctors and workers in science, literature, and the arts.

"There can be no socialist revolution, unless very many working women take a big part in it," Lenin wrote.³ Socialism has emancipated women and has given them the amplest opportunities for applying their creative powers in the most diverse spheres of life. There has been a steady growth in women's social activity in the transformation of the society on communist lines, and there is a corresponding increase in the number of women among party members.

Number of Women Communists
(On January 1 of each year)

	Total	%
1920	45,297	7.4
1940	490,844	14.4
1960	1,692,164	19.4
1983	4,968,693	27.4

New members

In the mature socialist society, there is a constant growth in the party's membership as it is being continuously replenished by the best, most conscious and forward-looking repre-

sentatives of the working class, the collective-farm peasantry and the people's intelligentsia.

Number of New Members

	Candidate Members	Full-Fledged Members
From 1966 to 1970 (between 23rd and 24th congresses)	2,987,809	2,988,242
From 1971 to 1975 (between 24th and 25th congresses)	2,593,824	2,473,576
From 1976 to 1980 (between 25th and 26th congresses)	3,162,372	2,945,652
1981	654,128	630,299
1982	667,625	619,145

CPSU Candidate Members by Occupation
(by territorial organizations, %)

	1966-1970	1971-1975	1976-1980	1981	1982
Total candidate members	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
of them:					
Workers	52.0	57.6	59.0	59.5	59.4
Collective farmers	13.4	11.3	10.3	9.9	10.1
Engineers, technicians, agronomists, zoo-technicians, scientific workers, teachers, doctors and other national-economy specialists	26.4	24.5	25.4	25.8	25.9
Administrative personnel	7.5	5.2	3.8	3.3	3.2
Students	0.7	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.4

The working class comes to play an ever more important role in the life of the society owing to the growth of its numbers, ideological and political maturity, educational standards and working skills, and this is reflected in the make-up of new party membership. From 1966 to 1982, the number of workers joining as candidate members increased by 14 per cent. From 1976 to 1980, more than 270,000 collective farmers became candidate members. Together, workers and collective farmers now make up 69.5 per cent of new members.

Party organizations see to it that the party ranks are actively increased by forward-looking intellectuals, as the intelligentsia has an ever more important role to play not only in science, education and culture, but also in material production. Among the office workers who became candidate members from 1976 to 1980, 41.5 per cent were engineers and technicians, of whom 32.5 per cent were persons working at enterprises in industry, transport, communications, construction and on state farms. Serious attention is being given to the recruitment of specialists engaged in the development and

engineering of new hardware and technology, and workers in science, literature, the arts and the ideological front.

The total number and percentage of women among new members have been growing from year to year: 34.3 per cent in 1982, the highest figure for the whole post-war period.

Number of Women
Among Candidate Members

	Total	%
1966-1970	767,424	25.7
1971-1975	764,050	29.5
1976-1980	1,017,940	32.2
1981	220,870	33.8
1982	228,748	34.3

"We are the party of the future, and the future belongs to the young. We are a party of innovators, and it is always the young that most eagerly follow the innovators."⁴ This is most manifest today, in the process of communist construction.

Nearly 75 per cent of those who have joined the CPSU since 1976 are members of the Leninist Young Communist League (YCL) — over 27 per cent more than the 1966-1970 figure — and this has markedly fortified the party core within the YCL, in whose ranks more than 1.5 million communists now work.

Number of Young Communists
Joining as Candidate Members

	Total	%
1966-1970	1,335,938	45.4
1971-1975	1,689,557	65.1
1976-1980	2,308,492	73.0
1981	478,179	73.1
1982	488,051	73.1

Educational and national make-up

The steady rise of the Soviet people's general educational, cultural and occupational standards is duly reflected in the party's make-up, as will be seen from the following figures on education.

Communists with a higher, incomplete higher, and complete secondary education accounted for 65.3 per cent in 1976, and for 74.7 per cent in 1983. Of the total party membership, 9,916,000, or 54.7 per cent, are specialists in various fields of knowledge and have a higher or secondary education. That is 2.3 million more than in 1976.

On January 1, 1983, 217,407 communists were candidates of sciences and 27,894 doctors of sciences, an increase of nearly 50,000 and 6,300, respectively, over 1976.

National Make-Up of the CPSU
(on January 1, 1983)

	Total	%
Total members and candidate members	18,117,903	100.0
Russians	10,809,066	59.7
Ukrainians	2,898,757	16.0
Byelorussians	684,492	3.8
Uzbeks	428,446	2.4
Kazakhs	355,213	2.0
Georgians	302,947	1.7
Azerbaijanians	304,915	1.7
Lithuanians	134,866	0.7
Moldavians	98,195	0.5
Latvians	74,225	0.4
Kirghiz	70,195	0.4
Tadjiks	80,293	0.4
Armenians	272,965	1.5
Turkmen	68,744	0.4
Estonians	58,341	0.3
Other nationalities	1,476,243	8.1

Educational Make-Up of the CPSU
(on January 1 of each year)

	1966		1976		1983	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
Total members and candidate members	12,357,308	100.0	15,658,891	100.0	18,117,903	100.0
Higher education	1,934,567	15.7	3,807,469	24.3	5,348,934	29.5
Incomplete higher education	315,366	2.5	382,556	2.5	395,032	2.2
Secondary education	3,816,180	30.9	6,022,397	38.5	7,800,147	43.0
Incomplete secondary education	3,402,057	27.5	3,175,163	20.3	2,836,139	15.7
Primary education	2,889,138	23.4	2,251,306	14.4	1,737,651	9.6

The men and women who are members of the CPSU come from more than 100 big and small nations. Yuri Andropov says: "In ideology, in make-up and structure, our party is a living embodiment of the unity and cohesion of all the big and small nations of the Soviet Union."⁵

Some structural data

Local Party Organizations
(on January 1, 1983)

CCs of CPs of Union Republics	14
Territorial committees	6
Regional committees	151
City committees equated to regional committees*	2
Area committees	10
City committees	873
City district committees	631
Rural district committees	2,886
Communists elected to governing party organs	5.1 mln
Including primary party organizations	4.7 mln

*Moscow and Kiev

Almost three-quarters (73.2 per cent) of all the communists in the national economy now work in the sphere of material production. Since 1966, the number of party members in this sphere went up by 3.1 million. There has been a steady growth in the number of commu-

nists working in industries turning out consumer goods, and also in agriculture, marketing and public catering, and in everyday services.

Primary Party Organizations
(on January 1, 1983)

Total	425,897
Shop organizations	480,256
Party groups	659,955

* * *

In its 80 years, the CPSU, once a small organization of Marxist revolutionaries, has become a mighty and well-knit party. In the developed socialist society, the CPSU has become the whole people's party, without losing its class character, and continues to be a working class party. There is a steady growth in the Communist Party's role in the life of Soviet society.

The party sees to the rigorous observance of the principle of democratic centralism and Lenin's norms of party life, the basis on which it has perseveringly worked to improve its make-up, to enhance the unity of its ranks, the vigor of activity in the primary organizations, and their influence on the work collectives.

1. *Kommunist*, No. 1, 1983, p. 14.
2. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 406.
3. *Ibid.*, Vol. 28, p. 180.
4. *Ibid.*, Vol. 11, p. 354.
5. *Kommunist*, No. 1, 1983, p. 14.

The CIA under Reagan

For decades the "invisible government" of the U.S. — its Central Intelligence Agency, has been an instrument of political provocation and international piracy. What new elements has the present Washington administration introduced into the agency's activity? This is the subject of the review by a U.S. journalist, published below.

Ronald Reagan and his Director of Central Intelligence, William J. Casey, are presiding over what the *New York Times Magazine* recently called "the biggest peacetime buildup in the American intelligence community since the early 1950's."¹ This development is dramatically expanding CIA activities in three areas: foreign operations against the socialist camp and developing countries, covert actions aimed at overthrowing independent governments or

destroying liberation movements, and spying inside the U.S. against U.S. citizens and resident foreigners.

While the budget of the CIA is of course secret, much of it hidden inside the Defense Department budget, it is known that CIA funding increased 25 per cent for the 1983 fiscal year, surpassing even the 18 per cent increase for the Defense Department. Both increases are scandalous when compared to the massive cuts in health care, education, food programs, care for the blind and elderly, aid to the poor and the cities — which are the hallmark of the Reagan administration.

According to administration budget officials quoted in the *New York Times Magazine*, the CIA is the "fastest growing major agency in the Federal Government"² and its current budget is approaching \$1.5 billion, a figure that seems

absurdly low to those in the United States who follow the CIA closely. A conservative magazine, *Defense Electronics*, estimated in December 1981 that the annual CIA budget is close to \$10 billion, with a total of at least \$70 billion for the overall intelligence budget. The government, which has used the demagogic slogan "take the government off our backs" to slash social services and human welfare programs, stands determined to increase the burden upon its citizens of a mammoth, secret, repressive, and growing, state-within-a-state.

William J. Casey is a millionaire former chairman of the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission and President of the Export-Import Bank, who served as Reagan's campaign manager in the last election. His irregular financial dealings caused a Senate Committee to conclude ambiguously that he was "not unfit" for the office of CIA Chairman. Casey's policy as CIA head is to enhance Reagan's right-wing foreign policy with aggressive overt and covert intervention and intelligence gathering around the world. And now Casey has been given the power to conduct extensive spying and intrusion into the affairs of people inside the United States.

Under Executive Order 12333, issued by Reagan in December 1981, the CIA is allowed for the first time in its history to conduct covert operations and spying within the U.S. to obtain "information relating to the capabilities, intentions and activities of foreign powers, organizations, or persons," a definition broad enough to include almost any activity. The Reagan Order further allows physical searches without a legal warrant, the surveillance of mail, wire-tapping and similar intrusive intelligence techniques.

The Reagan Executive Order removed limitations set by the Carter administration on assassinations and reporting of questionable CIA activities. The result is a vastly empowered agency, free of restraints, not subject to special scrutiny or oversight, and encouraged by the new Cold War mentality and rhetoric characteristic of the Reagan administration. Casey has gone so far as to request of the Justice Department complete immunity from prosecution for intelligence agents actions while on the job — if granted, this would place the CIA above the law — an ominous and frightening development. Long a notorious danger to the people of the world, the CIA is now an immediate threat to its own people. The agency responsible for butchery, assassination, misinformation, fraud, bribery, torture, deceit, human chemical experimentation, infiltration and other "dirty work" has now been loosed within its own country.

The four main divisions of the CIA are intel-

ligence, science and technology, support, and operations. The intelligence directorate has had a checkered career. Its reports, on which administration policy is often supposedly based, vary extremely in accuracy. CIA reports during the Vietnam War are generally credited with being more accurate (i.e., more pessimistic about victory) than the notorious estimates of the Pentagon, which kept insisting that it was winning the war until it lost. On the other hand, intelligence was harshly criticized for failing to understand the strength of the opposition to the Shah of Iran and for continually predicting that the economy of the Soviet Union was in a virtual state of collapse. It only recently corrected this last mistake, issuing a report in December 1982 crediting the USSR with steady, strong economic growth.

The science and technology directorate both interprets foreign technology, particularly Soviet, and engages in research on such projects as spy satellites. Ironically, the CIA is simultaneously attempting to clamp down on the very freedom of inquiry that has so aided U.S. science. In early 1982, then Deputy CIA Director Admiral Bobby Ray Inman directly threatened scientists at a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. U.S. scientists had better submit their research to the CIA for prior censorship or face a government crackdown, Inman warned. Scientists called the threat "disastrous" and "a nightmare." The Admiral's warning was in keeping with the Reagan administration's policy of preventing the flow of scientific information between the U.S. and the USSR, a short-sighted concept that has on several occasions resulted in denying U.S. scientists access to more advanced Soviet theories and technology.

But the essence of CIA activity under Reagan, and the area of Director Casey's greatest interest is the directorate of operations, which conducts clandestine intelligence gathering and covert activities. The U.S. publication that most closely monitors CIA activities, *Covert Action Information Bulletin*, estimates that of a \$10 billion overall budget, the CIA spends \$2-3 billion on paramilitary and undercover activities, and another \$2-3 billion on manipulating the world and U.S. media each year.

CIA undercover activities embrace the globe, including — to name but a few — shipments of military equipment to counter-revolutionary groups in Afghanistan, under-the-table financial aid to certain political parties in Europe, training of security forces for states sympathetic to the U.S., destabilization efforts in Grenada, military supplies and training for the El Salvador junta, the spreading of dengue

fever virus in Cuba, support for the UNITA counter-revolutionaries in Angola, providing arms for South Africa, destabilizing the African Front Line States, and orchestrating a worldwide "Yellow Rain" misinformation campaign which accuses Vietnam and the Soviet Union of using chemical and bacterial warfare in Southeast Asia, etc.

The CIA's ongoing encouragement and support for the apartheid regime in South Africa was summarized in November 1982 in testimony before the United Nations by William H. Schaap, staff counsel of the Center for Constitutional Rights in New York. Schaap reported that the CIA has maintained its contacts with Jonas Savimbi's UNITA counter-revolutionaries in Angola, in violation of U.S. law prohibiting clandestine interference in that country. Savimbi himself met with CIA officers in Rabat, Morocco, in the spring of 1981, and his representatives regularly hold such meetings. A new and deadly element, said Schaap, is the assistance being given to South Africa by CIA-trained Cuban exiles. They have been used by South Africa's Bureau of State Security to carry out contract killings since 1973, but this is the first time that up to 500 Cuban exile mercenaries provided by the CIA have been known to be participating in the war against the Angolan government. It is known also that the January 1981 raid by South African commandos on the homes of exiled members of the African National Congress in Matola, Mozambique, in which 12 unarmed civilians were murdered, was directly aided by CIA agents inside Mozambique.

It is the effort to overthrow the revolutionary Sandinist government of Nicaragua, however, that is today the most ambitious and well-funded of the CIA's clandestine operations. Aptly called by the *New York Times Magazine* "the largest paramilitary and political-action effort mounted by the CIA in nearly 10 years," the operation involves tens of millions of dollars and hundreds of CIA agents in Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Honduras.

The CIA assault against the popular government of Nicaragua is only one part of a many-sided offensive, not all of it conducted by the agency. The U.S. government has cut off all economic aid to Nicaragua and pressured international financial groups to do the same. It has turned neighboring Honduras into a U.S. base of operations, flooding it with the second largest amount of military aid in the Americas, \$30 million in 1982 (though some experts believe the actual figure to be as much as three times greater). The U.S. Embassy in Honduras has been enlarged, and its ambassador put in

charge of the offensive against Nicaragua. Washington has loaned Honduras a fleet of helicopters and fighter planes. In addition, Washington has orchestrated a propaganda campaign against the Nicaraguan government, and funnelled millions of dollars to Nicaraguan businessmen, church leaders and others opposed to the revolutionary policies of the Sandinist government.

The CIA is responsible for the direct military, paramilitary and clandestine attacks on the Nicaraguan people and their government. It has been revealed that a \$19 million fund was approved by the National Security Council in 1982 to recruit and train a paramilitary force to intervene in Nicaragua. This sum has been portrayed in the bourgeois press as the total allotted to the anti-Nicaraguan offensive, but it is merely one project among many, according to the editors of *Covert Action Information Bulletin*. The total funding is unknown.

Tens of millions of dollars have gone to building paramilitary training camps in Florida, California, Costa Rica and Honduras. According to an article in *The Nation* in January, "thousands of anti-Sandinists, most of them ex-Somoza National Guardsmen, are training in California and Florida camps . . . ABC Evening News revealed on November 18, 1982, that the CIA was currently employing several thousand Americans, all 'former' Green Berets, to instruct right-wing Nicaraguan exiles in Honduras. Reportedly these Nicaraguan recruits undergo CIA training courses, and biweekly flights from the Canal Zone bring in grenade launchers, machine guns, rifles and mortars to arm them."³

These counter-revolutionary bands have struck murderously against towns and villages inside Nicaragua near the Honduran border. These actions are part of the U.S. hegemonic aggressive course in Central America and the Caribbean.

One of the most tragic effects of CIA intervention in Nicaragua has been the manipulation of the Miskitu Indians who live along Nicaragua's northeast border. Exploiting cultural and ethnic differences is nothing new. During the Vietnam War, the CIA trained members of the Hmong people for armed struggle against the Vietnamese; the CIA used the same methods with the Kurds of Iraq and Iran during the 1970s. Now the CIA has incited discontent among the Miskitu, attempted to establish a Miskitu former agent of Somoza, Steadman Fagoth Muller, as a counter-revolutionary leader, and has used the plight of the Miskitu, caught in the zone of action of foreign invaders, to mount an international campaign

attempting to discredit the Nicaraguan revolution. Once again, the CIA is itself victimizing a minority people and then attempting to turn their plight into an advantage for the agency. An ironic footnote surfaced early this year. Former CIA agent Edwin P. Wilson, in prison for smuggling weapons, was charged by Federal officials with attempting to buy the murder of two U.S. Federal prosecutors and five U.S. government witnesses. This murder plot against U.S. citizens highlights an ongoing problem: right-wing terrorists and terrorist organizations that have been funded, trained, armed, promoted and protected by the CIA cannot simply be turned off when they are no longer needed.

The Cuban exile terrorist groups trained for 20 years by the CIA, the former Somoza Guardsmen in the jungles of Honduras, the former Saigon Army officers which have formed clandestine organizations of Vietnamese in the U.S., the countless individual agents trained in murder, torture and underground activities — all continue to be active. Were the political situation to change, they would continue to wage their private wars, with or without the support of the CIA, like murderous robots with no "off" switch. They

will be hired by corporations and right-wing governments to aid and advise repression. They form a pool of expertise and contacts in the service of repression and terror. They serve as unofficial links between the CIA, foreign governments and private organizations — links that cannot be traced, but which leave their scars across the face of the earth.

Except for the permission to conduct covert activities inside the United States, little of what has been described here is new in form. What is new, dangerous and a threat to peace, is the blanket support offered to the CIA by the Reagan administration. While Carter had been forced by public opinion to tighten the reins on the agency, subjecting it to scrutiny and oversight and partially restricting its operations, Reagan has obviously encouraged the CIA to enter areas even the agency had not considered possible before. Translated into money, power, weapons, this new CIA capability threatens lives and peace around the world as never before.

Terence Cannon

1. *New York Times Magazine*, January 16, 1983.
2. *Ibid.*, January 16, 1983.
3. "Reagan's 'Secret' War on Nicaragua," Stephen Schlesinger, *The Nation*, January 1-8, 1983.



A severe indictment

Fidel Castro, *La crisis economica y social del mundo*, sus repercusiones en los países subdesarrollados, sus perspectivas sombrías y la necesidad de luchar si queremos sobrevivir. La Habana, Oficina de Publicaciones del Consejo de Estado, 1983, 238 pp.*

This book by Fidel Castro, First Secretary, CC, Communist Party of Cuba, President of the Council of State and the Council of Ministers, Republic of Cuba, is a severe indictment of

imperialism. It reveals in specific and convincing terms the effects of the brutal oppression and exploitation to which the imperialists have systematically subjected the peoples of the Third World, or three-fourths of humanity, for decades.

These effects are truly appalling: in developing countries, hungry, over 500 million; living in extreme poverty, over one billion; life expectancy under 60, 1.7 billion; lacking medical care, 1.5 billion; lacking permanent and adequate water sources, 2 billion; unemployed and underemployed, 500 million (i.e., half the able-bodied population); illiterate adults, 814 million; children lacking schools or unable to attend, over 200 million. There is also a fact which has always been distressing but is all the more so in this era of space flights and the

*Also published in English and French. All quotations in this text are from the English edition: Fidel Castro, *The World Economic and Social Crisis, Its Impact on the Underdeveloped Countries, Its Somber Prospects and the Need to Struggle If We Are to Survive*. Report to the Seventh Summit Conference of Non-aligned Countries, Havana, Publishing Office of the Council of State, 1983.

scientific and technological revolution: in developing countries, every day sees 40,000 children die of starvation or disease.

The figures in which the book abounds (including those just cited) were culled by a team of young assistants of the author from statistics released by international organizations, as well as from specialized publications. The result is an important document synthesizing the questions, preoccupations and ideas presented by Fidel Castro earlier from the rostrum of the UN General Assembly and non-aligned summits. Fidel Castro circulated this scholarly, revolutionary book, which no fair-minded person can read without emotion or without stopping to think of the causes of the present situation and its unforeseeable consequences, as his report to the seventh summit conference of non-aligned countries in Delhi last spring.

"We thought it would be of interest," the author notes in the introduction, "to provide the Heads of State or Government and political leaders in general — especially those of the Third World — with official data that are beyond suspicion of bias and demonstrate the tragedy of our peoples" (p. 5).

The facts given in the book expose those guilty of this great tragedy, that is, primarily the transnationals.

Capitalism began plundering the colonized part of the globe, now known as the Third World, even as it was asserting itself in Europe (Marx saw it as one of the bloody methods of the primitive accumulation of capital). Lenin showed that imperialism had made this plunder permanent and all-round. Imperialism's main instruments today are the transnationals, which use the most refined devices.

Indeed, transnationals "produce and distribute an increasingly important share of all the goods in the world capitalist system and generate the biggest share of international capital flow which they control by means of a vast international financial network. This means that these international monopolies are the principal agents in the world capitalist process of accumulation and exploitation" (p. 135).

In the late 70s, 11,000 corporations controlled about 40 per cent of the developing countries' industrial production and half of their foreign trade. Due to price manipulation by transnationals, these countries lose from 50 to 100 billion dollars a year.

Fidel Castro describes U.S. transnationals as the most ruthless exploiters of the Third World. Eight of the world's 10 biggest transnationals are U.S.-owned. From 1970 to 1979, they invested \$11,446 million in developing countries and took out \$48,663 million in profits. This

means that they got \$4.25 for every dollar they invested during that period.

More and more often, imperialism resorts to loans on truly shackling terms as a refined method of exploitation. Needless to say, transnational banks are the main go-betweens. The result is well known. The foreign debt of the Third World has topped \$600 billion and half of it is owed by Latin America.

The burden of debts is so heavy that it nullifies not only the possibility of economic growth but also the effort to keep consumption at least on the existing low level. It is a vicious circle and breaking out of it is becoming harder and harder. In the 1978-1982 period, annual payment of interest increased by nearly a quarter on the average, exceeding the growth of the debt itself. "In other words, it is increasingly necessary to ask for loans in order to be able to pay what is already owed" (pp. 89-90). In absolute figures this meant, according to IMF statistics, that the payment of interest swallowed \$99 billion, or 85 per cent, of the \$117 billion borrowed by developing countries in 1981.

The book calls attention of world opinion to the grave dangers which the persistence of current trends presents to international trade and finance. By 1990, oil-importing countries of the Third World, which constitute the majority, will have to spend nearly four-fifths of their export earnings to pay interest and clear off debts.

On the strength of information released by the biggest capitalist banks and international organizations, the author exposes the fraud through which the imperialists want to make their victims give up attempts to cast off the yoke of dependence. This fraud may be called "transnational ideology." Its exponents advertise an industrialization model designed to turn underdeveloped countries into "export platforms" for the sale of the output of transnationals going to the world market. This abnormal model implies giving transnationals a free hand in using cheap and abundant labor as an "external industrial reserve army." The ideologists of transnationalism regard the struggle for full national liberation and all real steps toward economic independence as useless.

An important merit of the book, which we are reviewing in the most general terms, is its analysis of the ruinous effects of today's economic crisis, exported by the main capitalist powers, for developing countries. Citing incontrovertible evidence, the author shows how the imperialists try to put the burden of their crisis on the countries they are exploiting as producers, merchants and creditors.

Of particular interest is the coverage of three fundamental issues deeply affecting the developing world: the arms race, the food problem, and the so-called energy crisis. On all three points, the author adduces convincing data exposing imperialism, which rejects any reasonable solution, and, furthermore, tries to lighten the burden of its own problems above all at the expense of the Third World.

Fidel Castro singles out the threat to world peace as the most important of these three issues, which may be said to form the three sides of a heavy pyramid. "As part of its policy of coercion, threats, destabilization and aggression — with the ensuing increase of international tension and the climate of cold war — the United States government has launched the greatest peace-time arms build-up program in its history. This program, aimed above all at disrupting the strategic military balance reached during the 70s between the NATO countries and the socialist camp, is indeed the decisive factor in the gigantic upsurge of military expenditures and the arms race. The aggressive and interventionist course of President Reagan's administration, backed by the enormous combined offensive potential of the United States armed forces and its NATO allies, is the greatest conceivable threat to peace and the security of all the peoples of the world" (p. 199).

Imperialist strategy in regard to developing countries is at daggers drawn with the principles of the new international economic order sought by all peoples. This is why Fidel Castro considers it imperative "to struggle tirelessly for peace, improved international relations, a halt to the arms race and a drastic reduction in military spending, and to demand that a considerable part of those funds be dedicated to developing the Third World" (p. 212). Add to this main point others: the demands for abolishing unequal trade terms, ending the export of inflation to less developed countries and removing ruinous protectionism and inequality in the exploitation of marine resources, as well as for allocating funds and greatly easing the burden of debts, which should also include remitting them.

The author points out that to resist neocolonialism effectively, it is necessary for every country to have "a firmly established, independent government which defends national interests" (p. 147).

The indictment of imperialism, with its policy of plunder and warmongering, ends with an emphatic rejection of submission, pessimism and defeatism. The book calls for struggle. If this struggle is to lead to new victories, the non-aligned movement must above all preserve

its unity, Fidel Castro stresses. "We must not allow anybody or anything to divide us. We must use political formulas and negotiations to solve those problems which make some of our countries occasionally oppose each other. Let us form an indestructible battle line of peoples to demand recognition of our noble aspirations, our legitimate interests and our inalienable right to survive, both as Third World countries and as an inseparable part of humankind" (p. 216).

The seventh non-aligned summit met in a year when the whole of progressive opinion is marking the 30th anniversary of the beginning of the Cuban revolution whose victory, consolidation and progress enabled our people to win full national and social liberation. This makes it opportune to draw a parallel here between the speech made by Fidel Castro at the trial of participants in the assault on the Moncada barracks 30 years ago and the report he submitted to the Delhi summit. This parallel reveals the colossal progress that has come about in world history.

Three decades ago Fidel Castro, an arrested young revolutionary, spoke in court, formally as a defendant but actually as an accuser of the dictatorship. He voiced the democratic and liberation aspirations of Cuba's national forces, which rose against the tyrannical neocolonialist regime imposed by U.S. imperialism and which finally triumphed on January 1, 1959. Speaking in Delhi, this time as head of independent and sovereign Cuba and outgoing Chairman of the non-aligned movement, Fidel Castro set out in explicit terms a program for the democratization of international economic relations and an end to the neocolonialist tyranny of imperialist monopolies.

This struggle is bound to be much more protracted and arduous but it, too, will lead to victory, "to a world based, not on exploitation, but on international cooperation, a less unfair and more equitable world" (p. 27).

The author's confidence in the unity of the non-aligned movement and in the ultimate success of the struggle of the peoples of new states that is unfolding at a time when imperialism's positions have been weakened (which explains the extreme aggressiveness of its adventurist sections) and when socialism has consolidated itself still further, lends the book, in spite of the tragic reality reflected in it, the same optimistic tenor as rang in the speech "History Will Absolve Me" delivered by Fidel Castro 30 years ago.

Raul Valdes Vivo
CC member, Communist Party of Cuba

Indomitable spirit

Island in Chains. Ten Years on Robben Island as Told by Indres Naidoo to Albie Sachs, London, Penguin Books, 1982, 278 pp.

Indres Naidoo was one of a group of South African freedom fighters arrested in 1963. The whole group was tortured and Naidoo also suffered from a gunshot wound received at the time of his arrest which was left untreated for several days. Eventually he and two comrades-in-arms — Shirish Nanabhay and Reggi Vandeyar — were given 10-year jail sentences for sabotage.

Island in Chains, by Indres Naidoo and Albie Sachs (also a member of the ANC who was imprisoned in South Africa) and published in London, is the immensely moving and gripping account of the years Naidoo spent as political prisoner No. 885/63 in the South African regime's notorious Robben Island jail. Including as it does descriptions of the nerve-shattering brutality and sadism of Pretoria's jailers that all-too vividly illustrate the relentlessly mounting terror which the apartheid system inevitably produces, it might be expected to make depressing reading. Quite the contrary is true. It makes compulsive reading, inspiring the certainty that humanity and justice will triumph. The contradictions inherent in South Africa's political system, as well as the stupidity and impracticability of its very conception, emerge with glaring clarity.

The greatest achievement of this narration is its success in portraying the extraordinary selflessness and totally disciplined commitment of the activists of the African National Congress to free their fellow-countrymen. The quiet dignity and enduring self-respect of the ANC prisoners, in striking contrast to the disunity and abject degradation of some of the other prisoners, emerges as an example which cannot fail to have far-reaching effects. "Most of us," Naidoo relates of his fellow-prisoners, "had never set eyes on one another before, and our backgrounds were totally different, but while we were together our comradeship was of the highest caliber . . . Some spoke Zulu, some Xhosa, some English, some Sotho, some Afrikaans, some were illiterate, others had university degrees. But we were all together for the same reason: all in the same fight, for the same goals, suffering the same hardships" (p. 57).

Little wonder that even the warders were unwillingly impressed and eventually ac-

corded these men a certain reluctant respect. The recent removal to the mainland of Nelson Mandela, together with some other courageous prisoners, whose personal charisma and unshakable dignity and strength of will permeated the prison despite their permanent isolation, may well be in part an attempt to break the high morale and spirit of resistance.

The authors have obviously put a great deal of thought into the structure of this book. They have avoided the monotony which could easily have crept into a work that essentially describes long years of subjection to an endlessly repeated daily routine. Naidoo's experience is encapsulated in a series of episodes grouped together to illustrate life on the island, rather than arranged as a chronological progression. The central section of the book is divided into two parts illustrating the progressive concessions wrested from the jailers by tenacious and courageous action.

Here is an example of the conditions when Naidoo arrived:

"I ran as fast as I could, my leg chained to the leg of Henry Makhoti, my wrist to his wrist. Each movement of mine threatened to pull him down, we tugged against each other, with the warders on horseback getting closer all the time. We stumbled and fell and got up and ran again, soon at the back of the vast mass of prisoners all running desperately back to the prison, their chains rattling in the dust . . .

"Black warders on foot lashed at us with sticks, our feet tore on the sharp stones and the horses, skilfully guided by their riders, kicked at our ankles . . . It was a nightmare . . . I never believed we would reach the goal alive . . .

"We were running naked, our clothes bundled in our arms: a thousand of us streaming across a yard to place the clothes in a pigeon-hole, then racing, the cold air beating against our skins, to a door containing a metal detector, leaping through the doorway, one after the other, and then grabbing the first set of clothing we saw in a pigeon-hole on the other side, regardless of who had worn it the previous day, dressing as we ran, ducking blows and hearing insults as we sped toward the kitchen, grabbing a plate of food from prisoners handing out the evening meal — worried that if we missed we would go without food — picking up a mug and dipping it on the run into a large container of coffee and rushing into a big courtyard

where we were given five minutes to squat and finish eating" (pp. 44-45).

Perhaps surprisingly, Naidoo is able to maintain a sufficiently clear overall perspective to perceive the warders not merely as brutes, but as the brutalized victims of the same oppressor.

Lung diseases were common among the prisoners as a result of dust from the quarry and the unfavorable climate, yet sufferers from these and other illnesses were usually either ignored or "treated" with a dose of castor oil or an aspirin, in spite of the availability of a whole range of modern medicines displayed to impress visiting officials from the Red Cross and similar organizations.

Among the cases of neglect amounting to murder, the following instance is cited: a young prisoner "went to hospital with flu, and was turned away. The next day the same thing happened. On the third day he could not even get up, so some of his colleagues carried him to the hospital where they were told to take him away. They refused, leaving him lying on the floor of the dispensary, and even then he was given no treatment. Only when he was critically ill with double pneumonia was he rushed to the mainland. He died within days" (p. 132).

Despite the grim subject-matter, the authors have avoided making the book over-solemn. The prisoners demonstrated an amazing ability to preserve their sanity and fortify themselves by responding to their dire conditions with the maximum possible humor and flexibility. The tremendous strain of their 24-hour-a-day self-imposed decision never to show weakness or despair or lose self-control would have proved unendurable had they not provided themselves some relief in laughter, song, discussion, news-gathering and the various cultural and sporting outlets for which they put up such a strenuous battle.

These ANC prisoners, with the support of growing numbers of other prisoners who recognized the efficacy of their principled stand on all issues, waged an amazing fightback, including an incredible hunger strike and a strike at the quarry. Their only weapons were their unbreakable unity, determination, and the certainty of the justice of their demands. They also had the backing of international public opinion, which even fascist regimes do not venture to disregard totally.

Those who doubt the importance of worldwide solidarity in the form of international pressure exemplified by the total isolation of the racist regime in all spheres, by anti-apartheid activity, condemnation and intervention by non-governmental organizations, the close and well-publicized scrutiny of the

fate of all missing and detained political activists, should be convinced by this book of the need to continue and intensify all such activity, which benefits detainees not only as a lift to their morale, but also in practical ways, however limited these may be.

As literature with a definite political aim, *Island in Chains* succeeds in the very task which Naidoo mentions as one of the goals of the ANC prisoners in their cultural activities. Describing the plays performed by some of the other prisoners, he comments that these were typically "sketches about suffering and oppression in South Africa, never showing the way forward, never giving them the courage to fight, or showing a way out. We used to look at their plays — they had some talented actors and the singing was always beautiful — but in the end we always felt empty. Our own plays inspired us, even if the acting was not of a very high standard; poems by Brecht, plays by Gorky and Chekhov, sketches from our own struggle. They united us, inspired us, made us feel warm to each other, part of a struggle for freedom that was worldwide and winning its own victories" (p. 227).

Many passages in this book give a fresh insight into the depravity of the apartheid system, citing examples of inhumanity which, taken singly, are rarely dramatic enough to receive any publicity. These are multiplied thousand-fold, with daily insults routinely inflicted, hundreds of thousands of families broken up, beatings, pass laws, arrests and restrictions, which steep the lives of the people in sorrow and make the name of the South African regime abhorrent throughout the world. One such passage alludes to the moving story of Joseph Morolong, imprisoned for a petty infringement after years of banishment, "totally alone in a hut, restricted to an area of only one square mile, in which he had been the only human being." For him, the end of his terrible isolation more than compensated for the hardships and humiliations of prison life: "We could see him coming alive; even during the endless smashing of stones in the quarry he radiated new energy, he enjoyed conversations and always had a point of view to contribute; it was a pleasure to have him around. Then, slowly, we noticed his energy beginning to fade away. He started losing weight and became increasingly withdrawn" (p. 209). The reason? His impending "release" — back to banishment.

Those who survive and complete their sentences, are released to the "twilight freedom" of life under the present South African regime, almost without exception return to continue

the battle, not to submit or acquiesce. As the authors note in a postscript, "Robben Island was intended to be the place for the destruction of anti-apartheid militants, but instead has become a center of resistance and the symbol of the indestructibility of the movement for the creation of a non-racial democratic South Africa" (p. 277).

A number of former Robben Island prisoners have been brutally cut down by the racist regime in recent years. For example, Joe Gqabi was assassinated in Zimbabwe while acting as the representative of the ANC in that country. William Khanyile was one of those who died in the attack on ANC homes in Mozambique, and Zola Nqini, Pakamile Mpongoshe, Jackson Tayo, Titus Jobo, and Alfred Marwanqana were similarly murdered in Lesotho.

Readers might be interested to know some facts about Indres Naidoo. He was born into a family of which all members, both male and female, were unwavering in their devotion to the cause of their country's liberation. His father was adopted by Mahatma Gandhi when the latter lived in South Africa, and spent years

in incarceration for his political activities. His sister, Shanti, was imprisoned for one year for refusing to give evidence against her arrested comrades. Prema Naidoo, younger brother of Indres, together with Shirish Nanabhay, was arrested and jailed in April 1982 for helping to hide Steven Lee, an ANC white militant, after his dramatic escape from the maximum security prison in Pretoria.

This is further confirmation, if such were needed, that the spirit which fires the men and women of the ANC is indeed indomitable. This last incident (which occurred after this book went to press) is no exception. In fact it typifies the dedication of those who cannot be made to submit.

Let me end with the final words of the book:

"Our hope . . . is that each reader will be stirred by the story it tells into thinking about the contribution he or she can make to . . . the release of all political prisoners in South Africa, and the ending of the system which results in the best sons and daughters of our country finding themselves behind bars" (p. 278).

Meg Pahad

Chief hero: the working class

Art Shields, *My Shaping-Up Years*, New York, International Publishers, 1983, 240 pp.

The first volume of Art Shield's autobiography is a valuable contribution to Marxist literature in the United States. Written with the sharp personal insight of a communist journalist, *My Shaping-Up Years* covers an important period in U.S. history. Beginning in the latter decade of the 1800s, it concludes with the ending of World War I. This period signaled the rise of U.S. imperialism and its emergence on the world scene.

The book begins with the author's family background. His father's people were struggling small farmers in North Carolina. While the state was dominated by the slave-owners prior to the Civil War, this area was noted for its opposition to chattel slavery.

Art's mother was descended from a long line of preachers in the sect known as the Moravian Brethren — an offshoot of the famous Hussite movement. In the New World, the Moravian Brethren founded a colony in Pennsylvania, named Bethlehem, where all worked and lived in common. Along with the Quakers and other religious sects, they were early opponents of slavery. Moving southward, their dogma at-

tracted Art's father with its humanism. He joined the sect and became a preacher. Art writes that the views of his mother and father have had a lasting influence on him.

But what the book focuses on is not the author's personal experience. Shields vividly describes the stirring events he witnessed and took part in, and people he met. There is every reason to say that the chief hero of his book is the working class: Black and white workers, construction and steel workers, machinists and seamen. One also finds news reporters and policemen, as well as unfortunate young women thrust into prostitution.

Art Shields has won the title of "dean of labor reporters" in the United States. He knew Jack London, Upton Sinclair and John Reed. One meets Eugene V. Debs' socialists and "Big Bill" Haywood, leader of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW). The author provides first-hand details of the historic Paterson, New Jersey, textile strike of 1913, led by Haywood and the "Rebel Girl," Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, later to become National Committee Chairman of the Communist Party USA.

The book is a vast panorama of American politics, and many of the problems dealt with

are still relevant. This applies, in particular, to the bitter persecution and suffering of the native American Indians.

Several pages describe Shields' experiences in Alaska relating to the lives of both the Eskimos and gold prospectors. There is an exciting chapter on the joyful reaction of Alaskan workers to the Great October Socialist Revolution. Art relates how and why Lenin came to write his famous "Letter to American Workers."

The author, who celebrated his 94th birthday on October 31, 1982, possesses a phenomenal memory and enviable energy. He is well along with the writing of the next book of his autobiography. It will tell how he joined the young Communist Party, how he met his wife and life-long companion, Esther, how he took part in the long struggle to save the lives of Sacco and Vanzetti and in the struggles against the lynching of Blacks. The next book will be con-

cerned with many of his exciting experiences as a labor reporter for the Communist Party paper, the *Daily Worker* (now the *Daily World*), including many bitter strikes of the coal and copper miners, the steel workers and many others, as well as his experiences as a communist journalist during the Spanish Civil War.

My Shaping-Up Years is aptly titled. It is a warmly told story of events in the life of a young man and their impact on his political views. It revives milestones in the American working-class movement and is evidence of the author's confidence in the ability of the working class to bring down an outdated system based on exploitation and build a new, just society. The writer is the very personification of communist humanism, and *My Shaping-Up Years* is a book to read and cherish.

George Meyers
CC Political Bureau member,
CPUSA

"... But what about Ireland?"

Geoffrey Bell, *Troublesome Business: The Labour Party and the Irish Question*, London, Pluto Press, 1982, 150 pp.

This book is original in that it is the first time that the policies of the British Labour Party in relation to Ireland have been outlined. This does not mean that it is purely of interest for an Irish or British audience. It focuses on the role played by social democracy in a colonial country, a subject which should be of interest to all progressives. This is made easy by the author through his background information of the historical periods discussed.

In the introduction it is stressed that the book "is a record rather than an interpretation." This, evidently, limits the book's possibilities, but even so, much of the detailed research does uncover plenty of material to help the reader draw his or her own conclusions.

The book covers the history of the British Labour Party from its founding in 1900 right up to the present day, concentrating on specific periods. Naturally enough, these include the times when the Labour Party was in power, as it was then that its policies on the Irish question mattered most.

However, the best analysis and research seems to be of the first 20 years of the party, where the reader is shown the Labour Party evolving a policy on Ireland, as well as the interesting developments taking place both in-

side the rank and file and the leadership. One source well exploited by Bell are the parliamentary speeches of the latter, which he meticulously examines. His reasons for doing so are quite clear, "there was much sleight of hand at work in the words chosen" (p. 31). In this particular instance the Labour leader, Ramsey MacDonald, seemed to be opposing the imperialist plan to partition Ireland, in fact, as the author concludes, "it was, at best, an abstentionist position" (ibid.).

But the fine words of the Labour politicians were at least seen through by some of their contemporaries, if only outside Britain. This the author shows with what he calls "an intriguing and neglected" speech by James O'Grady, a Labour MP, in the House of Commons in October 1917: "When I was in Russia putting the case for the allies . . . I pointed out that at the beginning of the war 4,000,000 British citizens volunteered because they thought they were fighting a war of liberation. But said some of the Russians of the Soviets of Petrograd and Moscow, 'You say you are fighting a war of liberation, but what about Ireland?'"

Contrary to the rank and file's views to the Irish question during this period, the book shows up the wavering and often hypocritical line of the Labour "politicians," but also their fear of the influence that the Irish working-class leaders, such as the revolutionary James Con-

nolly, might have on the British workers. It also shows the impact international developments were having: "The first world war and the Russian revolution had helped commit the Labour movement to internationalism" (p. 60).

What also comes through is how long the Labour leadership have been using the same tactics to nullify progressive positions taken by the ordinary membership. This was clear in 1920, when the Labour conference gave unconditional support to Irish self-determination. The author points out directly after this: "As is the way with radical resolutions passed at conferences of the Labour Party, the policy was not reflected in the activities and words of the party leadership" (p. 57). So Ireland was partitioned with the blessing of the Parliamentary Labour Party.

As was mentioned earlier, Bell always tries to keep the reader in the picture concerning developments in Ireland. This is exemplified in his analysis of the Labour government, which was elected to power in 1945. This government throughout its term of office had close ties with the ruling force in Northern Ireland, the Unionist Party, which one Labour minister described as "reasonable and cooperative" (p. 74). Just how iniquitous this regime was, Bell shows in the speech of the then Northern Ireland Prime Minister: "Many in the audience employ Catholics, but I have not one about the house . . . In Northern Ireland the Catholic population is increasing to a great extent. Ninety-seven per cent of Roman Catholics are disloyal and disruptive . . . if we in Ulster allow Roman Catholics to work on our farms we are traitors to Ulster" (ibid.).

The author makes good use of Cabinet papers from this period to show that British interests in Ireland, Labour or Conservative, were based on one issue — its "first-class strategic importance" to Britain (p. 81). However, it is unfortunate that he doesn't put this in its international context, i.e., the impact of the defeat of fascism, the development of the liberation movements in other colonies and, of course, the fact that the Soviet Union no longer stood alone in the world as the only socialist country. Coupled with these changes was the cold-war foreign policy of the British Labour government, which included its decision to help found the aggressive NATO alliance.

The lack of an international perspective is a general criticism that can be made against part of the book, particularly treatment of the period after 1945. It is also unfortunate that the author omits to mention, and therefore to analyze, the fact that full control of Northern Ireland's fiscal powers remained in the hands of Westminster

under the Government of Ireland Act of 1920. This first of all makes nonsense of the almost 50 years old convention in the British parliament that Northern Ireland should never be discussed, as it was deemed to be outside its jurisdiction. Bell doesn't point to this contradiction, nor does he refer to these fiscal controls when discussing the Labour government of the 1960s. This is regrettable, as it was during this period in office that many of the foreign multinationals began to penetrate the Northern Ireland economy, with the result that by the mid-1970s 78 per cent of Northern Ireland's industries were foreign owned.

The last three chapters deal with the period of political crisis from 1968 till today. Here the author doesn't have the luxury of time or Cabinet papers to help show why things developed the way they did. This leads him, on occasions, to assume that the Labour government's inability, back in the late 1960s, to force drastic changes on the Northern Ireland regime stemmed from a "general apathy" on the part of the Labour leadership (p. 109). This is being overgenerous to the ruling circles inside the Labour Party, as is the claim that Labour governments "had too long a history of taking the soft option on Northern Ireland" (p. 110). It is much more likely that they did not wish to pressure too much a regime that had done such sterling work for British imperialism in the past.

But the situation didn't remain static and the Labour government of the 1970s found itself in direct control of Northern Ireland. Through careful analysis Bell shows how Labour pandered to Unionist wishes for more repression. Hence the Dublin newspaper, *Irish Times*, commenting on the Labour government's position, said it was "putting into effect policies long advocated by the Conservative Party" (p. 127). This inevitably had its consequences in Britain with the passing of the draconian Prevention of Terrorism Act, which "was used to arrest such 'terrorists' as pacifist Pat Arrow-smith, Irish trade union leader Phil Flynn, former Scotland Yard detective Arthur Evans and freelance journalist Ron McKay" (p. 129).

The Labour Party in opposition since May 1979 — a period not really dealt with in this book — has seen a change in policy. This includes the demand for the repeal of the Prevention of Terrorism Act and the now stated aim of working for the eventual reunification of Ireland. These are important breaks with the Labour and Tory bipartisan approach, which was so evident in the 1970s. However, there are major weaknesses in the Labour Party's new

policy; for example, repressive legislation, such as the Emergency Provisions Act, will still remain on the statute books. The use of such laws by the British army and police is the main cause of the violence on the streets of Northern Ireland today. What is needed is the removal of this draconian legislation and its replacement by a Bill of Rights based on the protection and extension of the rights of the entire population of Northern Ireland.

While one must welcome the positive developments in the Labour Party's policy in relation to Ireland, we should not lose sight of the fact that this party has a tendency not to practise in government what it preaches at national conferences.

As for Geoffrey Bell's book, it has its limitations, but it still is a valuable contribution in that it exposes the negative role played by the British Labour Party in Ireland. No one is more conscious of this than the author himself when he concludes: "The attitudes and relationships of the British Labour Party to Ireland have been neither honorable, internationalist, nor socialist . . . The question thrown at Labour MP James O'Grady by members of the Russian Soviets more than 60 years ago lies on the table: 'But what about Ireland?'" (p. 150).

Niall Farrell,
Representative of the
Communist Party of Ireland
on the journal

1883

THE KARL MARX CENTENARY

1983

Media Presents a Symposium on Cassette Tapes

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

In Karl Marx, history presents a person of the highest intelligence, having an understanding of the contemporary world, with unextinguishable hatred for exploitation of man by man. He knew the need for a struggle to end the system of exploitation and to restructure society starting with its very foundation.

This cassette symposium is presented for use by libraries, political science, economics and Afro-American studies in educational institutions.

It is a helpful medium for writers, researchers, and popular educational material for students and instructors.

It is presented to people-at-large for furthering their knowledge of the nature of the socialist system at the very time when people are questioning the validity of the capitalist system.

CONTENTS

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. FREDERICK ENGELS, WILHELM LIEBKNECHT, ELEANOR MARX and PAUL LAFARGUE, Biographical Sketches and Reminiscences on the Life and Work of Karl Marx <input type="checkbox"/> 2. V.I. LENIN: Karl Marx's Philosophical Outlook and Brief Review of His Major Theoretical Principles <input type="checkbox"/> 3. GUS HALL: Karl Marx and the Revolutionary Movements in Developed Countries <input type="checkbox"/> 4. TIMUR TIMOFEYEV: Marxism and Construction of Advanced Socialist Society <input type="checkbox"/> 5. MOSES MABHIDA: Karl Marx and Revolutionary Movements in Developing Countries. <input type="checkbox"/> 6. JAMES JACKSON: Karl Marx and the USA <input type="checkbox"/> 7. PANELISTS: Panelists' remarks also on cassettes 3, 4, 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 8. HANS-JOACHIM RADDE: Marx's Conception of Socialism and Existing Socialism <input type="checkbox"/> 9. HENRY WINSTON: Karl Marx and the Struggle for Peace in the USA <input type="checkbox"/> 10. GUS HALL: 100 Years After Karl Marx: Right on Target <input type="checkbox"/> 11. GUS HALL: Karl Marx in Our Time — the Struggle for Peace and Social Progress <input type="checkbox"/> 12. DR. HERBERT APTHEKER: Marx and Social Sciences in the USA <input type="checkbox"/> 13. PROF. PHILIP S. FONER: Marxist Traditions in the USA <input type="checkbox"/> 14. PROF. HOWARD L. PARSONS: The Idea of Creativity in Marx's Thought <input type="checkbox"/> 15. JOHN PITTMAN: Karl Marx and the U.S. Working Class <input type="checkbox"/> 16. THE DEATH OF KARL MARX |
|--|--|

All single cassettes \$4.00 each, including postage.

The entire centenary cassette symposium as a package, \$35.00, including postage.

Payments must be made by check or money order, payable to New Outlook Publishers and Distributors, and mailed to: Media, Room 704, 235 West 23rd Street, New York, N.Y. 10011. Telephone (212) 741-0659.

Subscription Rates for 1984 to World Marxist Review

	Individual	Institution
Canada	\$15.00	\$30.00
USA	\$15.00	\$30.00
Other countries	\$20.00	\$35.00

Subscribers to *WMR* receive *Information Bulletin* at no extra charge.

Subscribe or renew now at 1983 rates.

Subscriptions or renewals at 1983 rates, for the *calendar year*, must be received by November 30.

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

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

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Canada and U.S., \$12.50 a year. Institutions, double rate.

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

tuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Sinhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tagalog, Tamil, Telugu, Turkish and Vietnamese.

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

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

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

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

Editions of the journal

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

Central Books Limited,
14 The Leathermarket,
London, SE1 3ER, England
Progress Subscription Service,
71 Bathurst Street,
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6, Canada

Imported Publications,
320 West Ohio Street,
Chicago, Illinois 60610, USA

New Horizon Publications,
P.O. Box 2165
Mushin, Lagos, Nigeria

FRENCH EDITIONS:

Coopérative Ouvrière de Presse et d'Éditions,
16, rue Christoph Plantin,
Luxembourg/Gasperich

Société Populaire d'Éditions,
rue de la Caserne, 33-35
1000 Bruxelles, Belgique

Editions Nouvelles Frontières,
185, rue Ontario est,
Montréal, Québec H2X 1H5, Canada

Gestu BP 2678
Dacar, Senegal

AMHARIC EDITION:

Press Department
Ministry of Information and
National Guidance
P.O. Box 30232
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-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: Aikakauslehti Kommunisti,
Kotkankatu, 11, 00510 Helsingki 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
Tribouppis 53c, Nicosia, Cyprus

HEBREW EDITION: Problems of Peace
and Socialism, POB 9525, Haifa, Israel

HUNGARIAN EDITION: Kultura,
Könyves Hirlap, Külkereskedelmi-
Vállalat, Budapest 1, fő u 32, Hungary

INDIAN EDITIONS:

Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 110055, India.
In: Bengali, Hindi, Malayalam, Oriya, English,
Punjabi, Tamil, Gujarati and Telugu

ITALIAN EDITION: Libreria Rinascita,
Via delle Botteghe, Oscure 4,
001 86 Roma, Italia

MONGOLIAN EDITION: Ulaanbaatar Mongol,
Ulsyn Nomyn, Khudaldaany Gazar,
V.I. Lenin gudamzh 1, Mongolia

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Verden og vi,
Boks 3715, GB Oslo 1, Norway

PERSIAN EDITIONS: P.B. 49034,
10028 Stockholm 49, Sweden
16 Azar Ave.
No. 68, Tehran, Iran

POLISH EDITION: RSW "Prasa-
Ksiazka-Ruch", BKWZ Warszawa,
ul Towarowa 28, Poland

PORTUGUESE EDITION: Revista Internacional,
Av. Santos Dumont, 57,
30 Lisboa-1, Portugal

ROMANIAN EDITION: Ilexim,
Calea Grivitei 64-66,
POB 2001, Bucuresti, Romania

RUSSIAN EDITION: Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga,
Moskva 121200, USSR

SINHALESE EDITION: 91 Cotta Road,
Colombo 8, Sri Lanka

SPANISH EDITIONS:

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Aéreo 1253, Bogotá, Colombia
Revista Internacional,
Apartado 4665, San José, Costa Rica
Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa,
16 616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR
Ediciones Cubanas,
Ministerio de la Cultura,
La Habana, Cuba

Empresa Editora e Importadora C.A.,
Villami 211 y Calderon,
Casilla 6217, Guayaquil, Ecuador
Ediciones de Cultura Popular S.A.,
Filosofia y Letras 34,
Col. Copilco Universidad,
Mexico 20, D.F., Mexico

Revista Internacional,
Calle 46, Este No. 16,
Panama, Rep. de Panama
Ideologia Y Politica,
Jr. Rufino Torrico No. 671-Of. 401,
Lima, Peru

San Pedro a San Francisquito,
Edif. Cantaclaro, 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,
Khâu sách báo 32, Hai Bà Trưng,
Hà-Nôi, Vietnam