

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

WHO'S FOOLING WHOM IN CHILE?

What does the future hold for those socialist, democratic and progressive political parties, national organizations, religious groups and other political forces that enter into alliances with communist parties? Do the communists enter the alliance in good faith, with the thought of acting within the alliance merely as equals of the other parties and forces involved? Is it their true intention, within the bounds of their own political ideals and principles, to remain flexible to the political, social and ideological desires of the majority within the alliance for the common good of the alliance and the nation? Will the non-Marxist parties and forces of the alliance and their political, social and ideological ideals survive in the communist party version of the socialist state?

An explicit answer to these questions is found in a theoretical trilogy issued in February this year by the top echelon of international communism, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CC, CPSU). The central thesis appeared in the main journal of the CC, CPSU, Kommunist (issue No. 3, 1972), in a lengthy, wide-ranging article entitled, "The Falsifiers of Scientific Communism and Their Bankruptcy." Bearing the imprint "Prepared by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC, CPSU," the article carries the authority and political weight of a party directive, binding on all party members as well as on all parties worldwide. While providing the theoretical basis for upholding Moscow's ideological orthodoxy, the article ranges well beyond mere theory in prescribing in explicit terms the strategy and tactics for unifying and consolidating the "democratic, anti-imperialist and revolutionary forces" of the world under Soviet political hegemony.

To underline the international significance of the pronouncement, the CPSU simultaneously published two other articles further clarifying those sections of the Kommunist theme most pertinent to foreign communist parties. These articles appeared in Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn (issue No. 3, 1972), a Soviet international affairs monthly that appears in English and French editions as well as in Russian, and in New Times (issue No. 8, 1972), a Soviet international affairs weekly that is published in Russian, English, French, German, Spanish, Polish and Czech. Both articles were signed by Alexander Sobolev, well known among leadership elements of international communism as head of the section of the CC, CPSU responsible for history of the international communist movement.

Regarding political and ideological pluralism and the role of the communist party, questions of vital importance to non-communist parties and groups in alliances with communists, the "February decrees" of the CC, CPSU lay down the law as follows:

a) On Political Pluralism:

"The modern revisionists advocate *political pluralism*. In their opinion, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the experience of the socialist countries in the organization of political life have outlived their time and should be succeeded by spontaneous development and competitive struggle among all social and political forces, all political parties, which in effect signifies abandoning the use of the instruments at the disposal of the working class organized as the state to uphold the people's revolutionary gains. At a time when the monopoly bourgeoisie is steadily building up the machinery of its domination, its political mechanism of self-preservation, the revisionists deny the people and their leader, the working class, the right to suppress the resistance of the exploiters."

b) On Ideological Pluralism:

"The modern revisionists advocate *ideological pluralism*. Negation of the universal, international character of Marxism-Leninism is accompanied with the claim that there exist different, national forms of Marxism. At the same time it is maintained that equal and competitive co-existence of diverse ideological concepts is possible in the working-class movement and the socialist society."

c) On the Role of the Communist Party:

"Rejecting the need for a leading role by the communist party, as confirmed by the experience of the building of socialism in the USSR and the other socialist countries, the revisionists try to limit the party functions within the socialist society and bring them to a minimum. They suggest that the party should be considered merely as one of the social organizations not distinct from the other mass political, professional, or cultural organizations, playing not a leading role but merely the role of an "equal partner." The severe consequences which attempts to abandon the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the leading role of the party and the Leninist organizational principles may lead to were revealed by the 1968 Czechoslovak events. The activities of right-wing revisionists plunged the country into a profound crisis and created the danger of losing the socialist achievements."

World news media pay little or no attention to such weighty articles as those carrying the "February decrees" of the CPSU.

As a matter of course only the top leadership elements of local communist parties make it a point to read and digest the characteristically lengthy and dull theoretical pronouncements emanating from Moscow. As a result those who stand to lose the most (the non-communist parties and forces who join in common causes, alliances or coalitions with communists, other political parties and forces in countries and areas where such "united fronts" exist, and even the rank and file members of local communist parties) normally are unaware of Moscow's latest political and theoretical line. Under such circumstances, which are considered desirable in most cases by both the local communist party and Moscow, the leadership of the local party is allowed to formulate its own local line in the manner most politically expedient for the local constituency.

A case in point, and apparently an attempt at deception of a most blatant variety, involves the treatment of the CPSU "February decrees" by the Communist Party of Chile (PCCh) and the Communist Party of the USA (CPUSA). Both parties are considered among the most stalwart and conscientious followers of Moscow's brand of communism. Neither has ever engaged in anti-Sovietism or denied or even questioned "the international significance of the experience of the CPSU." On the contrary, both have always considered the CPSU the unquestioned leader of communist parties everywhere and the essence of actual socialism as built in the USSR as the goal to be emulated by all communists.

How then explain the fact that in the April 1972 edition of its leading journal, Political Affairs, the CPUSA chose to publish a full English translation of an article from the August-September 1971 issue of the theoretical journal of the PCCh, Principios, that directly contradicts the political and ideological line of the CPSU? The article in question is entitled "Ideological Pluralism", written by a member of the Central Committee of the PCCh, Sergio Vuskovic Rojo. It makes the following points:

a) On Political Pluralism:

"To Chile, the historical legacy of the workers' movement presents us, as one of its most valuable experiences, with the durable existence of trade union unity, but also with the existence of various parties in the political sphere. Therefore, in our country, democracy and liberty are guaranteed by political pluralism and trade union unity. On the cultural and ideological levels the mere existence of a multi-party system is a guarantee that no new alienations foreign to the history of the Chilean popular movement will arise."

"This style, so typically Chilean, of opening for ourselves the road to power was outlined in an interview

with comrade Luis Corvalan (Secretary General of the PCCh) in the magazine Rinascita of April 30 of this year. In it he states the following: 'The Popular Unity coalition has won the government of Chile within the bounds of the State of Law. Today we operate, and will continue to operate within such bounds, because there is no other road for the structural transformation of the country towards socialism. What if the adversary rushes into sedition? Well, the Government of Popular Unity will naturally use every means, will make an appeal to the masses for the restoration of the law, in view of the new conditions created by the reactionary adventure. The State of Law is not a cumbersome piece of furniture which we must discard at the first opportunity. And I repeat: the scope of political and social pluralism which points out the road today is that which will characterize socialism in Chile tomorrow.'"

b) On Ideological Pluralism:

"Just as political pluralism implies the existence of various parties, ideological pluralism implies that in the Popular Government now, and under socialism tomorrow, there are and there will be various ideologies. The corollary of political pluralism is ideological pluralism. That is to say that today, and tomorrow in socialist Chile, there will be complete freedom of religion, of the diffusion of religious or non-religious ideas. Besides Marxism, other ideologies will be able to defend their points of view, will have their publications and seminaries, will maintain Catholic churches and high schools, Masonic temples, or Protestant places of worship or those of other beliefs. Classes in religion of a voluntary character will continue, together with the new social and ideological activities which will keep arising in the revolutionary process."

c) On the Role of the Communist Party:

"Starting from the premise that the guarantees which are established cannot mean the stopping of change or the class struggle, which continues, the fact remains that not one of the parties in the Popular Unity coalition wants to be the one governing party, either now or in the socialist Chile of the future."

The timing of the appearance of the Political Affairs article is especially interesting since one normally would have expected that it would be precisely in its April issue that the CPUSA would have published its own guidance derived from the CPSU "February decrees."

As far as the PCCh is concerned, since the Chilean article was published in August-September of last year Rojo should by now have been branded as a "revisionist" and a corrected version of the PCCh line, in conformity with the CPSU line should have been published. Nothing of the kind has happened. In fact, in public statements since February, PCCh leaders have continued to reassure the electorate of Chile that the PCCh, as "an equal party" of the alliance, firmly believes in a permanent state of political and ideological pluralism.

One cannot but conclude that both the PCCh and the CPUSA, with the approval of the CPSU, are attempting to deceive not only other left-wing political parties but even their own rank and file members.

The following reference materials are attached:

a) Excerpts from the main Soviet article: "Falsifiers of the Theory of Scientific Communism and Their Bankruptcy," from Kommunist, No. 3, February 1972.

b) The English language version of the article from Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn, Russian, No. 3, February 1972, entitled "The Struggle of the CPSU for Unity of the World Communist Movement and Against Opportunism and Revisionism." This version appeared in the Soviet monthly International Affairs, No. 4, April 1972.

c) The article, "Anatomy of Modern Revisionism," from the Soviet English language weekly, New Times, No. 8, February 1972.

d) An English language translation of the Chilean CP article, "Ideological Pluralism" in the CPUSA theoretical journal, Political Affairs, No. 4, April 1972. The original article appeared in the journal of the PCCh, Principios, August-September 1971.

e) A commentary on the Kommunist article that appeared in the British fortnightly newsletter, Soviet Analyst, 30 March 1972, holding that the Soviet line is a reaffirmation of the most blatant Stalinism by the CPSU.

KOMMUNIST, Moscow  
February 1972

THE FALSIFIERS OF THE THEORY OF SCIENTIFIC  
COMMUNISM AND THEIR BANKRUPTCY

In the contemporary epoch the progressive social development is taking place at an ever faster pace. The leading trend of social development -- the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism and communism of mankind -- is making its way in the variegated and complex intertwining of historical events. This transition is linked with the implementation of the universal-historical mission of the working class, the most systematic fighter against all kinds of social and national oppression. The main achievement of the international working class and the main result of its revolutionary struggle are the formation and consolidation of the world socialist system. The growing power of the USSR -- the first country of victorious socialism -- and of all socialist countries is now exerting a decisive impact on the world revolutionary process.

Systematically opposing imperialism, the communist and worker parties are also engaged in an irreconcilable ideological and political struggle against right-wing and "left-wing" opportunism in the contemporary revolutionary movement. "Left-wing opportunism, mainly represented by neo-Trotskyism and Maoism, is trying to replace the scientific Marxist line of the revolutionary movement with political adventurism, and reactionary-utopian and barracks "socialism." Right-wing opportunism is trying to replace this line with bourgeois reformism. As a whole, as V. I. Lenin taught, revisionism always means political surrender to the difficulties and the class enemy, and the abandonment of proletarian positions.

The characteristic feature of the contemporary stage lies in the fact that right-wing and "left-wing" opportunism frequently merge with nationalistic trends and with the most reactionary extreme anticommunism and anti-Sovietism.

The struggle of the working class against revisionism has its history. Suffice it to recall the political bankruptcy of renegades such as E. Bernshteyn, K. Kautskiy, and others like them. V. I. Lenin provided a clear characterization of revisionism. "In the field of politics," he wrote, "revisionism tried to revise the real foundations of Marxism, namely the doctrine of the class struggle. Political freedom, democracy, and universal elections eliminate the grounds for the class struggle, we were told . . ." (Complete Collected Works, vol 17, p 22). He also said that "they determine their behavior on the basis of specific cases, adapting themselves to current events, to political pettiness, forgetting the basic interests of the proletariat and the basic features of the entire capitalist system and the entire capitalist evolution, sacrificing these basic interests for the sake of real or surmised temporary advantages. Such is the revisionist policy" in their struggle against modern opportunism.

Revisionists members of the "Manifesto" group in Italy, R. Garudy in France, E. Fischer, and F. Marek in Austria, and others, grossly distorting and falsifying the ideas of K. Marx, F. Engels, and V. I. Lenin, are presenting their "creativity" as the further development of the Marxist-Leninist theory. In a relatively short period of time the bourgeois publishing houses have brought to the book market large quantities of their revisionist output.

An analysis of the revisionist views indicates that on basic matters they are in fact supporting the positions of bourgeois ideology, anticommunism, and anti-Sovietism. Beginning with the revision of individual Marxist concepts, such people who, formerly, were within the ranks of the communist party, have become open renegades, abandoning the basic principles of the revolutionary doctrine of the working class, and replacing them with bourgeois ideological principles.

The abandonment of the revolution and the preaching of reforms which do not affect the political power of capitalism and a factual reconciliation with the bourgeois society is the essence of the revisionist views concerning today's revolutionary movements.

The basic problem of the socialist revolution is that of power, of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The socialist revolution begins with the seizure of political power which is used as the main tool for economic, social, and cultural changes. Using various pretexts the modern revisionists firmly oppose the dictatorship of the proletariat, identifying it with "party dictatorship," "the rule of the apparatus in the name of the party," and so on. They claim that the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat mandatorily presumes the leading role of the communist party does not stem in the least from the Marxist principles.

We are familiar with V. I. Lenin's numerous statements developing the basic Marxist principle to the effect that the dictatorship of the proletariat is inconceivable without communist party leadership; practical experience indicates that a multi-party system does not conflict in the least with the need for such leadership. The communist party is a vanguard of the working class. It is its most conscientious, organized, and unified detachment. It is only under the leadership of the party that the working class can implement its dictatorship over the overthrown exploiting classes, and engage in constructive and educational work.

Unlike the Marxists, the revisionists speak of the multiplicity of "morals of socialism," meaning a variety in the very nature of socialism. This is eloquently confirmed by the fact that all those supporting the concept of multiple "models of socialism" try, as a rule, to formulate "models" of a society whose socioeconomic and political system would be entirely different from those of real socialism. They openly proclaim that they are striving toward the type of socialism which would be radically different from the models so far known, and that the "model" they are building should embody the features of "real socialism."



This type socialism is distinct from real socialism above all in terms of its basis. According to the inventors of the "new socialism" the socialist state ownership of capital goods, dominating in the world socialist system, creates statism, and bureaucracy. It restricts democracy and leads to the distortion of socialism. For this reason they reject socialist state ownership, replacing it with an abstract socialist "social ownership managed by the sum total of working people" (Roger Garaudy. Le grand tournant du socialisme, p 191). It is natural that the superstructure erected on such a base would be substantially different from the superstructure of factual socialism. According to its inventors, such speculative socialism is "true socialism."

Such claims are radically different from the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. The classics of scientific socialism frequently pointed out that state socialist ownership of capital goods is the basis of the entire socialist society.

What are the "arguments" brought forth by the revisionists in substantiating their concept of the multiplicity of "models for socialism?" They stem, above all, from the following premises: since unlike the slave-owning system, feudalism, and capitalism, socialism is not a distinct socioeconomic system, since it carries both the elements of the old system -- capitalism or feudalism -- and the prerequisites for the future system -- communism. That is precisely what, according to the revisionists, predetermines the profound and basic differences among the various "models for socialism" which depend on the economic, sociopolitical, and ideological structure of each country. In other words, socialism is considered as a transitional system between capitalism and communism.

Marxism-Leninism, however, considers socialism not a transitional system but the first stage of the communist system. The transitional period covers the process of the revolutionary reorganization of capitalism into socialism. This view is of basic theoretical and practical significance. In fact, in the transitional period, a variety of socioeconomic strata and exploiting classes exist within the society against which the victorious proletariat and its allies are engaged in a class struggle. With the completion of the transitional period, as a result of the socialist reorganization of the entire economy, the vestiges of exploiting the classes are eliminated. As to the first phase of communism -- socialism -- it is characterized by the total and complete domination of the socialist ownership, socialist production relations, the existence of nothing but socialist type classes and strata, and the absence of social contradictions between town and country and between intellectual and physical labor.

Analyzing the building of socialism in the various countries, the revisionists reject nearly all the essential aspects characterizing the new society. Their purpose is to develop the type of "model of socialism" which would essentially resemble a "hybrid society" which combines both socialist and capitalist features.

The revisionists draw the conclusion that the communists must perpetuate bourgeois democracy and merely broaden its frameworks. According to the revisionist concepts the democratic nature of the future socialist society in the European countries and its deeper development compared with the existing socialist countries could be ensured only through political pluralism, through a multiple-party system which allows the existence of political parties with programs basically different from those of scientific communism and opposed to the communist party.

What is the attitude of Marxist-Leninists towards party pluralism under socialism? This question is inseparably linked with the attitude of the communists toward the other working class parties and the non-proletarian political organizations.

The communists clearly realize that the working class would be unable to build socialism without unity within its ranks or without an alliance with the remaining toiling masses. The question of the alliance between communists and other workers parties and political organizations of nonproletarian democrats in the various countries depends on the development of the class struggle and the role which such parties play in the revolutionary movement and the political life of their country. However, the basic characteristics of this alliance are its socialist objectives and the vanguard role of the communist party which ensures the reaching of such objectives.

Having gained political power, the working class strives toward the elimination of the private ownership of capital goods. This presumes the expropriation of the capitalists and the landowners and the reorganization of a petty market economy into a large-scale socialist social economy. As historical experience shows this inevitably leads to the elimination of class antagonism, to the ever greater rapprochement among class interests and to the establishment of friendly cooperation relations among all classes and strata within the socialist society. In this connection, under socialism, the grounds for the existence of any type of opposition parties opposing the communist party, is eliminated.

Development of the world revolutionary process fully confirms the Marxist-Leninist view to the effect that the working class can destroy capitalism and create a socialist society only under the leadership of a revolutionary party of a new type, based on the Leninist organizational principles, and equipped with a knowledge of the basic laws governing social development and an understanding of the objectives and paths of its struggle. "The experience of the historical development of many countries and of the class struggle convincingly proved how necessary to mankind are the activities of communist parties, and how fruitful such activities are in terms of social development," emphasized L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee Secretary General, at the 1969 International Conference of Communist and Worker Parties.

The revisionists try to present the Leninist doctrine of the party and its role in the revolutionary struggle and the building of socialism as a system of views separate from the basic concepts of Marxist theory. Yet, it is well known that the need for a political party of the proletariat was proclaimed as early as the Communist Party Manifesto. Emphasizing this basic Marxist view, on 18 December 1889, in a letter to G. Trier, F. Engels wrote: "In order for the proletariat to turn out sufficiently strong and be able to win in the decisive moment it is necessary -- a view which Marx and I have defended since 1847 -- for it to set up a separate party, separate from all others and opposed to them, a party which would consider itself a class party" (K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, vol 37, p 275).

E. Fischer calls for the abolishment of the communist parties as they have developed and to act differently, to dissolve them within a "left-wing" forces coalition in which the communists would not have their own organizational structure. "In my view," he states, "most existing parties have become obsolete in terms of their form and type. I see the possibility for the formation of new associations of fighters and people thinking alike, despite the old and frozen positions. If you wish, such associations would consist of Marxists and non-Marxists, of communists and social democrats, Catholics and Protestants . . ." (Stern, No 49, 1969, p 144). What is left entirely unexplained is how such heterogeneous associations could be associations of "alike-thinking people" and what would the objective of their "struggle" be. In any case, such associations, deprived of their proletarian conscientiousness, organization, and discipline, would represent no serious danger to the capitalist monopolies.

The modern revisionists are particularly active against the leading role of the communist parties in the socialist countries. This is no accident. The question of the place and role of the communist party in the life of the socialist society is basic for its solution affects, above all, the destinies of socialism in each individual country and the future of the entire world socialist system.

Rejecting the need for a leading role by the communist party, as confirmed by the experience of the building of socialism in the USSR and the other socialist countries, the revisionists try to limit the party functions within the socialist society and bring them to a minimum. They suggest that the party should be considered merely as one of the social organizations not distinct from the other mass political, professional, or cultural organizations, playing not a leading role but merely the role of an "equal partner." The severe consequences which attempts to abandon the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the leading role of the party and the Leninist organizational principles may lead to were revealed by the 1968 Czechoslovak events. The activities of right-wing revisionists plunged the country into a profound crisis and created the danger of losing the socialist achievements.

Using various methods the right-wing socialists try not only to undermine the leading role of the communist parties in the revolutionary movement and the building of a new society but to destroy the party itself, decomposing it ideologically and organizationally. They

undermining its ideological foundations -- Marxist philosophical materialism. Attacking the French Communist Party and, through it, the communist movement as a whole, R. Garaudy writes as follows: "If the party does not wish to be a doctrinary sect but the nucleus of all forces which intend to build socialism in France, it can not have any given "official philosophy." It can not be basically neither idealistic nor materialistic, neither religious nor atheistic" (Roger Garaudy, Le grand tournant du socialisme, p 284). The abandonment of philosophical materialism as the basis for a proletarian outlook and the attempt to separate party policy from scientific revolutionary philosophy are yet another confirmation of the betrayal of the cause of the working class by the revisionists.

Historical experience has repeatedly proved that it is precisely the communists, guided by the Marxist-Leninist theory in their policies, that have made and continue to make a decisive contribution to the revolutionary reorganization of the world. Under the circumstances of the sharpened ideological conflict between socialism and capitalism class ideological principle-mindedness is particularly important to the communists. Any retreat from proletarian ideology, whether as a concession to idealism which, using Leninist terminology, as before "turns to its own use even the slightest possible confusion in philosophical thinking" (Complete Collected Works, vol 18, p 380), or in another form, objectively increases the positions of bourgeois ideology and, essentially, is equivalent to the abandonment of an independent proletarian policy. That is precisely why the communist parties can not remain neutral in the conflict among antagonistic outlooks.

The revisionists are fiercely attacking the organizational foundations of the Marxist-Leninist parties. Above all they are rejecting the international nature of the Leninist organizational principles. These principles, naturally stemming from the very essence of the communist party as a party of revolutionary action, the revisionists try to present only as the product of specifically Russian conditions and the circumstances of the political struggle at the turn of the century. They claim that, having established the organizational structure of the party, V. I. Lenin considered it unchangeable and that today's Marxist-Leninist parties are no different at all from the Bolshevik party of that time in terms of organizational forms, when Bolshevism operated under clandestine conditions. Thus the revisionists deliberately confuse the essence of the matter, trying to replace the question of the principles of the organizational structure of the party with the question of the specific forms of its organization so that they may more easily accuse the communist parties of being out-of-step with modern conditions.

It is above all the principle of democratic centralism that is opposed by the contemporary revisionists. They claim that the implementation of this principle hinders the development of true democracy within the party, that it converts the party into a "hierarchical organization," a "bureaucratic pyramid," and so on. Arbitrarily breaking

the dialectical unity between democracy and centralism encompassed within this leading principle of the organizational structure and activities of the communist parties, the revisionists try to present matters as though centralism and discipline within the party allegedly inevitably lead to its bureaucratization.

Revisionist practices clearly show what they would like to make of democracy in party life. The activities of the "Manifesto" group, of R. Garaudy, E. Fischer, and other renegades proves that while allegedly favoring "free exchange of ideas," "the initiative of one and all," and so on, in fact they favor freedom of activity for antiparty groups and factions and the admission of the type of "initiative" which would be opposed to party interests.

The so-called "new" revisionist theoretical concepts we have analyzed are opportunistic and petty bourgeois. Their inherent features are eclecticism, the substitution of materialism with idealism and dialectics with metaphysics, as well as a distorted and one-sided interpretation of the new social phenomena. The revisionist views represent a certain danger to the revolutionary forces of today, to the working class and the Marxist-Leninist parties because, presenting themselves as followers of the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin, first of all, the revisionists exploit for reactionary purposes the broad popularity of Marxist-Leninist ideas; secondly, accusing the communist parties of "dogmatism," they present themselves as the "renovators" of Marxism, claiming that their theoretical speculations are nothing but the creative development of revolutionary theory; thirdly, they are actively supported by the propaganda machine of the monopolistic bourgeoisie which provides them with a very broad area for dissemination and enable them to use their "creations" to influence the minds of a certain segment of the working people.

Uncompromising struggle against dissident revisionist activities and their attempts to distort the theory of scientific communism is a major prerequisite for achieving the ideological, political, and organizational unity of communist and worker parties, and the unification and consolidation of their ranks on the principled foundations of Marxism-Leninism.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, Moscow  
April 1972

## INTERNATIONAL POSITION OF THE USSR AND CPSU FOREIGN POLICY

### THE STRUGGLE OF THE CPSU FOR UNITY OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AND AGAINST OPPORTUNISM AND REVISIONISM

**A. SOBOLEV,**

D. Sc. (Philosophy)

**U**NDER the present historical conditions, unity is becoming an increasingly important factor in the further development of the communist movement. This is primarily because the communist movement is the most influential, organized political mass movement of our day marching in the vanguard of the democratic, anti-imperialist and revolutionary forces. The fate of peace, democracy and socialism, as well as the future of all mankind, depend on the militancy and cohesion of the communist movement.

An analysis of the laws governing social development shows that the consolidation of the unity of the world communist movement is *an objective historical trend. Unity is a political and ideological expression of the real needs of the world revolutionary process in the cohesion of all revolutionary anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly forces.*

This historical trend, however, does not make itself felt directly, automatically or spontaneously. The unity of the world communist movement arises out of the vigorous social, political and ideological struggle, and various objective and subjective difficulties have to be overcome to maintain it.

That is why the problem of unity, the reasons for the urgency of it under the present conditions and the prospects for its achievement should not only be viewed subjectively as just political and ideological struggle against various opportunist and faction groups, trends and personalities. The gist of the problem of the world communist movement's unity can be understood correctly only by thoroughly analysing the present-day confrontation between socialism and capitalism, as well as the objective and subjective factors and circumstances which determine the arrangement of class forces and the course of the struggle between them; it can be understood only against the general back-

ground of the socio-economic, political and ideological battles which form the content and development of the world revolutionary process and condition the growing role played by communists.

The CPSU with its diverse political, organisational, ideological, and theoretical activities plays an exceptionally important role in the struggle for the unity of the world communist movement. The struggle to consolidate the communist movement is the internationalist duty of each communist party loyal to the banner of Marxism-Leninism. The principle of party equality in the world communist movement organically includes an equal historical responsibility for the militancy of the revolutionary vanguard. As equal among equals, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is, at the same time, the most experienced contingent of the world communist movement, and it makes a particularly large contribution to the struggle for consolidation of this movement and for the enhancement of the revolutionary and transforming role played by the communist parties. The CPSU wages its struggle against the Right and "Left" opportunists, against the nationalists and splitters and those who, directly or indirectly, undermine the militancy of the communist movement; this struggle is based on creative Marxism and proletarian internationalism, a Leninist analysis of the present stage of historical development and consistent implementation of a principled political line.

The 24th Congress of the CPSU has made a very valuable contribution to improving the communist movement's militancy. The major importance of the decisions adopted by the Congress is that it has furnished an answer to many urgent questions of our day and has made a new and concrete contribution to the theory and practice of the international communist movement. It has further enhanced, and

CPYRGHT

consolidated its prestige and historical role as the leading force in the social progress of mankind and as the leader of the revolutionary activity of the working class and all working people.

THE PRESENT epoch is marked mainly by the great confrontation between world socialism and world capitalism, which is becoming more active, multifaceted and dynamic with each passing year. It has entered the phase when the advantages of socialism come more and more clearly to the fore and thereby multiply socialism's transforming and magnetic force, while the contradictions and social ills of capitalist society are becoming increasingly more acute, conflicting and explosive, the anti-popular character of capitalist society manifesting itself particularly vividly.

The struggle between socialism and capitalism finds its real expression in the world revolutionary process with the following characteristic features:

— Firstly, the revolutionary process has become *truly worldwide*. All countries have become the arena of the sharpest clashes between the forces of peace, democracy, national liberation, revolution and socialism, on the one hand, and the monopoly bourgeoisie and its allies, on the other. All nations have been drawn into this struggle.

— Secondly, in its *social aspect* the revolutionary process has *become universal*. It is directed against all outdated socio-economic relations, all archaic structures, against capitalism, feudalism, the survivals of semi-feudalism, slave-ownership, communal relations, against everything that impedes the social progress of mankind. General democratic, national liberation, anti-imperialist, and other movements, while retaining their independence for a more or less long period, in the final analysis, lead to a socialist revolution. In other words, the world revolutionary process includes socialist and communist construction, socialist revolutions in the capitalist countries, broad mass democratic movements against reaction, agrarian reforms directed against the survivals of feudalism, oligarchy and the latifundists; national liberation movement against imperialism, non-capitalist development aimed at eliminating economic backwardness and archaic socio-economic structures and paving the way to socialism.

— Thirdly, *the driving forces of the world revolutionary process are expanding, while the*

*forms and methods of revolutionary activity are developing and becoming enriched.* The international proletariat is the main driving force of the revolution. But fresh contingents of peasants, intelligentsia, white-collar workers, artisans, urban middle-classes, youth and particularly students are joining in the active struggle for peace, democracy, national independence, revolutionary transformations of society and the transition to socialism. Some strata of the national bourgeoisie take part in the anti-imperialist struggle in countries suffering from colonial oppression.

The substantial expansion of the driving forces of the world revolutionary process sets before the communists important political and ideological tasks, the principle task being the struggle for the masses of people, above all for the majority of the working class and its consolidation on a revolutionary basis. This also envisages a union of manual and white-collar workers, aimed at overthrowing the power of the monopoly bourgeoisie, and a union of all progressive and patriotic forces directed towards liquidating colonialism, neocolonialism and all forms of imperialist oppression. Problems pertaining to the ideological relations between the allies in the struggle against imperialism inevitably come to the fore.

The present historical conditions and the level of the class struggle make it possible to raise the question of inculcating socialist ideology into the democratic movement. It is necessary primarily to explain the essence of the Marxist-Leninist policy and the aims of the struggle, as well as to educate the non-proletarian revolutionary masses by using their own political experience. All this helps to raise the class struggle to a higher level. However, the task of political unity of all anti-imperialist forces, particularly of ideological relations among them has far from been solved.

— Fourthly, *the world revolutionary process is indivisible in the broadest sense of the word*, and this finds expression in the international character of the class struggle.

In their time, Marx and later Lenin, developing Marxist ideas, discovered the dialectics of the international and the national in the development of the socialist revolution. In our day the internationalisation of the class struggle has reached a very high level. Today there are no isolated revolutionary and liberation activities and processes in the world.

The interconnections between the three main revolutionary streams are becoming stronger, the interdependence in the activity of all na-

tional revolutionary contingents and democratic movements and currents is growing while the role and significance of the worldwide confrontation between socialism and capitalism, between democracy and reaction for the success of the struggle waged by each national revolutionary-democratic contingent are becoming more important.

At the same time, a stormy process of growing individualisation of the actual historical conditions of revolution and socialist construction takes place. The dialectical connection between the international and the national has become closer and, at the same time, more flexible.

The individualisation of the concrete historical conditions in the revolutionary activity is in itself a step forward in the general development of the revolutionary struggle but, at the same time, this individualisation is fraught with possibilities of growing nationalistic sentiments, isolationism, and propaganda of non-Marxist views.

Life repeatedly shows that socialist construction, national liberation movements, and revolutionary transformations in any country, regardless of the wishes of political leaders and theorists were, are and will increasingly become the results of the world efforts of the international working class and its creation — the socialist system. This gives rise to the problem of further coordinating the international and national strategy and tactics. It is becoming perfectly clear that an objective necessity to elaborate the international strategy of the confrontation between socialism and capitalism is growing and, that taking this into account, it is necessary to improve the national strategy for preparing and carrying out the revolution in any particular country. Fresh opportunities to intensify the dynamics of revolutionary processes will open up as these problems are solved.

— Fifthly, *the world revolutionary process is irreversible*. This is the historical law of the present social development. In the course of the worldwide confrontation between socialism and capitalism the reactionary forces may and do score temporary and partial successes, and separate setbacks and failures of anti-imperialist forces are possible in the course of the struggle. However, historical initiative has irrevocably passed to socialism. Monopoly capital has neither socio-political reserves nor spiritual and ideological values to meet the decisive historic challenge of our age — the challenge of socialism.

Today it has become even clearer that the policy of manoeuvres and adaptation pursued by the monopoly bourgeoisie does not consolidate capitalism as a social system but intensifies its incurable ills.

**T**HE INTERNATIONAL communist movement is the vanguard force in the world revolutionary process. Its prestige, influence and militancy increase as the successes scored by the revolutionary forces it guides grow. This is the result of the struggle waged by the communist parties for the ideological, political and organisational consolidation of their ranks as they master the science and art of political leadership.

The international communist movement is the only political force which has scored the greatest historic achievement, namely, the establishment of the world socialist system. In its triumph, socialism exerts a decisive influence on the entire course of social development and raises the hopes of people throughout the world.

An analysis of the leading trends in present world development shows that the growth of the prestige and influence of the communist parties, as well as the enhancement of their revolutionary and transforming role in and responsibility for peace, democracy, national freedom, revolution and socialism are an historical regularity of the social life of our day.

The rapid development of the communist movement and the enhancement of its revolutionary and transforming role is in no way a series of continuous successes. In the communist movement there are various splitting factions and groups, opportunist vacillations in the policy of some parties, and revisionist distortions in theory. The revisionist and splitting currents can be singled out approximately as follows:

— *Right-wing revisionism*, which in essence consists of revising Marxist-Leninist theory on the objective regularities of the class struggle and socialist construction, and of denying revolution as a form of transition from capitalism to socialism, as well as of professing reformism, trivial evolutionism and spontaneity, and of denying the leading role of the communist party and the working class as the main revolutionary forces;

— *“Left”-wing revisionism* which is an attempt to replace the Marxist-Leninist theory on laws governing the preparation and implementation of the revolution by a subjective



and idealist theory of voluntarist violence upon history:

— *Nationalism*, which denies the dialectics of the international and the national and, directly or indirectly, completely or partly opposes the national interests to the international;

— *Maoism* which is a specific ideological and political trend seeking to replace Marxism-Leninism with Mao Tse-tung's ideas.

No single objective or subjective factor can account for the emergence of the difficulties, sharp contradictions, revisionist currents and splitting trends in the world communist movement. Moreover, they cannot be explained only by mistakes, delusions of illwill of a particular political leader. Of course, the subjective qualities of a politician can make a serious imprint on the development of the factional and splitting struggle but the deep reasons for the emergence of different variants of revisionism are varied and complicated.

Lenin taught that every type of revisionism should be regarded and studied as a social product of the entire historical epoch. All modern trends and manifestations of revisionism should also be regarded as the effects of complicated causes operating on an international and national scale.

One of the main causes is that the monopoly bourgeoisie is now intensifying its ideological and political struggle against the revolutionary forces, primarily communists by combining partial concessions, and social and ideological demagoguery with the subtlest forms of violence and fraud. Using every possible means the ruling classes seek to inculcate in the minds of the working people the carefully camouflaged patterns of bourgeois ideology and to carry out, directly or indirectly, various ideological subversions among communists.

It may be said that the gamble on the disintegration of the communist and the entire revolutionary movement from within is one of the most important trends of the class strategy of imperialism. In his time Lenin wrote: "The more victorious we are, the more the capitalist exploiters learn to unite and the more determined their onslaught".<sup>1</sup>

The process of enlarging the social base of the world revolutionary movement by including the intermediate strata is a process that engenders serious differences in the consciousness and organization of separate contingents of this movement and is an important factor that feeds various non-Marxist views. Once

drawn into the revolutionary movement, the mass of non-proletarian working people bring with them a powerful revolutionary potential and hatred for capitalism. At the same time, they have a vague and sometimes utopian or even reactionary notion about socialism. They lack a clear objective and organization. All this inevitably exerts an influence on the communist movement.

We should further note the complicated and contradictory effects of the rapid growth of the communist parties. The people of non-proletarian origin who join the party have no proletarian training, often lack experience in the class struggle, and possess an inadequate knowledge of Marxism-Leninism; this also facilitates the emergence and dissemination of nationalistic views, as well as the Right- and "Left"-opportunist deviations.

One should also bear in mind that countries with different levels of development have embarked on the road of socialism. That is why the difficulties encountered by a country which overturns its system of social relations only add to the difficulties of levelling out its development and overcoming backwardness.

It is also necessary to mention the complicated consequences of the awakening and self-assertion of a nation. The very process of a nation's awakening and self-assertion is one of the greatest achievements of our age. It is the result of scores of nations and hundreds of millions of people being drawn into active political life, as well as the changes in the political balance in the world. At the same time, this process involves nationalism and infringes upon the dialectical connection between the national and the international to the detriment of the latter. There are also other factors which feed the complicated gamut of revisionist, anti-Leninist trends in the communist movement.

All modern Right and "Left" revisionist trends have some common political, methodological, gnosiological, ideological and theoretical peculiarities which determine the content and pattern of revisionism as a whole.

The denial of the internationalist character of the Marxist-Leninist theory, as well as the unity and continuity of Marxism and Leninism, and the revision of the basic propositions of the revolutionary theory present the most important features of modern revisionism. The aggressive attacks against Marxism-Leninism vary in their design and arguments. Here is a typical way of reasoning.

— Leninism is opposed to Marxism and

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 450.

Lenin to Marx; a subjectivist and voluntarist approach to the reality is slanderously attributed to V. I. Lenin, an approach that allegedly neither reflects nor explains the latest phenomena in capitalist development and in class relations and therefore cannot serve as an instrument for cognising the present world;

— Leninism, as revisionists assert, is a phenomenon engendered by the specific conditions in backward Russia, and it cannot be applied to the explanation and solution of the socio-economic problems of developed capitalist society, particularly under present-day conditions, when, under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution, capitalism has allegedly made a qualitative change;

— the ideas of mature Marx are a distortion of the ideas of young Marx, the genuine content of Marxism — “humane Marxism” — having been elaborated in Marx’s early works.

On the basis of this reasoning the revisionists have issued the call: Back to young Marx, to “genuine, authentic Marxism”. Of course, they completely distort the true views of young Marx.

E. Fischer, an Austrian revisionist, asserts that Marxist philosophy is a theory about a “whole” man. Milovan Djilas, who has completed his revisionist path as a renegade, said in his interview to Sulzberger: “...Young Marx was not a ‘Marxist’! He was half Hegelian... I am for ‘open Marxism’... We go back from Lenin to Marx like the protestants who went from the Vatican to the Bible”.<sup>2</sup>

Metaphysical absolutisation of some aspects of social relations serves as a methodological basis for present-day revisionism. Revisionists virtually deny Marxist dialectics. Opposition of national peculiarities to international essence and international conditionality of social development is typical of revisionist methodology, while concrete and historical phenomena are raised to the level of general laws.

In the final analysis, all revisionist theoretical and methodological propositions lead to a denial of the general pattern of social development, of class struggle and revolution. It is also a denial of the entire process of transitions from capitalism to socialism, and of the common pattern of organisation of a socialist society. They offer extensive opportunities for extolling and worshipping spontaneity, something which dooms any communist party to political passivity and loss of revolutionary initiative, as well as for developing any forms

<sup>2</sup> *Tagesanzeiger*, Dec. 7, 1968.

of voluntarism and subjectivist arbitrariness.

It is a characteristic of all revisionists that they renounce the principle of a proletarian assessment of events and phenomena when determining their political line and their place in the fierce class struggle.

Politically all trends in present revisionism are characterised by various degrees of anti-Sovietism. The revisionists deny the international significance of the experience of the CPSU, as well as the historically natural essence of actual socialism as built in the USSR, and they slander the domestic and foreign policies of the Soviet government.

All modern revisionists oppose the theory and practice of the communist parties which operate on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, and deny the necessity for a general policy in the international communist movement.

Such are some of the common features of all trends of modern revisionism. It would be erroneous, however, to concentrate attention on these general features alone. Each revisionist trend has its own peculiarities, specific arguments, political tendencies, as well as tactics, methods and forms of struggle. It is important to know these peculiarities in order that a successful struggle against concrete revisionist trends may be waged.

The exposure of the theory and practices of Right-wing revisionism, which constitutes the main danger in many parties, is becoming more important in the struggle to consolidate the communist movement and to enhance the militancy of the communist parties. Most active in elaborating and disseminating Right-wing revisionist ideas are such renegades as R. Garaudy, E. Fischer, F. Marek and O. Sik.

The components of the theoretical and political credo of Right revisionism are: denial of Marxism-Leninism as the single international theory; denial of the general pattern of a revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism and organisation of socialist society; praise of the spontaneity of social development; replacement of revolution as the cornerstone of the transformation of society on a socialist foundation by trivial reformism; denial of the dictatorship of the proletariat and its replacement by bourgeois-democratic pluralism; denial of the common character of the processes of socialist development in society, and propagation of a qualitative diversity of “models of socialism”; and denial of the party’s leading role.

The political and ideological credo of the “Left” revisionists includes all the features of modern revisionism. However all these points

of departure are refracted through the prism of the subjective and idealistic views and adventurist action. It is on this basis that the specific features of "Left" revisionism grow. The "Left" revisionists underestimate or even deny the objective and regular character of the preparation for and implementation of the revolution and overestimate the role played by subjective factors, as well as the importance of the accelerating factors. The "Leftists" underrate the role of the masses as a decisive force in the revolution, ignore the task of political educating the broad sections of the working people, the use of all forms of drawing the masses into the revolution, and at the same time absolutise the role played by political groups, guerrilla detachments and certain personalities. The "Leftists" revise the Leninist premise of the abundance and diversity of forms and methods of struggle and absolutise the armed struggle alone, regarding it as the only means of awakening the people and solving revolutionary problems.

Lenin always waged a relentless struggle against the pseudo-revolutionary "Leftists", and showed how to combine revolutionary enthusiasm with the most sober assessment of the alignment of class forces and the mood of the people. The history of the communist movement, the events in Indonesia and some Latin American countries in particular, as well as the activity of the White Flag Party in Burma show that pseudo-revolutionary radicalism has done considerable harm to the cause of the working class and socialism.

The struggle against revisionism in theory and opportunism in practice, and also the struggle against every ideological vacillation and political uncertainty are, in historical significance and social content, a struggle for the popular masses. It is an inseparable component of the political strategy aimed at uniting the working people of both town and country and the manual and white-collar workers on a revolutionary basis for the purpose of solving the acutest problems of social development, namely those of peace, consistent democracy, national prosperity, and social progress. It is a constituent of revolutionary tactics, the essence of which is to help the masses master the most effective forms, ways and means of the anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly struggle and to ensure the ideological and political rout of all those who consciously or unconsciously deceive the people and prevent them from effectively using their class energy in the struggle against reaction.

At the present stage, the communist movement has encountered Maoism, another dangerous form of revisionism with particularly refined methods of splitting and subversive activity.

Maoism is an anti-Leninist trend with specifically Chinese social, historical and ideological sources. Under their influence, Marxism-Leninism was distorted, changed and adapted to the great-Chinese hegemonistic and chauvinist aims. Maoism has borrowed its reasoning from various past and present opportunists.

The essence of Maoism is a revision from a chauvinistic point of view of all the basic provisions of Marxism-Leninism. It replaces Marxism-Leninism with an ideology which eclectically combines vulgar materialistic notions of the objective world, a subjective and voluntarist understanding of the world historical process and primitive mechanistic dialectics. Maoism seeks to replace the theory of scientific communism with a reactionary and utopian theory of barrack socialism with its economic equalisation on the basis of poverty and spiritual levelling based on illiteracy, as well as an amorphous facelessness of the people led by a "great personality". It also envisages a militarisation of social life under the flag of socialism in order to pursue a hegemonistic policy.

Politically Maoism is manoeuvring between classes, social strata and political trends, opposing groups to one another or inciting them against each other. "The thoughts of Mao" are aimed at substantiating voluntarism in politics, arbitrariness in the economy, a possibility of radically changing the political tasks depending on a concrete manifestation of the hegemonistic goals, as well as at substantiating a striving to use Marxist-Leninist ideas and the revolutionary, communist movement in order to attain these goals.

Maoism advances an anti-Marxist concept of the class struggle and the world revolutionary process. It denies revolutionary content in the competition between socialism and capitalism, conceives revolution as a volition, propagates the export of revolution, denies the policy of peaceful coexistence, and regards a world war as the only form of solving the problem of revolution on a worldwide scale.

Maoist views reflect the historical impatience and confusion of non-proletarian elements of Chinese society faced with the complex problems of transition to socialism, and surrender to the difficulties connected with socialist construction, particularly great in so

backward a country as China. The Maoists have completely broken with the principles of proletarian internationalism, and have substituted nationalism for it, taking an overtly chauvinistic course aimed at establishing China's world hegemony.

Maoism, more than any other revisionist trend, is characterised by rabid anti-Sovietism accusing the USSR of capitalist degeneration and aggressiveness. As a matter of fact, anti-Sovietism ensues from the chauvinistic goals. In words, the Maoists advocate the most revolutionary aims, while in deeds they pursue a reactionary policy. The appeals to fight imperialism are combined with actual flirting with imperialist powers, particularly the United States, and forming alliances with them against the socialist countries.

The leadership of the Communist Party of China has attempted to impose its views on other parties. It has set up its own "Marxist-Leninist communist parties". These "parties" are in a state of crisis or total disintegration. However, the task for the communist movement to struggle against Maoism remains very urgent.

Erich Honecker, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, emphasised in his Report to the 7th Party Congress: "The policies of the Chinese leadership keep creating serious obstacles to the further consolidation of the unity of the socialist states and the entire world communist movement, and the union of all anti-imperialist forces. The great-power chauvinistic and anti-Soviet policy pursued by the Mao Tse-tung group is spearheaded against all socialist countries and all Marxist-Leninist parties".

THE COMMUNIST Party of the Soviet Union, created, educated and hardened by V. I. Lenin has always waged a principled struggle aimed at enhancing the militancy of the communist movement, consolidating the communist ranks on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and surmounting all opportunist, revisionist, and splitting trends and currents.

The CPSU has most actively participated in all international ideological and political actions which have enhanced the organisational, revolutionary and transforming influence of the communist movement on the historical development of modern society. The CPSU was one of the initiators and active participants of

the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in 1969.

The Meeting has made an important contribution to consolidating the unity of the world communist movement, to further developing the principles of proletarian internationalism, overcoming the existing differences in the communist movement, and elaborating common views on many key problems of our day. The Meeting emphasised that the cohesion of the communist and workers' parties is a most important factor in the alliance of all anti-imperialist forces. The Meeting sharply criticised the splitting activity of the Maoists in the international communist movement, and revealed the fatal consequences of the great-power chauvinistic, and anti-Soviet stand of the CPC leaders. The Meeting denounced nationalism as an ideology and policy which feeds various deviations, vacillations and uncertainties, and is incompatible with Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. In the course of its work, the Meeting condemned Right and "Left" revisionism, and the various manifestations of opportunism and dogmatism.

In addressing the Meeting, János Kádár, First Secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, said: "We must fight with firmness and political courage the different attempts of the imperialists to undermine, weaken and disunite our ranks. It is necessary to intensify the struggle against the bourgeois ideas which penetrate into our ranks, against the revisionist and dogmatic views which distort the principles of Marxism-Leninism and lead people astray". An important step aimed at improving the ideological and theoretical arsenal of the communist movement was the Centenary of V. I. Lenin's birth, which, both in the USSR and throughout the world, was celebrated with a view to aiding creative development, enriching and deepening revolutionary theory.

The 24th Congress of the CPSU was an outstanding event in the life of Soviet Communists and the entire international communist movement. The Congress proved anew that the CPSU was, is, and will continue to be a party of creative Marxism, a party of unity of revolutionary theory and practice, and a staunch fighter for enhancing the militancy and unity of the communist movement. The creative Marxist-Leninist analysis of the latest developments in the socialist and capitalist worlds made by the Congress is of decisive importance in the struggle against revisionists. The Congress documents furnish people with an answer to the question about the concrete ways and

means to be used in strengthening socialism, and fostering an economic upsurge, and social progress.

Summarising the latest experience of socialist development, the Resolution on the CC CPSU Report to the 24th CPSU Congress has once again confirmed "the correctness of the Leninist tenet that for the successful construction of socialism it is necessary to proceed from the general laws of socialist construction, and also to take account of each country's specific features". The entire work of the Congress, as well as the decisions it adopted were a new blow at all concepts denying in one way or another the dialectics of the international and the national and the world significance of the CPSU's experience.

The premises of the Congress concerning developed socialist society and the laws governing its functioning and improvement have been further enriched by the theoretical and political activity of the communist parties of the fraternal countries. At the congresses of the fraternal parties of the socialist countries the concept of developed socialism has been concretised in accordance with the real and specific conditions prevailing in each country and enriched with national characteristics.

The theoretical and political activity of the CPSU broadens the initiating revolutionary and transforming role of world socialism. At every new stage, it more effectively and convincingly proves that the socialist road, as scientifically substantiated by Marx, Engels and Lenin and as experienced by the Soviet people, is the general line of development for all mankind, as well as the only way of progressively solving the most acute social problems in the interests of the people all over the world.

The CPSU's contribution to the Marxist-Leninist theory of developing the world revolutionary process, its driving forces and historical task of the working class has a great importance for enhancing the militancy and unity of the communist movement. The documents of the 24th CPSU Congress, which deal with all

the latest processes show that the international working class was and continues to be the only force capable of transforming society.

The working class is the most conscious and consistent fighter for the overthrow of the power of capital, and the genuine creator of socialist society. All present attempts of the Right and "Left" revisionists to depreciate the role played by the working class and minimise its leading role in the present world revolutionary process are doomed.

The Congress stressed that the powerful upsurge of the working-class and democratic movements reveals that there is evidence of impending class battles which may lead to fundamental social changes and the establishment of working-class power in alliance with the other sections of the working people. The CPSU has been tirelessly participating in the strenuous theoretical work of the communist movement which implements Lenin's behest on applying the theory of scientific communism to the conditions prevailing in countries with a backward socio-economic structure. The CPSU also takes part in developing the Leninist idea of the transition by the peoples of these countries to socialism, bypassing capitalism.

During the course of this struggle to find the only correct forms of social progress, and the strenuous ideological battles, powerful blows are delivered at the theories of the "Left" extremists, at the Maoists and Trotskyists consciously or unconsciously leading the peoples of the developing countries to the pernicious path which, in the end, brings defeat.

By its political, ideological and organisational activities the CPSU fosters cohesion of the communist ranks. The struggle against revisionism is waged on the basis of the creative development of Marxism-Leninism, the enrichment of the principles of proletarian internationalism, the elaboration of a constructive and scientifically substantiated programme, and its translation into reality.

NEW TIMES No. 8, Moscow  
February 1972

CPYRGHT

PROBLEMS AND OPINIONS

# ANATOMY OF MODERN REVISIONISM

ALEXANDER SOBOLEV, Ph. D.

**T**HE Communist and Workers' parties are the vanguard of social progress, a powerful, organized force with a following greater than any other political movement of our time. They guide the constructive labours of the peoples of the socialist countries, head the class struggle waged by the international proletariat, and are the leading force of the national liberation movement. The responsibility that rests on them for the destinies of peace, democracy and socialism, for civilization, the future of humanity in general, is great indeed.

Hence the importance of struggle against revisionist trends and groups of every shade and hue, of combating the divisive machinations of anti-Leninist elements out to paralyze the activity, sap the militancy and diminish the fighting capacity of the Communist movement.

Modern revisionism is a complex, multi-faceted phenomenon. It comprises a variety of trends which, though in many respects springing from common roots, differ from one another as regards social background, theoretical argumentation, ideological positions, organizational forms, the scope of their influence and political activity, and, hence, their role. Moreover, revisionism has its national features.

In the more than 100 years of its history, the Communist movement has accumulated a wealth of experience in fighting the danger of revisionism. This experience has shown that in order effectively to combat opportunist trends a differentiated approach must be taken to each, and this requires a correct understanding of their social roots, ideological essence and political role. In some cases ideological struggle on the theoretical plane is most effective, in others political and organizational action is needed, and in still others scientifically substantiated criticism of mistakes may suffice.

The political line of the International Communist movement, its Marxist-Leninist principles and strategic and tactical platform, and the principles of proletarian internationalism are assailed and distorted by a variety of quarters, namely:

— Right-wing revisionist groups and trends of diverse kinds which seek to revise the fundamental Leninist theses concerning the universal laws of the socialist revolution and socialist organization of society and to replace them with abstract utopian pipedreams of gradual evolution from capitalism to socialism through reform and reactionary romancing about the spontaneous development of socialist society and the possibility of qualitatively different models of socialism arising;

— Left revisionist groups and trends that likewise deny that there are any general laws governing the revolutionary activity of the working class to remake society, but substitute for them voluntarist interpretations of the historical process which find expression in eruptions of petty-bourgeois revolutionary meachment of subjectivism, or extremist actions;

— Nationalist elements who deny the dialectical interconnection between the International and the national, give absolute priority to national features, oppose national interests to the common objective of strengthening the positions of world socialism, propound national political self-sufficiency, self-isolation, and the like;

— splinter groups that substitute Maoism for Marxism-Leninism and "drill-ground communism" for scientific communism, seek to subordinate the Communist movement to the ideological and political hegemony of Maoism, and work to split the ranks of the champions of peace, democracy and socialism.

Pressures are also exerted on the Communist movement by various anti-Leninist groups of Trotskyites, anarchists, and the "new Left."

Besides the openly revisionist trends there are also camouflaged, "shamefaced" revisionists, who profess fidelity to Marxism-Leninism but ignore its universal internationalist essence in propounding their views on the political line, strategy and tactics of the Communist movement. They pay lip service to the method of Leninism but discard its fundamental theoretical principles, vow loyalty to proletarian internationalism but diffuse it in nationalistic hyperbole.

Bourgeois ideologues make extensive use of the arguments advanced by revisionists of all hues to assail the general line of the Communist movement, Marxism-Leninism, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other truly revolutionary parties.

The opponents of communism harp on the allegedly insurmountable differences, dissension and division in the Communist movement, claiming that it is in the throes of crisis and that proletarian internationalism has lost to nationalism on the battleground of history. Although the facts of life give them the lie—witness the growth of the Communist movement and the decisive role its influence has come to play in social development in our time—it would nevertheless be a mistake to underrate the danger presented by revisionism.

## Why the Activation

A cardinal precondition of success in fighting revisionism is thorough examination of the factors underlying the rise and spread of its various trends.

It would be incorrect to attribute the activation of revisionism to any one isolated cause. Every anti-Marxist trend of course has its social roots, but Right-wing revisionism, Left extremism, Maoism, Trotskyism and anarchism, for instance, can hardly be said to stem from a petty-bourgeois mentality alone, though it goes without saying that its influence should not be ignored.

It is essential to see the social, historical, epistemological, and political sources of the various trends, but even more important is it to explain why they have gained currency.

"Opportunism is no chance occurrence, sin, slip, or treachery on the part of individuals, but a social product of an entire period of history," Lenin said.

The causes of the rise and spread of revisionism in general and its various trends in particular can be properly grasped and explained only in the light of an analysis of the basic tendencies in world politics, the sharpening confrontation between socialism and capitalism, the shifts in alignments of social strata and the motive forces of the revolutionary

process, the interaction of these forces, a thorough assessment of the activities of political parties, and the content and intensity of the ideological struggle.

In examining the question one must weigh a number of factors in their complex and fluid interaction.

Above all it is necessary to bear in mind the sharpening of the confrontation between world socialism and world capitalism in all spheres of social life. Although the historical initiative belongs to the forces of socialism, the monopoly bourgeoisie is constantly perfecting its machinery of self-preservation, seeking in every way to adapt to the new situation and find the social, economic, political and ideological answers to the challenge of socialism.

In the *socio-economic sphere* the monopolies, harnessing the scientific and technological revolution to serve their selfish ends, on the one hand intensify the exploitation of the workers, and on the other make forced concessions to the fighting working class, concede isolated reforms, and propound demagogic policies of social partnership, profit-sharing and the like.

In the *political sphere* they incessantly modernize the system of coercion, seek overtly or covertly to suppress the revolutionary forces, clamp down in every possible way on the Communist parties. At the same time, under pressure from the rapidly growing activity of the masses, they are compelled to preserve and, at times, even to broaden democratic freedoms.

In the *ideological sphere*, blatant anti-communism and anti-Sovieteering, slander of socialism as it exists today, is demagogically combined with recognition of one or another virtue of socialism and attempts to embellish capitalism, to discover in it "popular," "democratic" and even "socialist" features. Propaganda of "improved" socialism and concoctions ranging from the convergence concept to all manner of pseudo-revolutionary theories have become part of the capitalist ideologues' stock in trade.

In the final analysis all these efforts of the monopoly bourgeoisie only aggravate the contradictions of capitalism and underscore its historical doom. Yet it would be a mistake to ignore them. For they influence the behaviour of social strata and political forces. Among some sections of the working people these complex machinations are capable of giving rise to illusions, among others, they are apt to heighten confusion and the desire artificially to accelerate the march of history. In either case they tend to create the soil for the emergence and spread of non-Marxist concepts.

Nor should sight be lost of the fact that the need for production regulation and forecasting as concomitants of the scientific and technological revolution, and the automation and mechanization of management tend to camouflage the dominance of the propertied classes and to delude a part of the workers into believing that the nature of capitalism is changing and that it can evolve into socialism.

The effect of the numerical growth of the working class and the structural changes that have taken place in it should also be borne in mind. Even though the dominant historical tendency is for the revolutionary role, political activity and organized strength of the working class to grow, the inflow expanding its ranks comes largely from the middle strata, bringing with it the preconceived concepts and delusions of these strata. The structural changes accompanying technological progress too make the working class less homogeneous, leading as they do to a differentiation of interests among its various sections. And not all sections of the working class are at the same level of political maturity and ideological

clarity, not all are equally class-conscious, organized along class lines, or self-disciplined. Under the corrupting influence and ideological pressure of the propertied classes, the specific interests and outlook of the privileged, and also of the backward, sections of the working class may—and do—breed political instability and ideological vacillation in the labour movement.

The constant influx into the revolutionary liberation movement of ever new sections of society has its negative aspects as well. That more and more peasants, intellectuals, clerical and service workers and students are joining the struggle against the reactionary policy of the monopoly bourgeoisie, for peace, democracy and socialism, is of course testimony to steady, irreversible social progress. But at the same time the newcomers bring to the democratic and liberation movement not only a new charge of revolutionary energy, but also preconceived notions, not only a burning loathing of capitalism, but also utopian illusions, political wavering, ideological instability. And only too often this finds reflection in the emergence of diverse non-Marxist political movements and theories.

It should also be borne in mind that the rapid growth of the Communist movement itself is not free of adverse features. As a result of the military, moral and political defeat of fascism, the emergence of the socialist world system, and the crisis of many traditional political parties, the prestige and influence of the Communist movement and the numerical strength of Communist parties have increased greatly. But while the entry of large numbers of revolutionary-minded peasants, clerical workers and intellectuals strengthened the parties' ties with the masses, it resulted, wherever ideological education was inadequate, in a lowering of the level of political maturity, ideological staunchness and theoretical grounding of the membership.

This bears out, in other conditions and another context, what Lenin said in 1910: "One of the most profound causes that periodically give rise to differences over tactics is the very growth of the labour movement... The enlistment of larger and larger numbers of new 'recruits,' the attraction of new sections of the working people must inevitably be accompanied by waverings in the sphere of theory and tactics, by repetitions of old mistakes, by a temporary reversion to antiquated views and antiquated methods, and so forth. The labour movement of every country periodically spends a varying amount of energy, attention and time on the 'training' of recruits."

Ours is an epoch of struggle by the revolutionary, democratic forces against national oppression, an epoch of the rise, development and self-assertion of a growing number of nations that were subjected to exploitation and oppression. The political and ideological banner of the fight these nations are waging for freedom and national independence is nationalism, various concepts of which have gained wide currency. But nationalism has two aspects: the national democratic, expressive of the interests of the working people, and the conservative, standing for the interests of the propertied classes. Moreover, national consciousness is one of the most complex, stable and tenacious forms of social consciousness.

National consciousness evolves in the process of bitter struggle. If the conservative aspect prevails, it becomes the political and ideological banner of insularity, divides nations and sets them one against the other, becomes reactionary and degenerates into chauvinism. The democratic, popular elements can assert themselves and play an increasingly progressive role only if they are transmuted into a genuine patriotism of

the people, socialist patriotism, on the basis of proletarian internationalism. Under certain circumstances, however, the pressure of nationalism can be extremely great; in many cases it penetrates into the labour and even the Communist movement, where it is bound to come into conflict with the principles of proletarian internationalism, with the process of the internationalization of the class struggle, and provides a fertile soil for the poison weeds of Right and Left revisionism.

Other factors that tend to animate revisionism are the difficulties encountered in building up the revolutionary movement and its slow growth, primarily in the developed capitalist countries, as well as the strategic and practical mistakes and blunders made by one or another Communist party. Hence in some cases it is the reaction of unstable elements to the retarded development of the class struggle, an instance of revolutionary impatience, in others it is a matter of seizing on difficulties and mistakes in pursuit of ulterior ends. And there are also cases that can be traced to both of these considerations.

Modern revisionism can also be a distorted reflection of confusion among one or another section of the working people in the capitalist as well as the socialist countries in face of the formidable tasks involved in building the new society and the attendant difficulties, which are accentuated by the pronounced unevenness of initial levels of socio-economic development. It mirrors the complexity and sharpness of the global confrontation of socialism and capitalism in the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution.

Such, then, are the basic objective and subjective causes of the rise of revisionist trends. These causes do not operate in isolation from one another, but neither can they be regarded as the mechanical sum of diverse factors. They are in complex dialectical interrelation with one another, an interrelation that varies depending on the concrete situation, the national background of the given country, and the specific features of the activity of the given Communist party. In some instances Right-wing revisionism comes to the fore, in others Leftist distortion of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice.

## Behind the Screen of Pluralism

The political and ideological concepts of Right and Left revisionism often appear to be diametrically opposed to each other, and within each of these trends too there are different shades of opinion. But in the course of the political and ideological struggle points of contact between them are increasingly revealed. It becomes more and more obvious that the fundamental methodological and theoretical tenets of all varieties of contemporary revisionism coincide.

The prime common denominator is denial of the universal, international significance of Marxism-Leninism, of the laws governing the world revolutionary process and socialist development discovered by Marxism-Leninism. The hallmark of all revisionists is anti-dialectical mode of thought, metaphysical absolutization of some aspects and phenomena of social life, rejection of the dialectical link between the international and the national. This logically leads to denial of the international significance of the experience of the CPSU and other Communist parties. At the same time they maintain that the international Communist movement needs no general line, that such a line is not viable, and that unity of its political, strategic and tactical principles can be dispensed with.

Contrary to the integral internationalist Marxist-Leninist doctrine and methodology, and at variance with the established

practice in the international Communist movement, both Right and Left revisionists propound pluralism.

The modern revisionists advocate *social pluralism*. Distorting the Leninist thesis concerning the diversity of the paths of revolutionary transition to socialism and forms of socialist organization of society, they claim that there can be a variety of models of socialism qualitatively different from one another, different not only as regards form but also as regards content. It is a stock argument of both overt and covert revisionists that all existing "models of socialism" have evolved on the basis of a backward economy and hence allegedly bear the imprint of historical "inadequacy." In their opinion the victory of socialism in the developed capitalist countries will at once change the outward features as well as the substance of socialism.

Needless to say, the further development of socialism, the growth of the strength of the socialist world system, will steadily improve the historical setting for the transition of more and more countries to socialism, make this transition less painful. But as experience and Marxist-Leninist theory show, this will be a matter of the further operation of the general laws, not of their negation.

The modern revisionists advocate *political pluralism*. In their opinion, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the experience of the socialist countries in the organization of political life have outlived their time and should be succeeded by spontaneous development and competitive struggle among all social and political forces, all political parties, which in effect signifies abandoning the use of the instruments at the disposal of the working class organized as the state to uphold the people's revolutionary gains. At a time when the monopoly bourgeoisie is steadily building up the machinery of its domination, its political mechanism of self-preservation, the revisionists deny the people and their leader, the working class, the right to suppress the resistance of the exploiters.

The modern revisionists advocate *ideological pluralism*. Negation of the universal, international character of Marxism-Leninism is accompanied with the claim that there exist different, national forms of Marxism. At the same time it is maintained that equal and competitive co-existence of diverse ideological concepts is possible in the working-class movement and the socialist society.

All varieties of revisionism find political expression in anti-Sovieteering, bellicose anti-communism, and divisive activity in the ranks of the Communist movement.

While noting the common groundwork on which the theoretical-cognitive and methodological principles and political views of all modern revisionists rest, it is essential also to have a clear idea of the specific argumentation advanced by the Right and the Leftist trends and the degree of danger they present at different stages of the struggle, in different countries, and in different historical conditions.

## The Right Revisionists

Right-wing revisionism remains a serious threat to the Communist parties' capacity for action and the unity of their ranks. Prominent among its most active theorists and propagandists are Roger Garaudy (France), Ernst Fischer and Franz Marek (Austria), a group of theorists associated with the journal *Praxis* (Yugoslavia), O. Sik and K. Kosik. Though Right-wing revisionism springs up on national soil, it rapidly acquires international implications, and hence it is the internationalist responsibility of all Marxists-Leninists to combat it.



The Right revisionists seek to recast the fundamental principles of the Marxist-Leninist outlook. They reject Leninism, which they claim is a variant of Marxism confined to Russia alone. The philosophical works of Lenin and Engels, they argue, "misrepresent" the teachings of Marx, and socialism as it exists today they label a "bureaucratic-stalinist" distortion of the Marxist doctrine of humane socialism. This offensive against the substance of Marxist theory is waged on the pretext of "restoring" the real views of Marx, moreover, the views of the young Marx, by removing the "later theoretical and practical accretions."

The Right revisionists deny the revolutionary role of the working class in the reconstruction of society, maintaining that, as a result of the technological revolution, it is being diluted in the general mass of working people directly or indirectly connected with production. In this way the leading role of the working class in the fight for socialism is disposed of. Garaudy, for instance, advances the idea of what he calls a "historical bloc"—a bloc of the workers and intellectuals with the latter playing the leading role.

The Right-wing revisionists reject the scientific theory and practice of socialism, counterposing to them the concept of a socialism governed by the blind forces of the market. What this concept so zealously championed by Sik, Garaudy, Fischer and other revisionists leads to was convincingly shown by what happened in Czechoslovakia. The latest facts offer incontrovertible proof that any kind of blind operation of economic forces is bound to have grave social consequences.

In both theory and practice the Right revisionists often find themselves in the same camp with the reformists, who believe in spontaneous evolution leading to socialism. The fallacy of this concept has been amply proved by the historical experience of the working class, yet for the objective and subjective reasons mentioned above it still has its supporters and seriously impedes the mobilization of the masses to the struggle for peace, democracy, national freedom, and socialism.

### The Left Extremists

The need to combat Left revisionism in all its manifestations is as urgent as ever. Its basic premises—negation of the objective laws governing the class struggle, the development of the revolution, and organization of socialist society, denial of the revolutionary mission of the working class and the vanguard role of the Communist parties, anti-Sovietism, anti-communism, and nationalism—do not differ in principle from those of the Right-wing revisionists. What is specific to the Left revisionists are non-scientific voluntarist and subjectivist concepts of revolution, tactics, forms and methods of struggle.

The Manifesto group in Italy and the Theodore Petkoff group in Venezuela are to one or another extent exponents of Left revisionist views. Left extremism determines also the political course of the Communist Party of Burma (the "White Flag" party) which, operating in the jungles, has for a long time now been waging an armed struggle against the democratic government.

In a number of countries Left revisionism is represented by small groupings ranging from the sectarian-dogmatic to the revolutionary-adventurist. Some have appropriated the name of the indomitable Latin American revolutionary Che Guevara and have set up detachments which call for immediate, essentially adventurist armed actions without regard for the mood of the masses, or the concrete situation. In Ceylon, for

instance, such self-styled "Guevarists" played a central role in the reactionary armed uprising against the democratic forces.

In some countries there are small but extremely aggressive parties that call themselves "Marxist-Leninist" and seek to implant in the workers' movement the ideas, policy and tactics of Maoism. As for Maoism, it is a trend of a specific order, which, like the present-day Trotskyites who seek to infiltrate the revolutionary working-class movement, merits special examination.

The Left extremists underestimate the role of the objective conditions in the preparation and carrying out of revolutionary changes, and overestimate the subjective factors, the role of will. For them politics is the Demurge of history. They underrate the role of the masses in the revolution and the need to prepare them, and regard the actions of small isolated armed detachments as decisive. They ignore all other forms and methods of struggle against the reaction, of rallying the masses to active struggle, and rely exclusively on armed force. Yet among them there are a great many who are eager to come to grips with the oppressors, ready to lay down their lives for the revolution, people who sincerely believe that isolated armed actions can bring success, but who are captive to the most confused revisionist and often anti-Communist illusions. To be real revolutionary fighters what these people need, besides enthusiasm, is clarity of purpose, political consciousness.

### The Fight Against Revisionism

The fight against Right and Left revisionism, against the nationalists and Maoists that have tacked themselves on to the international Communist movement, against the Trotskyites and anarchists, is not an end in itself for the Communist parties. It is not a matter of intolerance, or a doctrinaire striving for abstract purity of theoretical dogma, as anti-Marxists of every hue claim in their efforts to slander the Communists and mislead the masses.

For historical and social purport, the fight against revisionism in theory and opportunism in practice, against all manner of ideological wavering and political vacillation, is a fight to win the masses. It is a component of a political strategy projected towards uniting the working people of town and country, manual and mental workers, on a revolutionary platform with the aim of resolving the most pressing social problems—strengthening peace, giving effect to consistent democracy, ensuring national prosperity and social progress. It is a component of revolutionary tactics designed to help the masses master the most effective forms, methods and means of anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly struggle, to ensure the ideological and political defeat of all who consciously or unconsciously deceive the masses, doom them to wander aimlessly in the labyrinths of history and prevent them from channeling all their class energy to the defeat of the reaction.

The political effectiveness of struggle against all varieties of opportunism depends primarily on being able to distinguish those who preach and practise revisionism and prevent the working people from consciously coming over to positions of revolutionary struggle, from those who are the victims of the ideological deception and vacillate because of their ideological and political immaturity and inexperience. Needless to say, to cement the unity of the Communist ranks and to rally the working people, the important thing is not only to refute the opportunists' arguments in theoretical discus-

ations but to develop these discussions into an ideological offensive which would sweep away the mists of revisionism of every shade, bring Communists who have erred back to the positions of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and enlist the wavering in active, conscious struggle.

In the capitalist countries there are non-Marxist groups and trends whose political development is determined by a growing spontaneous resistance to capitalist violence. They criticize present-day capitalism and are full of resolve to fight its evils, but their political credo lacks principled definitiveness and often combines hatred for capitalism with active anti-communism. The task here clearly is to help as many of the adherents of these groups as possible to find their way to the highroad of conscious revolutionary struggle.

But there are also revisionist groups and trends that are on a downhill course—from conscious action to anarchy, from organized struggle to freebooting, from participation in the Communist movement to combating it. There can be no compromise with those who persistently uphold and spread revisionism.

After prolonged discussions, Garaudy, Fischer, Morek, Sik, the Manifesto group and that led by Petkoff were expelled from their respective Communist parties. Since then they have stepped up their attacks on the Communist parties, choosing the road of renegacy, anti-communism and anti-Sovieteering. More and more often they line up with the capitalist ideologists and politicians, and this has naturally led to their moral and political isolation in the working-class movement. The Manifesto group, for instance, suffered a fiasco in its efforts to win over wavering Communists and is now disintegrating. All the Maoist groups too are experiencing a grave crisis.

A complex problem in the Communist movement is presented by nationalism, which feeds partly on the legitimate national interests of the people and is to a large extent an expression of the pressure exerted by national prejudice. Although the growing influence of proletarian internationalism is gradually forcing nationalism to retreat, no little effort and time is still needed for the principles of proletarian internationalism to become the sole criterion in relations between all the fraternal parties.

In pursuance of their internationalist duty, the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties are waging an uncompromising struggle against all varieties of opportunism and revisionism, against all attempts to divide the Communist movement, to confine the Communist parties within their particular national bounds and to disunite them at a time when the organized monopoly bourgeoisie is intensifying its attacks.

A landmark in the struggle for the ideological unity of the Communist movement was the 1969 International Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is working actively and consistently to cement the unity of the Communist movement, the vanguard element of the world revolutionary process. As is recognized by the other Marxist-Leninist parties, the activity of the CPSU aimed at the further development of Soviet society and the strengthening of its economic and political might is of decisive importance. Realization of the programme adopted by the 24th Congress of the CPSU for strengthening our developed socialist society in every respect is dealing shattering blows at the revisionists' machinations, opening new broad vistas of communist construction, and exerting a powerful influence on the liberation struggle of the peoples.

POLITICAL AFFAIRS No. 4, New York  
April 1972

SERGIO VUSKOVIC ROJO

CPYRGHT

## Ideological Pluralism\*

In the conditions of Chile's Popular Government the construction of the future society in our country has moved from a problem of science-fiction to a problem of science.

When the Petrograd workers scattered the seeds of socialism on the earth, this made it possible for socialism to bloom anywhere on the planet. And fifty-four years have not passed without results. Today, when the socialist camp is more powerful than the imperialist one,

\* The following article is reprinted from the theoretical journal of the Communist Party of Chile, *Principios* (August-September 1971). It discusses some important theoretical questions related to the attainment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Chile. We therefore thought it would be of interest to our readers. The translation from the Spanish is by Abraham Zitron.

the advance into the new society is not only the concern of all the people, but is also a problem to be solved scientifically within an assessment of the scope and a comprehension of the complexities which it presents as a living process.

*The Validity of a Question*

In tackling the many facets of the Chilean liberation process, a question immediately arises which affects our daily tasks in today's struggle: This broad coalition of popular and progressive forces which the Basic Program of Popular Unity established—is it only for the present or will it continue? In other words, these broad forces which are in the process of integrating the liberation movement around the working class—peasants, white collar workers, intellectuals, progressive professionals, small businessmen and important sections of the non-monopolist bourgeoisie—will they accompany the Chilean working class only in winning the Popular Government, and then be cut off as "fellow travelers" from the people's advance?

And this question has great validity with respect to the non-monopolist national bourgeoisie from the class point of view, and with respect to the Catholics, Protestants or Masons from the ideological point of view. Will we reach socialism in Chile with or without them?

The answer we give to these questions is directly related to our immediate tasks. For will these social forces whole-heartedly join in today's anti-imperialist, anti-oligarchic fight, that is to say in the defense of the Popular Government, if we do not give them a clear perspective of what we think of their historical future?

Major weight must be given to this question if we consider that these are active and animating social forces, and that their participation will inevitably contribute to the outcome of today's struggles.

It seems to us that our answer must be very clearly: "Yes."

We can attain the construction of socialism together with them in Chile, provided that we start from a dynamic conception of social development. Participation in the construction of socialism is not a free gift; it is won by taking part in its achievement, or at least by not acting as a brake on its advent. Participation in today's struggles is the best guarantee of future security, particularly if for these forces a clear perspective of the role they can play in the future is opened up. The breadth of the line of the Popular Unity coalition, unanimously agreed to for directing today's struggles, presupposes also a broad approach for future struggles.

Nevertheless, this criterion of breadth which we project does not mean an abstract idealization of a political situation. We are aware that the tremendous efforts the working class is making today to assure its decisive participation in the process of liberation are the best guarantee that the popular movement will not stop halfway. This is the historical role of the proletariat, which arises from a constant development of divergent influences, from the struggle to embrace and defend the interests of all the sectors participating in the liberating process.

With the consciousness that national liberation and socialism will not be possible if the movement is not centered on the working class, there arises in the Christian Catholic or lay masses some natural disquiet. In regard to the national, non-monopolist bourgeoisie, there are the eternal questions of a class which fears reprisals and a final

In any case, the installation of the Popular Government headed by Comrade Allende signifies the opening up of a series of questions which spring from a new situation: the action of a government established on the basis of a new correlation of forces. How will the government open the way to socialism in our country? This perspective has brought forth a series of insistent questions: Will not liberty be endangered? What guarantees will the non-Marxist groups, specifically the Catholics, have? Will there be freedom for the creative mind, for research, for the expression of ideas?

These are sincere, valid questions; they arise in the development of our democratic alternative which will lead into the multi-party construction of socialism, and within the concept of a State of Law.

There arises a tendency to leave these questions to history, as if she were a character in a tragedy who suddenly appears and solves the problem, or as if, instead of our making history, history makes us.

Every future perspective must be made clear and guaranteed now, and such guarantees are the only bases on which a united and consistent march towards the new society can be established. Now is the time when we must undertake the exhaustive examination of the road ahead.

The problem of coming to power has been vital, but no less so is that of consolidation and of what to strive for at this point on a very complex road, most replete with historical subtleties—the line of the conquest of power through mass struggle. Yet we are not sufficiently concerned to make known the conditions and bases of the future society, as they are set down in the Basic Program of Popular Unity.

#### *The Problem of Guarantees and Concrete Experience*

Large popular strata, disillusioned by the failure of the Frei Government, are now greatly worried. They ask: where do we turn after the Frei failure? They are aware that the solution is not in remaining isolated, undecided and hesitant; even more are they repelled from alliance with the inveterate enemies of the people, with the Nationalist Party. With them the idea of coming to the popular movement of our country, of supporting the Popular Government, is making progress. But they ask themselves: will the popular movement include us? Also, what guarantees does it offer? For them, as for us, the question is: will we be able to guarantee each other full freedom of ideas? Will we be capable of refraining from all discrimination on philosophical or religious grounds?

We have already said that participation in today's struggles is the best guarantee of tomorrow's security, and in this sense, the people themselves are their own guarantee, because the position they will attain will be determined in the struggle. Yet this formulation, though correct, is not enough.

Starting from the premise that the guarantees which are established cannot mean the stopping of change or the class struggle, which continues, the fact remains that not one of the parties in the Popular Unity coalition wants to be the one governing party, either now or in the socialist Chile of the future. They see both periods as being products of coalitions—a popular coalition today, a socialist coalition tomorrow.

To Chile, the historical legacy of the workers' movement presents

us, as one of its most valuable experiences, with the durable existence of trade union unity, but also with the existence of various parties in the political sphere. Therefore, in our country, democracy and liberty are guaranteed by political pluralism and trade union unity. On the cultural and ideological levels the mere existence of a multi-party system is a guarantee that no new alienations foreign to the history of the Chilean popular movement will arise.

On another plane, speaking in terms of theory, the concept of a multi-party socialist government is a truly Leninist idea, since Lenin himself projected it both before and after the October Revolution. In the first Council of People's Commissars there were non-Bolshevik representatives. In fact, the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries also participated. This was the only party which agreed with the Bolsheviks on establishing peace and giving land to the peasants. This was nothing but the confirmation in practice of what Lenin forecast in his report to the Petrograd Garrison on November 11, 1917. Lenin said: "It is not our fault that the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks have gone. They were invited to share political power, but they want to sit on the fence until the fight against Kerensky is over. We asked everyone to take part in the government. . . . They know that we wanted a coalition Soviet government. We did not exclude anyone from the Soviet." (*Collected Works*, Vol 26, pp. 269, 270.)

In our case, the possibility of a multi-party socialist government in Chile is associated with the idea of assuring political liberty even to classes displaced from power, logically within the limits of respect for the new legality, and if they stay within that legality.

This approach also has a Leninist root. In fact, the concept of a legal opposition existing within a socialist regime is one of Lenin's ideas. Thus, Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries continued in legality and were the legal opposition *within* the Soviets until 1921, the year in which, by participating in the Kronstadt counter-revolutionary revolt, they placed themselves outside of Soviet legality.

At this point, a new question may naturally arise: What about Chile? What has all this to do with the Program of Popular Unity?

On page 13, the Basic Program of the Government of Popular Unity states: "The Popular Government will guarantee the exercise of democratic rights and will respect the individual and social guarantees pledged to the people. Freedom of conscience, speech, press, and assembly, the inviolability of the home, and the right to organize and to join unions will truly be in effect without the restrictions by means of which the ruling class now limits them."

And lest there be any doubt, in the pages immediately following it adds: "The Popular Government will guarantee the right of the workers to employment and the right to strike, and the right of the whole people to education and culture, with full respect for all thought and religious belief, guaranteeing the practice of their religion."

But, one might argue, this is only on paper. Therefore, let us turn to the concrete experiences of these first eight months of the Popular Government in its path toward socialism in Chile.

On the ideological front, which is what we are now examining, everyone recognizes that the pledges given in the Basic Program have been fully kept, even beyond what was promised. There is an

removed from power has been maintained. They even retain the possibility of a comeback. We have not confused the State with the Party, nor have we confused the State with the Popular Unity coalition. The labor of synthesis, of setting solutions in motion, has taken place not in the inner councils of the Popular Unity coalition, but in the councils of broad democratic institutions or through corresponding government organs.

In the Popular Government of Chile, no party imposes its decision. Each one, in accordance with its duties and rights, persuades, convinces, or accepts the rational modifications coming from its allies. It is the Government of the Republic which imposes or applies the collective decisions at which it ultimately arrives, in a unanimous fashion. This is done through its responsible organs, not without discussions within the participating parties of the Popular Unity coalition on the one hand, and not without going through all the innumerable difficulties caused by the opposition parties as well as by the illegal opposition in the country on the other. Thus, the Popular Government and the nation as a whole do not stop advancing toward socialism as a concrete manifestation of the distinct electoral mandate, which has already been attained, and as the concrete embodiment in practice of the new role the working class and Chilean workers are playing in Chilean civil life in accord with the State of Law which is fully functioning in the country. The juridical-political approval of revolutionary actions which take place in the social life of the nation are undertaken in accordance with the norms which the Constitution now in force establishes for its own modification.

In spite of every kind of resistance, the juridico-parliamentary structure of the country sanctioned a great event in the economic history of the country: the reform of the Constitution establishing the sole ownership by the State of the wealth of the sub-soil. This allows the country to recover legally its main mining wealth—copper. This achievement is not a gift of the parties of the opposition, which have a majority in the chambers of Congress, but the result of a protracted struggle of the proletariat and the Chilean people to recover their basic wealth. It was the fruit of the unshaken firmness with which the Popular Government announced its determination to fulfill entirely the Program of Popular Unity. Finally, a role was played by the fact that some of the fundamental ideas and plans of the Popular Government go beyond the Popular Unity coalition, and extend far into the ranks of the working masses and middle strata which are active in the opposition parties, especially the Christian Democratic Party.

This style, so typically Chilean, of opening for ourselves the road to power was outlined in an interview with comrade Luis Corvalán in the magazine *Rinascita* of April 30 of this year. In it he states the following: "The Popular Unity coalition has won the government of Chile within the bounds of the State of Law. Today we operate, and will continue to operate within such bounds, because there is no other road for the structural transformation of the country towards socialism. What if the adversary rushes into sedition? Well, the Government of Popular Unity will naturally use every means, will make an appeal to the masses for the restoration of the law, in view of the new conditions created by the reactionary adventure. The State of Law is not a cumbersome piece of furniture which we

political and social pluralism which points out the road today is that which will characterize socialism in Chile tomorrow."

As a synthesis, the concrete experience of the Popular Government on the way toward socialism shows that it is possible to advance toward socialism and at the same time to respect all the guarantees given before we gained power. Our experience teaches that within the State of Law, of full respect for individual guarantees, it is possible to build socialism in Chile in a regime of political, economic, and ideological pluralism. But this possibility opens another question: what will be the role of Marxism-Leninism?

#### *Ideological Pluralism and the Role of Marxism-Leninism*

Just as political pluralism implies the existence of various parties, ideological pluralism implies that in the Popular Government now, and under socialism tomorrow, there are and there will be various ideologies. The corollary of political pluralism is ideological pluralism. That is to say that today, and tomorrow in socialist Chile, there will be complete freedom of religion, of the diffusion of religious or non-religious ideas. Besides Marxism, other ideologies will be able to defend their points of view, will have their publications and seminars, will maintain Catholic churches and high schools, Masonic temples, or Protestant places of worship or those of other beliefs. Classes in religion of a voluntary character will continue, together with the new social and ideological activities which will keep arising in the revolutionary process.

The State and the Church will be fully independent of each other, each master in its own domain. And what we affirm in relation to the Catholic Church, we reaffirm in relation to every religion practiced in our country.

Does ideological pluralism mean that we Marxists would renounce our struggle to convert our doctrine into the leading theory? Quite the contrary, because Marxism has need of confrontation in full freedom with other cultures and philosophies and with religious beliefs for its own development. The nature of its veracity is tested in confrontation with reality and with other ideologies and by the extent to which, embodied in the masses, it transforms reality.

Ideological pluralism presupposes an ever more active and more alert ideological watchfulness in a creative, understanding and faithful class attitude. It means that the superiority of Marxism will not be imposed by prohibitions or administrative measures. It will turn into the dominant doctrine through its intrinsic power, as a scientific and vanguard theory capable of satisfying the aspirations of the people of our period. And that will depend in no small measure on our ability to enrich it, to develop it in a living and creative form; it will depend also on our not putting on dogmatic blinders in judging the new facts of the Chilean reality. It will depend on our realizing, in confronting other ideologies, that in some of them we shall come to hear echoes provoked by the disquieting theoretical discoveries of Marxism, since in the complex reciprocal influences which determine the ideological struggle, Marxism-Leninism more and more influences the other ideologies. It has been doing so for some time. Thus it appears in the various ideas of structuralism, in the conception of work which we find in the encyclical *Populorum Progressio*, in the criticism that arises in the Church itself of the attempt to cut down the "aggiornamento"—the "modernization"—and at present in Chile a path seems to be opening in certain definite

sectors to positions they abandoned only yesterday in favor of extremist positions which they are now repudiating.

The inherent strength of Marxism as a scientific and vanguard theory calls upon us for redoubled ideological watchfulness to complete the task of raising the sense of responsibility and theoretic achievement of the masses to the level of the political influence of the popular movement.

Our responsibility in the realm of theory is carried out by acquainting people with Marxism-Leninism as such, and through its application to the national reality in the elaboration of a political line and a necessary program, understood and eagerly desired by the peoples. It is carried out by exerting ourselves to revitalize our national and Latin-American traditions, weighing them critically in the present hour, by informing the whole people about the struggles of the other peoples of the world, and especially of the other socialist countries. And finally, it is carried out by expressing our opinion about each new proposal of the other ideological sectors taking part in the battle of ideas in our country.

We start from the base that we neither exclude the traditional thought which constitutes our inheritance, since we are installing ourselves in that tradition, nor, as we have said, other forms of contemporary thought. However, we claim for ourselves the theoretical right—which we also recognize for the rest of the ideologies—of reviewing critically and rigorously every thought past and present from our dialectical approach and, therefore, excluding all one-sidedness. Marxism strengthens itself in this type of confrontation; it owes its mode of existence to it. Marxism is a debate with itself and with the world. Further, there is no doubt that every debate, confrontation, or dialogue, like every struggle, assumes an encounter and an adversary. And here we are trying to establish the grounds and the rights of our ideological opponents. And if we do so, it is in order to assure the healthy state of our own doctrine, as Karl Marx's brilliant example demonstrated in the past.

Soviet Analyst, Vol. 1 No. 3, London  
30 March 1972

CPYRGHT

## *New Soviet Directives for Western Communist Parties*

"The changing nature of Communism" has been the topic of numerous discussions in the West over the past 20 years, ever since the death of Stalin. A great many optimistic statements have been made on the subject, especially after the late Mr. Krushchev's 20th Congress speech in 1956, with its suggestions regarding the non-inevitability of war, the possible avoidance of violent revolution and the chances of a peaceful parliamentary road to communism in some Western countries. Since then it has been generally assumed that communist ideology and strategy had undergone a profound change or, at the very least, had moved a long way away from the original Leninist tenets. Communism came to be regarded as a respectable, even rather stuffy

bourgeois movement; in some countries, as a mainstay of order and stability, in others, as a possible participant in a governmental coalition, on the international scene, as a reliable partner in a mutually beneficial dialogue.

On these not infrequent occasions when communist actions have contradicted the new image Western observers have sought an explanation in the momentary ascendancy of unspecified 'hawks' or even in a sudden tempor-tantrum thrown by some influential leader. The basic assumption of the new model of communism has not itself been questioned.

Yet there appears to be every reason to regard the popular view of post-1956 communism as in-



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200160001-7

correct, and to accept the fact that every basic Leninist principle, aim and method, has been maintained with remarkable consistency by the C.P.S.U. and the international communist movement. The immutable nature of Leninist strategy has now been confirmed once again by an article in the latest issue (No. 3 1972) of the Soviet theoretical journal *Kommunist* to reach the West. Entitled "Falsifiers of the Theory of Scientific Communism and their Bankruptcy", it bears the imprint "Prepared by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.C. C.P.S.U.": the highest possible ideological grading, binding upon all party members.

### The Dictatorship of the Proletariat Today

The article is devoted to a restatement of Leninist principles of revolution, of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and of the party of a new type, in the light of the current ideological ferment in Western communist ranks. Although ostensibly directed against such "revisionists" and "falsifiers of Leninism" as Roger Garaudy, Ernst Fischer, Franz Marok and the Italian *Il Manifesto* group, the article's clear purpose is to lay down the law for much more important sections of the international communist movement than this motley collection of insignificant transgressors. Much of its contents undoubtedly apply to the Communist Parties of Italy and Chile — and to those "bourgeois" politicians who seek or actually enter into electoral alliances with them. But the importance of the *Kommunist* theses transcends any one country.

*Kommunist* attacks the "modern revisionists" for having "replaced the imminent process of the change-over from capitalism to socialism by abstract arguments about 'evolution', 'reform', 'renovation' ". What these arguments boil down to is *rejection of revolution* — irreconcilable with true Leninism: "The basic question of a socialist revolution is the question of power, of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The socialist revolution begins with the seizure of political power which is then used as the main instrument of economic, social and cultural change".

According to the "modern revisionists" a dictatorship of the proletariat without the leadership of the Communist Party does not contradict the fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism. They are wrong:

"We know the numerous statements in which V.I. Lenin developed the basic Marxist thesis that the dictatorship of the proletariat is inconceivable without the leadership of the Communist Party. Practical experience has shown that even the existence of a multiparty system does not refute the necessity of such leadership. The Communist Party is the vanguard of the working class, its most conscious, organised and unified part. Only under the leadership of the Party can the working class implement its dictatorship over the defeated exploiting classes.

Historical experience shows that the defeated exploiting classes never leave the political scene voluntarily. They do not renounce their attempts to overthrow the workers' government even after the victory of the socialist revolution, and in this they can rely upon the wholehearted support of international capital. Under these circumstances only the dictatorship of the proletariat, in one form or another, can defend the achievements of the toiling masses".

*Kommunist* makes it clear that it is writing not of remote historical events but of present-day and future developments in the communist revolutionary movement throughout the world:

"As a result of the great variety of socio-economic conditions that have evolved in different countries under the impact of historical, geographical, national and international factors, the methods of building socialism, and hence the forms of political organisation of the new society also allow of considerable variety. Yet for all that the process of the establishment and development of communist formations is subject to a single set of laws of social development. These countries share a number of common features, all characteristic of the essence of socialism".

*Kommunist* contemptuously rejects the revisionist idea of the 'multiplicity' of 'models of socialism'. Such a view reveals ignorance of Marxism-Leninism as well as the desire to establish a 'hybrid society' combining the features of both capitalism and socialism. Any such half-way house between bourgeois democracy and the dictatorship of the proletariat is out of the question.

"The revisionists conclude that Communists should perpetuate bourgeois democracy and do no more than expand its framework. According to these revisionist notions the democratic nature of the future socialist society in the countries of Europe and its greater strength compared to the existing socialist countries can allegedly be secured only by political pluralism, by multiparty systems providing for the existence of political parties whose programmes differ in principle from the platform of scientific communism and which are in opposition to the Communist Party".

### The Future of the Multiparty System under Socialism

The authoritative exposition of the C.P.S.U. leadership's views on the nature and role of the multiparty system during the struggle for the establishment of 'socialism' and under a 'socialist' government constitutes the heart of the *Kommunist* article. It explains that the unity of the working class and an alliance with other segments of the toiling masses are prerequisites for the establishment of socialism; the precise form of such alliances with non-communist parties will depend on the actual situation in the countries concerned. "But the basis and the distinguishing goals and the vanguard position of the Communist

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200160001-7

Party, which will secure the achievement of those goals".

Class antagonisms under capitalism are expressed in the existence of various political parties — a situation which Communists utilise for the purpose of achieving power. However,

"Having once acquired political power, the working class implements the liquidation of private ownership of the means of production. This entails the expropriation of capitalists and landowners, the transformation of small-scale commodity production into large-scale socialist public production. Historical experience shows that this inevitably leads to the elimination of class antagonisms, to the over-increasing reconciliation of class interests and the establishment of a relationship of friendly cooperation between all classes and groups of socialist society. As a result of this under socialism there remains no more ground for the existence of any opposition parties counterbalancing the Communist Party".

"The criterion of genuine socialist democracy is not the number of parties that exist in the country but the degree of participation of the working class, of the whole working people in the government of the country, in the social, political, economic and cultural life of society".

A truly democratic society — in other words, a communist society — can be created by the working class, continues *Kommunist* "only under the leadership of a revolutionary party of the new type, constructed on the basis of Leninist organisational principles". The main heresy of the "modern revisionists" lies in their denial of the leading role of the Communist Party, their attempt to limit the workings of Leninist organisational principles exclusively to the specific conditions of Russia, and their desire to diffuse the clear-cut leadership of the Communist Party within a broad alliance of political, professional and cultural organisations. "The grave consequences of any attempt to depart from the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the leading role of the Party and to renounce Leninist organisational principles are well illustrated by the events of 1968 in Czechoslovakia", concludes *Kommunist* ominously.

**The Internationalist Duty of Communist Parties**

The article prepared for *Kommunist* by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.C. C.P.S.U. is not intended as an abstract theoretical exercise: it lays down official directives for the guidance of all non-Soviet Communist Parties. The binding nature of the experience and of the ideological and practical principles evolved by the C.P.S.U., as well as the "internationalist duty" of obedience to the USSR enjoined upon all Communist Parties,

have been simultaneously re-asserted (surely more than a mere coincidence) in a powerful article by Herr Hermann Axen of the East German Politburo (*Pravda* 10th March) — an article which a commentator of *The Times* sees as calling for the re-establishment of the Cominform. Herr Axen goes much further than the customary obeisance to the leading role of the USSR within the international communist movement — he demands that all Communist Parties subordinate their policies to that of the Soviet-controlled communist "majority", regardless of what their local interests or national circumstances might be. The demand is framed in an uncompromising tone:

"It is quite possible that at any sharp turn in world events the tactical interests of the struggle in some particular country may temporarily come into conflict with the requirements of the international class struggle. It is these circumstances that test the Marxist-Leninist maturity of a Communist Party, its capacity to stand up for the common interests, its ability to see that proletarian internationalism requires, as V.I. Lenin put it, the subordination of the interests of the proletarian struggle in one country to the interests of the struggle on a world-wide scale".

Nothing, we believe, could be clearer.

As usual, Western news media have paid no attention to the latest C.P.S.U. directives on the strategy and tactics of the world communist movement. Western public opinion has come to regard such theoretical disquisitions as meaningless acts of homage to an outdated and largely discarded doctrine. This ingrained attitude ignores the fundamentally ideological nature and the unchanging messianic goals of the Soviet system and the international communist movement.

We have trained ourselves to disregard such theoretical pronouncements, to believe in "de-ideologization" and "polycentrism", to think of the "new" post-Stalin communism as a pragmatic and rational system. This is unwise from our point of view as well as being unfair to the Soviet leaders. We could at least have the grace to accept that they mean what they say. Whenever they backslide from what we regard as the "modernised" principles of the "new" Communism — over Berlin, Czechoslovakia, the Middle East, etc. — the West is indignant about the deception practised upon it. Yet there is no deception, or at any rate no more than is usual in diplomatic exchanges. The guiding principles to which the communist movement undeviatingly adheres are laid down without concealment for all to see — for all, that is, who are not blinded by self-imposed preconceptions.

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200160001-7

Next 2 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200160001-7

FOR BACKGROUND USE ONLY  
June 1972

HUNGARIAN-SOVIET DIFFERENCES

At an impromptu airport news conference held on his return from economic discussions in Moscow (27-29 March), Hungarian Premier Jeno Fock gave a frank and revealing account of his country's economic problems with the Soviet Union. A Hungarian economic delegation, headed by the Premier, had gone to Moscow to discuss a Hungarian long-range economic plan providing for the delivery of Soviet raw materials during the next 10-15 years. (Hungary is totally dependent on the USSR for oil, gas and iron ore.) However, the Soviet Union, which supplies Hungary with these basic raw materials in return for industrial products, was reluctant to make any long-range commitments and told the delegation that Hungary was "looking further ahead than we are able to do in the Soviet Union."

Fock revealed that in the course of his Moscow discussions he told Soviet Premier Kosygin that Hungary wanted an industrial structure "more suited to our economy," and added that Hungarian leaders had to rack their brains to come up with economic plans which "would be good not only for the Soviet Union but also useful and necessary for Hungary."

The Hungarian Premier's candid account of his bargaining with Moscow is interesting not only for its substantive revelations, but because it represents a decision on the part of the Hungarian leadership to air its differences with the Soviet Union in public. Up to this time, Romania had been the only East European bloc country to openly express its resentment of Soviet economic hegemony. (It should be noted that since the nineteen fifties Moscow has worked to integrate the economic programs of its East European clients with that of the Soviet Union. Consequently the economies of these countries have been oriented first of all to Soviet requirements and secondly to their own. The resultant economic dependence of East Europe has been used by Moscow to encourage political conformity.)

Fock's remarks indicate that in their new long-range economic plan Hungarian leaders have provided for national needs as well as for those of the Soviet Union and CEMA. They also indicate that Moscow is unhappy with certain aspects of Hungarian Communism and is threatening to withhold raw materials essential to Hungarian industry until Budapest gets back in line.

In determining what aspects of the Hungarian program are unacceptable to Moscow, it is useful to recall that in January 1968 Hungary quietly carried out a series of economic reforms which changed the Hungarian economy from a totally planned one to one which has become a part-planned and part-market economy. Prices, for example,

are no longer pre-established for any but the most basic commodities. Financial incentives have been introduced, the import of foreign goods liberalized and better provisions made for consumer needs. Such reforms are anathema to orthodox Marxists.

However, Soviet reservations may extend to other aspects of Hungarian socialism. Concomitant to Hungary's economic liberalization, there has been a gradual and unspectacular democratization of political institutions, greater freedom for the intellectuals, and an attempt to develop a modicum of independence in foreign policy. (For example, Hungary has been expanding its relations with Romania and is also seeking to improve relations with Peking. Hungarian news media treated Nixon's visit to China more objectively and positively than their Moscow counterparts and have been consistently less hostile to the United States.) In February 1972, Pravda referred to Hungarian "bourgeois nationalism" (the first time the term had been heard in reference to Hungary since 1956.) Pravda also complained that "In Hungary Zionism is particularly on the alert to introduce bourgeois ideology and pro-Western sentiments." (A few days later politburo member Karoly Nemeth implicitly rejected the criticism on behalf of the Hungarian leadership when he called for a "resolute struggle against hostile and erroneous views" among which he included "anti-semitism.") Thus, the Soviet decision to apply pressure on the Hungarian comrades may have been generated by the latter's lack of political as well as economic orthodoxy.

In any case, these exchanges make clear that the Soviet Union is uneasy over what is taking place in Hungary. And at a time when it is seeking to enforce bloc discipline -- in the face of East-West detente and the challenge from China -- Moscow is probably not disposed to look favorably on new economic or political experiments in East Europe, particularly when they presage a loosening of ties with the Soviet Union. For its part, Hungary, like most East European countries, tends to see the European Community and the projected Conference on European Security and Cooperation as an opportunity to loosen the ties that bind it to Moscow. China, above all, is regarded as a force which could be used to weaken Soviet hegemony in East Europe. (It is not without significance that one of the most ubiquitous of East European graffiti is the one which exhorts the dragon to bite the bear's rear end.)

Meanwhile, widespread comment and speculation in the Western press, inspired by Fock's airport remarks, have made it necessary for the Hungarian leadership to reaffirm its fealty to Moscow. The latest of these oaths is a lengthy article by Fock himself which appeared in the 13 May issue of Pravda. Fock blames "enemies striving to drive a wedge between Hungary and the Soviet Union" for spreading "false and malicious interpretation and conjecture," and declares that Hungary and the Soviet Union "stand in close and indestructible unity." However, Fock also used the occasion to

reiterate the basic Hungarian position re the inadequacy of long-range planning in CEMA (saying that five years is too narrow a time frame) and claiming that CEMA members favor expanding economic relations with all European countries, West as well as East. Thus, despite all professions of loyalty and orthodoxy, and Moscow's evident displeasure, Hungarian leaders are adhering to their priorities of developing and modernizing Hungarian industry.

Developments in Hungary are symptomatic of deeper undercurrents: hostility toward the Soviet Union and the desire for more viable and -- above all -- more national forms of socialism. However, these remain undercurrents. Hungary is a member of the Warsaw Pact and CEMA, and supports Soviet foreign policy initiatives (including the invasion of Czechoslovakia). It is unrealistic to expect any change in this pro-Soviet orientation until one or another of the possibilities mentioned above becomes a realistic alternative. And that, as Marxists are fond of saying, requires some basic changes in the "objective conditions" which govern Hungary's relations with the Soviet Union and its position in the East European bloc.

However, the fact that the leaders in Budapest have acted on their assumption that it is possible at this juncture to publicly disagree with Moscow on matters of basic economic policy has, at the very least, served one useful purpose: to extend the perimeters of the permissible in the realm of public dialogue with Moscow.

CPYRGHT

WASHINGTON POST  
17 April 1972

CPYRGHT

HUNGARY SAID TO SEEK GREATER AUTONOMY

By Victor Zorza

Special to the Washington Post

New friction between the Soviet Union and Hungary, evident in a news conference given by Hungarian Premier Jeno Fock, on his return from a Moscow visit recently, reflects a rising state of tension between the Soviet Union and its East European allies generally.

The Russians have been making it difficult for Eastern Europe, much of whose industry was developed after the war in response to Soviet needs, to cut itself off from Russian apron strings.

But Fock disclosed in his impromptu news conference at Budapest airport that he had told Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin in Moscow earlier this month that "We Hungarians would like to improve the structure of our industry." He explained that what Hungary wanted was "an industrial structure which is more suited to our national economy."

The Russians are using their commanding position in Comecon, the East European equivalent of the Common Market, to impose on other member countries industrial development plans that would be more in Soviet interests than in their own. Officials of many Comecon countries resent this, but only the Romanians have said it openly. Now Hungary is beginning to speak out.

"We have had to rack our brains," said Fock, to devise industrial development plans which "would be good not only for the Soviet Union but also useful and necessary for Hungary." But, he confessed, "We were unable to reach final agreement" in Moscow.

Raw Materials

Hungary has to rely on the Soviet Union for

raw materials and energy resources which keep its industry going. But Moscow refuses to give any long-term assurances that its supplies will keep up with Hungary's growing needs.

The basis of the Moscow negotiations Fock said, was that "We wish to reach agreement on the most important questions affecting us up to 1980 or even 1985," but, again, "We were unable to get answers on these questions from the Soviet comrades."

The Soviet Union is using its economic stranglehold on its East European allies to limit their freedom for political maneuver. By binding them closely within the Comecon network, it is integrating their industries and their planning mechanisms into an organization which is bound to be dominated by the Soviet Union, with its overwhelming economic power.

The Hungarians have been casting envious glances at the Common Market, as did the Czechs before them, and as other East European nations are increasingly doing.

If Hungary's fight for economic independence is successful, it could encourage other members of Comecon to stand up for their own interest with equal vigor. This was already a danger in Romania's successful attempt to loosen its Comecon ties.

News Analysis

Indeed, as soon as Czechoslovakia began striking out on its own, it quickly found a common language with Romania in opposition to Moscow, as Hungary is now doing by rapidly expanding its own contacts with Romania.

Economic Independence

what coldly to the new friendship between Hungary and Romania. The Kremlin may well be wondering whether the new emphasis in Hungary on the need to pursue an "active" foreign policy does not also signify an interest in a more "independent" foreign policy.

The Hungarian press has even been hinting that the Soviet Union should make a more determined effort to improve its relations with China. Hungarian papers also took a distinctly more moderate and objective view of President Nixon's visit to Peking than did the Soviet press—and they have been consistently less hostile to the United States.

The Chinese have lately been making friendly noises towards the Hungarians and other East Europeans. The Kremlin makes it clear that it regards this as an attempt to alienate the affections of its allies. Romania and Yugoslavia are already using their links with China to counterbalance the pressure from the Kremlin, and in due course Hungary and other Eastern European nations might do the same.

Moscow's East European allies have given vigorous support to its drive to a European security conference, but they have their own objectives in mind. At least some East European officials hope that a new security arrangement might bring them closer to Western Europe, whose power they might be able to use to redress the balance established by the Soviet Union.

Swirling Undercurrents

All these undercurrents flow and swirl deep below the surface of East European politics, breaking through to the top only occasionally, as in Jeno Fock's airport news conference.

gary, which has taken over the torch of reform from Dubcek's Czechoslovakia, to carry it more circumspectly, to implement the reform more gradually, but with equal determination. The Kremlin, which at one time was content to watch the Hungarian experiment without too much interference, has now come to fear that things may be going too far.

A recent "Pravda" discussion of Hungarian nationalism mentioned that the Hungarian leadership "rejects any form of anti-Sovietism."

The article was, in effect, a stern reminder that hostility to the Soviet Union, nevertheless, persists.

Hungarian party leaders have been complaining about the resistance to change among veteran, "dogmatic" party members.

Pravda retorted that "dogmatic tendencies" were unfairly attributed to Hungarian party veterans.

Anti-Semitism

The Kremlin is also using the weapon of anti-Semitism, much as it has used it elsewhere, accusing reformers of being Zionists. In Hungary, Pravda said, Zionism is "particularly on the alert" to introduce bourgeois ideology and pro-Western sentiments into the country.

Within a few days Pravda got its reply from one of the top Hungarian leaders, Karoly Nemeth, a politburo member and the party secretary for Budapest. In a widely publicized speech he called for a resolute struggle against "hostile and erroneous views," among which he specifically listed anti-Semitism. No politburo member in any other Com-

party has gone out on a limb to denounce, in of

fect, the Kremlin's anti-Jewish policies.

**Threat to Stability**

The slow and undramatic democratization of political institutions now being carried out by the Hungarian leaders, together with their attempts to develop a for-

eign policy of their own, is being increasingly regarded in the Kremlin as a threat to the stability of the East European bloc.

The Hungarians deny any hostile intent as strenuously as the Czechs did, and as sincerely. The Russians, at this stage, are content to issue veiled warnings, as in

the "Pravda" article.

Hungarian policies are an integral part of the deep and powerful pressures for freedom and democracy which have repeatedly welled up in Eastern Europe —as in Czechoslovakia, as in the Polish riots in Gdansk, as in the Romanian demand

for independence. The signs from the Kremlin suggest that at least some of the Soviet leaders believe that the Hungarian rot must be stopped before it begins to spread to the neighboring countries and to threaten the whole edifice of Communist power.



WASHINGTON POST  
30 April 1972

CPYRIGHT

HUNGARY: A CAUTIOUS PROGRESS

By Richard Homan

Special to The Washington Post

BUDAPEST — Uncertain

about the degree of support it can expect from the Soviet Union are hampering Hungary's efforts to shift its economy from farms to factories.

Besides Moscow's reluctance to give any long-term pledges of cooperation, Hungary is also meeting with resistance from some of its Communist neighbors, who grumble that its innovative, Western-style economy is not geared to the Eastern Europe common-market needs and is producing a dangerous petit bourgeois class.

Through careful diplomacy with its allies, by curbing the most blatant excesses of affluence and by denouncing selected aspects of the Western world, however, Hungary has been able so far to continue its cautious progress as the most relaxed and prosperous of the Communist states.

Hungarians and their Western supporters here are convinced, nevertheless, that the situation is so sensitive that any publicity, good or bad, can be damaging.

The "Wunderkind"

Thus, when a Western ambassador recently characterized Hungary as "the economic wunderkind of Eastern Europe," an aide quickly added, "Writing about that sort of thing can only hurt them."

Last week, too, Communist Party Secretary Janos Kadar, who has guided Hungary's development since the 1956 Soviet invasion, told the parliament that the nation's economic progress should not too closely mirror the West's. Adopting Western ways, such as

diction.

The Hungarian Party newspaper, Nepszabadsag, recently carried a more specific warning.

As the key to making its four-year-old New Economic Mechanism work, Hungary has taken much of the economic decision-making and planning away from central party authorities and put it in the hands of technicians and managers.

But this Western approach to business, Nepszabadsag said, should not be seen as an opportunity to Westernize the nation. It cautioned against the attempt to transplant, along with progressive technical, economic and organizational methods, bourgeois views concerning their application as well.

But as an example of Hungary's relaxed detachment from the favored lock-step Communist approach to world events, more than 100 artists, teachers and government officials recently went to the U.S. embassy to celebrate the opening of a library, while Hungary's press and that of other Communist nations were scolding the United States for its resumption of bombing in

The biggest problems for Hungary now are maintaining its economic momentum—which requires maintaining excellent relations with the Soviet Union, its chief supplier and customer—and keeping its population, especially the young, from becoming restive.

17 Arrested

On March 15, during festivities recalling Hungary's 1848 attempt to win independence from the Habsburg Empire, 17 persons were arrested, according to authoritative reports here.

Although eyewitness reports differ on the size of the disturbance, it is clear that there was no widespread demonstration against the regime and most western observers here ascribe the disorders to youthful spring unruliness. But the fact that news of the arrests was suppressed for a month damaged the credibility of the official accounts and resulted in reports in the West of wide discontent.

Hungary's problems in getting long-term commitments of economic support from the Soviet Union surfaced at the end of March when Premier Jeno Fock was interviewed by Hungarian correspondents at the Budapest airport on his return from trade talks in Moscow.

Fock, talking a little more candidly than Communist officials usually do, made it clear that Hungary hadn't gotten the commitments it wanted for the period beyond 1980. But, he said, they still hoped to get them when talks resume next winter.

"We Hungarians, the Soviet comrades said in a praiseworthy manner, are looking a bit further ahead in economic matters now than they are able to do in the Soviet Union," Fock said, adding that this was said to him "in a rather jocular manner."

Finding a dependable supply of raw materials and energy is at the heart of Hungary's effort to transform itself from an agricultural to an industrial nation. But the Soviet Union, in its grand design of economic integration for Comecon, the Eastern counterpart of Western Europe's Common Market, would prefer to have Hungary remain somewhere between an agricultural and an industrial producer.

Besides withholding commit-

ments for supplying industrial materials, the Soviet Union has placed agricultural levies on Hungary which are so heavy that this year, for example, the State is imploring farmers to produce more vegetables on their private backyard plots so that exports of the state crops to other Comecon countries will not leave Hungarians short.

Hungary produces virtually no fuel and little energy of its own and it has few raw materials.

In 1970, the last year for which figures are available, Hungary had to import 70 per cent of its crude oil, 82 per cent of its iron ore, 75 per cent of its timber and most of the basic materials for its chemical industries.

That year, for the first time, Hungary had to depend on imports to meet its electrical power and cement building-material needs. Since then, according to, unofficial figures, the gap between domestic production and demand has grown.

In 1970 the Soviet Union supplied 95 per cent of Hungary's fuel oil imports, 85 per cent of iron ore and 88 per cent of timber. Hungary cannot purchase significant amounts of raw materials in the West because it does not have the hard currency.

Though Moscow did not commit itself to support of what Fock described as Hungary's effort to "develop an industrial structure which is more suitable to our national economy," one bit of long-term planning, beneficial to the Soviet Union, was taken care of.

Hungary agreed to step up its supply of bauxite—the one raw material of which it has a plentiful supply—to the Soviet Union during the period in which its own raw material imports are still in doubt.

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200160001-7

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200160001-7

THE CRISIS IN STATE SOCIALISM: AN ITALIAN COMMUNIST ANALYSIS

Italian Marxist philosopher Lucio Lombardo-Radice has written a thought-provoking analysis of Communism in the Soviet Union and East Europe entitled Is a Second Revolution Necessary? The article first appeared in the September 1971 issue of the Florentine journal I Problemi di Ulisse (but not in the official party press), whence it was picked up by Neues Forum, an Austrian leftist monthly, and published in its February 1972 issue. The attached excerpts are based on the German version.

Lombardo-Radice is a Marxist theoretician of distinction, an outspoken critic of both capitalism and the authoritarian state socialism practised in the Soviet Union and certain countries of East Europe. His Communist credentials are unassailable: a veteran militant imprisoned by Mussolini for anti-Fascist activities, he has been a member of the Italian Communist Party since 1938 and of its Central Committee since 1968. He is a leading proponent of a Marxist-Christian dialogue.

By way of introduction, Lombardo-Radice raises three questions:

"Given the crisis which developed in the Soviet Union and the East European bloc countries in 1968, a militant Marxist must ask himself certain basic questions:

a. After Khrushchev's unsuccessful efforts to change Soviet policies at the 20th CPSU Congress, after the Soviet army's liquidation of the 'new course' in Czechoslovakia, or after Poland, where a historical period whose beginnings in October 1956 were marked by courage and hope ended so tragically, can we or can we not still speak of 'socialism?'

b. Has the capitalism of the consumer society and the scientific-technical revolution overcome its inherent contradictions, or has it simply succeeded in preventing them from emerging in the classic form of regularly recurrent crises of over-production?

c. In the socialist countries, which are undergoing a fundamental crisis, is it possible to renew socialism in historical continuity, or is a second revolution necessary?

Regarding the first question, the author concludes that there has been an historical break with capitalism and that, in spite of everything, socialism endures:

"No matter how detrimental, regrettable, notorious and disgraceful the privileges of this or that group of functionaries in a socialist society, we cannot speak of capitalism... Exclusive state ownership of the means of production, and production relations which are determined by public need and not by profit relations are socialist in nature... This conclusion is not invalidated by the difficult -- at times even insupportable living and working conditions one used to encounter and still encounters in some areas of the Soviet Union." And again, "...The absence or non-functioning of the mechanisms of self-determination (above all of an autonomous and democratic labor union) which can call attention to mounting pressures and make their relief possible, has put workers under too heavy a burden.. Too much has been asked of the worker without first securing his consent. (The history of socialist revolutions, from the Russian and Chinese to the Cuban, demonstrates that one can get the seemingly impossible out of workers if one operates on the basis of persuasion, consent and participation in decision making.)"

According to Lombardo-Radice, the kind of "socialism" which exists in the USSR and the East European bloc has been distorted; a precise definition must take into account these shortcomings:

"The tendency to deny the status of socialism to an authoritarian system of state ownership is deeply rooted in the soul of those who fought to establish a world-wide socialist society. For being a militant socialist consists of considerably more than planning to abolish profit and its dynamics and to replace it with a given utilization of the surplus value consistent with a given collective logic. It means, rather, a determination to realize .. a new position for man in society and a new place for society in history. Comrades whose line of reasoning is similar to ours and who reject as fallacious the theory of a 'return to capitalism' on the part of the Soviet Union and its allies conclude that these countries are not truly capitalist but neither are they truly socialist; rather, they represent societies with a special structure for which a new term must be coined. In my opinion, the correct scientific definition is contained in the following statement by Luigi Longo [then Secretary General of the Italian Communist Party]:

'We proceed from the conviction that the socialization of the basic means of production is the necessary -- but by no means sufficient -- precondition for developing the forces of justice and freedom intrinsic to socialism. In order for these forces to develop fully, a fundamental democratization of power in all sectors of society must occur.'

"...However, experience has shown that in the economic-political sphere a full development of the forces of justice and freedom proper to socialism has not yet occurred, and its precise definition therefore still requires a qualifying adjective. In our opinion the term 'state' is most suitable, since it refers both to ownership relations and to political structures; if political institutions alone are taken into consideration, the adjectives 'centralized,' 'authoritarian,' or 'bureaucratic' also apply.

"I consider centralization of the state the characteristic element of this form of socialism. Contrary to many contentions, I hold that the revolutionary political party in the Soviet Union has become an organ of the state rather than the state having become an instrument in the hands of a party which is divorced from it..."

Regarding the second question, whether Marx's theory re the deepening of the contradictions inherent in capitalism has been proven or disproven, Lombardo-Radice offers the following (inter alia):

"It seems beyond doubt to me that imperialist capitalism's ability to change was underestimated not only by Stalin and the Third International, but by Lenin in Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism... State monopoly capitalism has learned to avoid natural catastrophies, but this in no way removes the contradiction between ownership relations and the development of the forces of production. The fundamental contradiction between capitalist ownership relations and the forces of production in the capitalist system has assumed new forms. However, despite the increased possibilities of capitalism which Marx did not predict, this contradiction has continued to exist and has even expanded and deepened."

Re the final question, whether the transition from state socialism can take place through a "new course," that is, through renewal in which continuity is maintained, or whether a "cultural revolution" or even more radical institutional break is required, the author states unequivocally that a renewal can come about only through socialist democracy, and that if such a renewal is prevented by force, then we can expect a radical and painful break with the past:

"Today there is a deep and insurmountable contradiction between the institutions of socialism and the socialist society which has developed under them. They stand in objective contradiction to the demands of a technologically and scientifically advanced production; they obstruct and limit the mechanisms of a production dynamic necessary for

further development. One of these mechanisms, the fundamental one, is democracy... Democracy and freedom are government and self-government processes required by the forces of production in the socialist countries.

"The institutions of state socialism also conflict with the outlook of the citizens. The contrast between the principles in which they believe and in which they were educated (equal rights, freedom to criticize, the power of the working people, respect for national sovereignty, etc.) and an absolute uncontrollable super-state becomes ever clearer to the citizen, given the absence of the right of the worker to have any say in management, the lack of control from below, and the theory and practice of 'limited sovereignty' [a reference to the so-called Brezhnev doctrine, developed to justify the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia].

"What is necessary, therefore, is a transition from the present forms of state socialism to forms which we Italian communists call socialist democracy. This transition would be characterized by the effort to move from the hegemony of the state to decentralization, from authoritarian decision-making to decision-sharing, from censorship to freedom, and from dogmatic Marxism to a Marxism open to innovation. The cultural revolution in China, the 'new course' in Czechoslovakia, 'self-determination' in Yugoslavia, and Cuban equalitarianism (I find no suitable term and hope I will be understood) are very different and conflicting phenomena. Yet they all run in the same direction and are all attempts to find a way out of state socialism controlled from above -- or to avoid ever falling into it, that is, ever having to pass through a centralized and authoritarian stage... The compromise, attempted today in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, between the authoritarianism of the political-state apparatus and the freedom of the scientific community, between the dogmatic sanctity of official ideology and the critical awareness of researchers, and between strict conservatism in political theory and practice (or in history) and bold innovation in the development of the natural sciences, technology and production -- this compromise cannot be maintained in the long run.

"In the long run, the contradiction between the development of the forces of production and political institutions in the countries with 'advanced socialism' will not lead of itself ... to socialist democracy. The development of the forces of production in the scientific-technical revolution constitutes the basis and condition for political change. But, such a change must take place at the political level as was the case in Czechoslovakia during the 'new

course,' which was generated by the contradictions between economic requirements and the inability of the political structure to fulfill them."

Lombardo-Radice reaches the following conclusion regarding the possibility of a reform in state socialism such as occurred during the "Prague Spring."

"History seldom repeats itself because a historical situation is constantly changing. Institutions, parties and human consciousness are short-lived when a change in course which is by its nature inevitable and historically necessary is prevented, as was the case in Czechoslovakia in 1968. Since a change is inevitable, it will happen; but from year to year, from month to month it becomes more and more likely that the change will occur through a break with the past which will be all the more radical, painful and 'costly' the longer the existing situation is maintained by 'anti-historical' violence."

NEUES FORUM, Vienna  
February 1972

IS A SECOND REVOLUTION NECESSARY IN THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES?

Lucio Lombardo - Radice, philosopher, professor of geometry at the University of Rome, member of the Italian Communist Party since 1938, member of its Central Committee since 1968/69, for years incarcerated, an avant garde exponent of critical Marxism and reform Communism in the West who played a leading role in bringing about a dialogue between Christians and Marxists within the framework of the Salzburg Congress of the Paulus Society in 1965, as well as during subsequent conferences. Member of the International Editorial Committee of Neues Forum since its inception in July 1967. The text below appeared in Italian in I Problemi di Ulisse, Florence, September 1971.

I. Socialism in Crisis, Long Live Socialism

During 1968, an extremely serious crisis erupted in the Soviet Union and in the European socialist countries allied with it which still persists and which can be overlooked by no one.

A militant communist who, loyal to his mentors Marx and Lenin, has chosen the path of scientific reason and historical analysis must ask himself radical questions in the face of a crisis of such dimensions:

1. After Khrushchev's unsuccessful effort to change Soviet policies at the 20th Party Congress, after the Soviet army's liquidation of the 'new course' in Czechoslovakia, or in Poland, where a historical period whose beginnings in October 1956 were marked by courage and hope ended so tragically, and elsewhere, can we or can we not still speak of "socialism?"
2. Has Marx' theory of the expansion and deepening of the contradictions inherent in capitalism been proven or disproven?
3. In the so-called socialist countries which are undergoing a fundamental crisis, is it possible to renew socialism in a context of historical continuity or is a second revolution necessary? (See: Leszek Kolakowski: "Can Bureaucratic Socialism be Reformed?" NF, Oct/Nov 1971 - the Editors)

The first and the third questions are intimately linked, of course. If we can no longer regard the countries under discussion as socialist, then we must endorse a true socialist revolution by the workers of these countries against regimes which have appropriated the name "socialist" illegally. If, instead, we decide that there has not only been an historical break with capitalism but also that socialism endures despite all -- and that precisely will be our answer -- then an answer to the third question is no longer necessary.

There are two possible prospects: a "new course" or a "cultural revolution." We use these two terms because they are the only ones that can be used to describe the situation in the socialist countries.



concrete and immediate sense of the possible alternatives: either a renaissance which, no matter how profound or radical it may be, still springs from within and maintains a certain continuity, or a break, an assault from without on existing institutions, a "bombardment of headquarters," so to speak.

With the second question, we subject the foundation of Marxism as a revolutionary science to critical analysis, in fact, question Marxism itself. Marx and Engels have always defined their work in terms of taking socialism out of the utopian realm and making it a science. The "classics" regard socialism as the only possible solution and the necessary way out of the contradictions of capitalism. It is no longer propagated as an "ideal goal," no longer as a "more just" and "more brotherly" system of government.

## II. State Socialism, Not a Return to Capitalism

The Communist Party of China has advanced the theory that a "restoration of capitalism" has taken place in the Soviet Union and in the other Moscow-oriented Eastern European countries. A majority of the groups belonging to the so-called "extra-parliamentary opposition" in Western Europe have accepted this theory.

Let us examine this theory more closely from the scientific point of view, where we use "capitalism" in the strict conceptual context of Marx and Engels.

In the Soviet Union, in Poland, etc, there is no private ownership of the means of production. In Poland one quite frequently still encounters small farm ownership, but existing restrictions on the extent of private land holdings and the number of persons employed there have in fact thus far prevented a revival of ownership in the capitalistic sense. And besides, the theory of the "restoration of capitalism" does not refer to such a category of farmers, who hold little land. For all that, there surely is not a single factory in the countries in question which is privately owned and where labor is exploited for private profit.

In fact, in its finely-honed formulations, the European extra-parliamentary left doubtless speaks not of "capitalism" but of "state capitalism." Here lies the core of the problem.

What precisely do we mean when we say that the economic structure of Italy, for example, strongly bears the imprint of "state capitalism" or, to be more exact, of "state monopoly capitalism?" As I see it, we characterize here the strong inter-connection that exists between classical capitalist (i.e. private and individual) ownership and state enterprises, public banks, economics ministries, etc, the "sole mechanism" which controls production. This being the case, one cannot speak of "state capitalism" in connection with socialist countries, since one of the two elements, private ownership of the means of production, is totally absent there. When state ownership is the only form of ownership, capitalistic profit in the scientific sense no longer exists.

In the absence of capitalism, one cannot call state ownership "state capitalism." Or, to put it in still simpler terms, it is impossible to speak of capitalism without capitalists. This difficulty was duly noted by those groups who speak of a "restoration of capitalism" in the Soviet Union and the other Eastern European socialist countries. Consequently, they claim that functionaries, the apparatchiki, have taken the place of capitalists and now constitute the new rulers. If "ruling class" means command authority and a monopoly on decision-making re production and wages without worker voice in such decisions, then the managers of public enterprises in countries like the Soviet Union are without doubt masters, indeed often absolute rulers, over production. But this no longer holds true. If by "ruling class" one means "capitalist owners," the the salient feature of capitalist production is missing, namely the fact that the latter is determined by the profit motive above, that is by the efforts to maximize profits.

Profit in the capitalist sense, lastly, means the private appropriation of the surplus value, which the owners (to be precise, the capitalistic owners) use for new investments for the purpose of generating new profits, according to the law of maximum profit.

The personal expenditures of the capitalist constitute only a very small proportion of his profit, even in the most spectacular instances of "dolce vita," and they can by no means be identified with the latter. It follows that the (relatively) greater availability of money or property to the functionaries in many socialist countries vis à vis the average worker cannot be designated as "profit." Even if this availability, this "having more" is quite considerable (way-above-the-average income, private car, luxurious housing, access to favored travel spots, travel, entertainment, privileged eating and shopping facilities, and so on), it is still a question of privilege, hence totally different from the profit of a capitalist. It is akin to the privilege accorded scientists or technicians in the same socialist society, or high officials, university professors, or corporation managers in a capitalistic society.

Moreover, while in a capitalist society high and highest productivity can be converted into private ownership of the means of production, namely into capitalist profit in the true sense (exploitation of the wage-earning labor force and private appropriation of the surplus value), there is never a question of that in the kind of society we are talking about.

No matter how regrettable, detrimental, notorious and disgraceful the privileges of this or that group of functionaries in a socialist society (even on the assumption that all functionaries have a privileged standard of living), we cannot speak of capitalism.

### III. Instead of Profit Dynamics, Socialist Accumulation and Social Utilization of the Surplus Value

Thus, an answer to the question "capitalism" or "socialism" depends on the decisive factor of the utilization of the surplus value, i.e. the surplus-product in relation to the requisite quantity of goods created by labor-power for the reproduction of labor-power. In societies where the means

of production are exclusively in the hands of the state (foremost among them in the Soviet Union), the surplus value is not converted into profit, even if it were utilized primarily for "primitive" socialist accumulation (establishment of a heavy industry and the infrastructures requisite to it) in the first five-year plans and, subsequently, for areas of public need (apart from the armaments industry and space flights): schools, hospitals, housing, and so on. Whether this was done better or worse, extravagantly or not, is of no relevance to our question: "state capitalism or state socialism?"

We do not hesitate a moment to answer: "state socialism." Exclusive state ownership of the means of production, and production relations which are determined by public need, and not by plans oriented toward profit relations, are socialist in nature, are a form of socialism.

There are global, macroscopic differences between state monopoly capitalism and state socialism. The relationship between European Russia and Asiatic Russia was, in 1917, not unlike that between the United States and the Latin American subcontinent. While present day South America, as half a century ago, is still characterized by under-development, illiteracy, and an almost monstrous contrast between the wealthy elite and the miserable masses, nobody can deny that the nationalities once oppressed under Tsarism have won culture and schools, in some cases, indeed, the alphabet itself. The change of Siberia from the quintessence of underdevelopment into a developed region, containing areas that have in fact advanced into the future (Novosibirsk), is one of the most phenomenal facts of the last 50 years, in historical, social, and, especially, geographic terms. The disappearance of illiteracy in the underdeveloped regions after the Socialist Revolution, and the unshakeable stability with which lack of education persists in the "Third World," which is either directly or indirectly dominated by big international monopoly capitalism, are among the most salient visible consequences of two opposite systems in terms of production relations: of capitalist profit seeking on the one hand, and, on the other, of utilizing the surplus value for the public good, which is typical of socialist economies, even state-run ones.

This conclusion is not invalidated by the difficult, at times even insupportable, living and working conditions which one used to encounter from time to time in some area of the Soviet Union (one recalls the revolts in Potsdam, Gdansk, or Szczecin) and in similarly structured socialist countries, and still encounters today.

The absence of an institutionalized reaction from above to pressure from below and, with it, the absence -- or non-functioning -- of mechanisms of self-determination (above all, of an autonomous and democratic labor union) which call attention to mounting pressures and make their relief possible, has put workers under too heavy a burden at various times in various places in the past, and does so today. Closely examined, too much was asked of the worker without first securing his consent. (The history of socialist revolutions, from the Russian and the Chinese to the Cuban, demonstrates that one can get even the seemingly impossible out of workers if one operates on the basis of participation in decision making, of persuasion and consent.)

It is important to me to establish that one can speak of an "exploitation" of workers in the Soviet Union only in the applied and not in the scientific sense. The allegation that the Soviet Union exercises a "big power" policy vis-à-vis the Warsaw Pact nations can be sustained only on condition of a more precise definition. The logic underlying the regrettable and, for the most part, sensation-causing restrictions on or violation of national sovereignty by the "leading nation" of the Soviet bloc differs totally from that guiding the conquests and interventions of imperialistic powers. They are related to the idea of a supra-national socialist system which, in its function as state, regards power as the strength of socialism, and where subordination serves the common goal of the survival of socialism? (Of course, one asks, which socialism.)

I shall not offer here an exhaustive treatise on, nor deal at length with reasons for, this special kind of inter-dependence between the Soviet Union and the nations which are its allies, since I do not consider them relevant to an elucidation of the concept "state socialism" (I could equally well limit my explanations to the Soviet Union). Let us say only that the Soviet state also asks very considerable sacrifices of its own citizens which serve to strengthen the might of the socialist bloc and frequently are greater than those demanded of other Pact member nations, which is consistent with the logic of power politics. But the Russian, naturally, feels quite differently from the Pole about the same sacrifice, for his own state imposes it on the first, while an outside force imposes it on the second.

#### IV. What is State Socialism?

The tendency to deny the status of socialism to an authoritarian system of state ownership is deeply rooted in the soul of those who fight to establish a worldwide socialist society. For being a militant socialist consists of considerably more than planning to abolish profit and its dynamics, and to put in its place a given utilization of the surplus value, consistent with a given collective logic. It means, rather, the determination to realize more complex and comprehensive perspectives: a new position for man in society, and a new position for society in the context of history. It happens, however, that comrades, whose argumentation runs along the same lines as ours and who therefore reject as fallacious the theory of a "return to capitalism" on the part of the Soviet Union and its allies, conclude their analysis with the declaration that these countries are not truly capitalist but neither are they truly socialist; rather, they represent societies with a special structure for which a new term must be coined.

In my opinion, the correct, scientific definition is contained in the following statement by Luigi Longo: "We proceed from the conviction that the socialization of the basic means of production is the necessary but by no means sufficient pre-condition for developing the forces of justice and freedom intrinsic to socialism. In order for these forces to develop fully, a fundamental democratization of power in all sectors of society must occur."

Longo obviously uses the term "socialization" as synonymous with "communal ownership," without further defining the form this ownership takes. It is true that state ownership (in general, and without private, capitalist co-ownership) is a form of socialization in the sense in which Longo uses the term, and we must employ the term "socialism" for all those

countries where it has taken place. But experience has demonstrated that in the economy. Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200160001-7  
freedom characteristic of socialism" has not yet occurred, and its precise definition therefore still requires a qualifying adjective. In our opinion, the term "state" is most suitable, since it refers to the ownership situation as well as to the political structure. If political institutions alone are taken into consideration, the adjectives "centralized," "authoritarian," or "bureaucratic" also apply.

I consider centralization of the state the characteristic element of this form of socialism. Contrary to many contentions, I hold that the revolutionary political party in the Soviet Union has become an organ of the state rather than the state having become an instrument in the hands of a party which is divorced from it.<sup>1</sup> Thus, the employment of Marxism, deformed into a doctrine of dialectic materialism, as the official ideology of the state (I am almost tempted to say as a state religion) appears to me as a reasonable process: it is a matter of a denominational state in the Marxian sense rather than of an ideological party (an ideological party can very well renounce state privileges for its ideology).

Half a century since the socialism of pure idealism and of the force of the idea has become government, state, territory and power, we must liberate ourselves from the myth of socialism and face the reality of various socialist systems. Fifty years after the storming of the Bastille (which was to bourgeois revolution what the storming of the Winter Palace was to proletarian revolution) France stood at the door of the Second Empire, that of the "minor Napoleon." Even when it had returned to the feudal scheme of ownership, it nevertheless remained a bourgeois regime; and how many different forms the latter took during those fifty years! Jacobin Republic and the Republic of the Thermidor, consulship and empire, anti-liberal monarchy and constitutional monarchy, a republic again, and again a military dictatorship. And how many different forms socialism has taken in the first half-century of its history! Predominance of the power of the state and self-government, the personality cult (which one could simply term a socialism monarchy), exercise of power by the Soviets and the bureaucrats, complete control from above, complete freedom of speech (I am thinking of the first 9 months of the new course in Czechoslovakia). Here I refer only to the now "classical" socialist countries, including Cuba and China; I do not refer to new ones that I know little of or which have just begun to develop, such as the "African socialism" of Tanzania or the "parliamentary socialism" in Chile.

#### V. Capitalism Has Not Overcome Its Basic Antagonisms

Before continuing with this subject, I would like to answer, briefly, the second question with respect to the antagonisms of capitalism. I will limit myself to summarizing the observations and thoughts which I expressed in an earlier work.<sup>2</sup> The historical-scientific (not utopian-moral) expression of Marx-Engels socialism is based on the assertion that there is an incurable antagonism between the development of the forces of production and capitalist ownership relations that will become even more severe in the future.

1. In a conversation with Togliatti after my trip to the USSR in 1962, I informed him that the soldiers who occupied the party presidium in Leningrad made a curious impression on me, as happens at a religious service. Togliatti answered that the Party in the USSR is something different from ours; his reply to my question whether it had become a special organ of the Soviet state was in the affirmative.

2. Socialism and Freedom, Editori Reuniti, 1968; cf especially the

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200160001-7

This gives rise to the necessity of a socialist revolution (here I skip the mechanistic interpretations of this "historical necessity" which characterized the Marxism of the Second International, the belief in socialism as a pure and simple act of history and not as a hard-won achievement of revolutionary activity; Lenin or Gramsci made this point clear once and for all).

If capitalism succeeds in rehabilitating itself, in somehow bridging permanently the antagonisms that characterized it in the days of Marx and Lenin, there will then be an end to the socialist perspective as the scientific goal of the analysis of historical materialism. In this case socialism will remain a goal, but it will again be a utopia, a "great refusal" of the rebels and freedom fighters who break with society for the sake of socialism; it will no longer be the final result of the growth of a new class within the capitalist structures which alone is capable of overcoming the antagonisms of the system.

The rejection of scientific socialism and the recent acclamation of utopian socialism found and find a vast (if not always conscious) expression in many restless fermentations of rebellion. Herbert Marcuse clearly and consciously expressed the two poles of this conviction: capitalism has really succeeded in "integrating" the proletariat by dulling and lulling to sleep the exploited with promises of prosperity in the consumer society. The working class, at least in the late capitalist countries, is no longer the bearer of the revolution. The only hope for a rebirth of socialism is the "great refusal" of the excluded ones, of the peripheral groups of capitalist society. The theory of the ability of highly developed capitalism to achieve the dissolution and transformation of its antagonisms into a dynamic equilibrium has one fact as its point of departure on which it rests: the new capitalist road which has developed since the last classical crisis of 1929. Keynes and Roosevelt, an economist and a politician, brought about this important historical change and are symbolic of it.

It seems beyond doubt to me that imperialist capitalism's ability to change was underestimated (not anticipated) not only by Stalin and the Third International, but by Lenin in "Imperialism as the Highest State of Capitalism." It is also clear that Engels (as a faithful interpreter of Marx) in his later writings was convinced of the inevitability of the cyclical recurrence of over-production, and he even determined the nature of its occurrence (in periods of 10 years).

The following problem evolves as a logical consequence from these statements: Has the capitalism of the consumer society and the scientific-technical revolution overcome its organic antagonisms, or has it simply been successful in preventing them from emerging periodically in the classic form of a crisis of over production?

It seems to me that a "yes" to the second alternative is unavoidable. It is a historical fact, a macroscopic manifestation that the basic antagonism remains, expressing itself in new forms. The periodic destruction of over-production takes place not in the form of "natural catastrophes," in crises 10 years apart, but in another way, in the form of smaller or larger wars, armament, unproductive state expenditures. Basically only

the uncontrollable and incalculable earthquake has ceased. State monopoly capitalism has learned to avoid natural catastrophes, but it removes in no way the antagonism between the ownership conditions and the development of the forces of production. The polarization of this development is growing out of proportion into a monstrous, fearful thing: fantastic metropolises and hells of under development, excess and suffering form antagonisms that affect everyone, not just the Marxists, increasingly (although only Marxism scientifically explains the reasons for this contradiction in the capitalist ownership relations and in the chaotic struggling for profit).

But the big city, itself, is a kind of hell. A hell of excess is sometimes no less unbearable than a hell of hunger. This experience is now a general one; it has found repeated, tortuous expression not only in economic-psychological literature, but in novels, films, paintings, and plays by Ben Shahn, Samuel Beckett, and Ingemar Bergman.

It was not pure accident that the fear of the rich-poor big city dweller (who lives alone in confines, a master of all things though himself only an object), is quickly used up, and lives in constant insecurity because things are so much greater than he, because he is worth nothing, because the decisions that burden the ordinary man are made by hostile and dark forces (It was not accidental that this human form of existence was defined in a word accepted today by all, a word which dominates the early writings of Marx: "alienation.")

The chaos and waste assume ever more threatening forms and head relentlessly toward the limits of the absurd. Boundless riches are used to make weapons which, when used, lead to the destruction of the attacker and attacked, perhaps even to the extinguishing of all life and certainly to a long night for culture on this earth. Mature capitalism in the era of the scientific-technical revolution and its "wonders" is comparable to the sorcerer's apprentice in Goethe's ballad (to use the analogy of Marx and Engels) no less than capitalism in its early stage of development. The inability of capitalism to control production appears in the most scandalous forms: nature and human health are in danger because the sorcerer's apprentice does not know the magic formula that regulates the movement of the pail of excess, so that everything is inundated by excess production, sinks, is poisoned and exposed to destruction.

It is in the advanced, rich big cities themselves that the nerves of the people tremble, regardless whether they are directors general or electro-mechanical apprentices. Hearts become sickly before their time, and minds become confused. The basic antagonism of capitalism break out inside the people who experience it and makes them despair.

1968, the year in which the crisis of the East European states appeared in all its seriousness, was also the year of rebellion of the sensitive segment of the people of capitalist West Europe, of the students who in their way attacked the unbearableness of "advanced" and "mature" capitalism.

## VI. Revolution in the Revolution

Our answers to the first and second questions which we asked ourselves were 1) Yes, the Soviet Union and the other states controlled or dominated by it are socialist countries, with the reservation, of course, that what is involved is a special form of the collective which we have defined as "state socialism;" 2) The fundamental contradiction between the capitalist ownership relations and the forces of production in the capitalist system, which is the basis of the scientific predictions of socialism by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, has assumed new forms. But in spite of the increased possibilities of capitalism, which the Marxists did not predict, this contradiction has continued to exist and has even expanded and deepened.

Our answer to the first question permits us to proceed to the third question, which has only become meaningful through the first answer. We can now rephrase it as follows:

Can the (necessary) transition from state socialism still take place through a "new course," that is, through a renewal in which continuity is maintained, or does it demand instead a "cultural revolution,"<sup>3</sup> if not indeed an even more radical institutional break? I want to explain briefly the adjective "necessary," which I put in parentheses and which I used in an affirmative, not a questioning, sense:

Today there is a deep, insurmountable contradiction between the institutions of state socialism and the socialist society which has developed under them. They stand in objective contradiction to the requirements of a production which is technologically and scientifically highly developed; they obstruct and hinder the mechanisms of a production dynamic necessary for further development. One of these mechanisms, the fundamental one, is democracy. Democracy and freedom are ideas which must be demythologized and humanized. Democracy and freedom are government and self-government processes which are demanded by the forces of production in the socialist countries.

The institutions of state socialism are also in contradiction with the consciousness of the citizens, who are socialist citizens and workers. The contrast between the principles in which they believe and in which they were educated (equal rights, freedom to criticize, power of the working people, respect of national sovereignty, etc.) and the absolute, uncontrollable superstate is more and more clear in the consciousness of the citizen -- given the absence of the right of worker codetermination, the lack of control from below, and the theory and practice of "limited sovereignty."

What is necessary therefore is the transition from the present forms of state socialism to forms which we, in the language of the Italian Communist Party, call socialist democracy. This transition must concern things as well as the consciousness of the people, but it is characterized

3. Actually all of us use the term "cultural revolution" as a synonym for a second revolution which makes a radical break with the first one, without taking into account that in the Chinese Cultural Revolution



by the effort to move from the supremacy of the state to decentralization, from authoritarian decisions to co-determination, from censorship to freedom and from dogmatic Marxism to a Marxism open to innovation -- the true work program, one can well say, of all socialist states.

The cultural revolution in China, the "new course" in Czechoslovakia, the Yugoslav "self-determination," and the Cuban equalitarianism (I find no suitable term and hope that I will be understood in spite of this) are very different and conflicting phenomena. And yet they all run in the same direction and are all attempts to find a way out of state socialism controlled from above or to avoid ever falling into it, ever having to pass through a centralized and authoritarian state. Kadar's step-by-step, cautious liberalization in Hungary and Gierek's current effort to stimulate or revitalize the decision-making cells at the base are both going in this same direction.

The great "invention" of the Russian proletariat in 1905, the Soviet, the first, almost legendary institutionalized form of the first, brief collective experiment, the commune -- that is the "lost paradise" which the now matured socialism longs for and which it will undoubtedly rediscover or will invent again in more highly developed and more complex forms.

But how?

## VII. The Long Trek of the Scientific-Technical Revolution

In recent years, and especially in the first months of 1971, events occurred in the political leadership of state socialism which were not particularly spectacular but were nonetheless, in my opinion, very significant. These events characterize the start of a crisis from below in the present administration. I am thinking of the GDR's productive, technical, and scientific progress and of the advance, promotion, and emergence in the party leadership of a new type of cadre which possesses true economic and technical leadership qualities.

Comrade Gierek, who took over Gomulka's post after the extremely serious Polish crisis in December 1970 and entered on a course of productive progress, is also this type of cadre. I am also thinking of Brezhnev's emphasis on scientific-technical progress at the 24th CPSU Congress and on the necessity of overcoming every form of "conservatism" in this area.

I am thinking of the increasing significance of Soviet scientists and technologists in the political field. Zakharov, a physicist, is today substantially stronger than author Solzhenitsyn. Basically, they both demand increased freedom of speech and absolute respect for "human and civil rights," as formally guaranteed in the constitution and by law. Yet, when Zakharov speaks, writes, and forms committees to "support the sanctions" of human rights, he is acting as a spokesman for the Soviet Union's intrinsic need for scientific development and not, like Solzhenitsyn, only as a representative of individual and collective problems of consciousness, of "pure" freedom of thought.

Thus, an organic, structural demand for freedom emerges from the science of the more highly developed socialist states: freedom for

theories, trips and relations abroad, information, and doctrines. As Radovan Richta pointed out<sup>4</sup> with the highly regarded cooperative work he directed, the scientific-technical revolution means leading all workers to creativity, as well as critical consciousness, and free, completely co-responsible and not just performing people. Therefore, Richta is quite right in believing that a complete scientific-technical revolution is incompatible with capitalistic ownership relationships. I would like to add to this that it is also incompatible with state, monolithic and authoritative socialism and that the full development of the forces of production released by the scientific-technical revolution is guaranteed in only one social-political organizational form -- namely, in socialist democracy.

The compromise attempted today in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries between the authoritarianism of the political-state apparatus and the freedom of the scientific collectives, between the dogmatism and sacredness of official ideology and the critical consciousness of research, and between strict conservatism in political theory and practice or in history and the bold revival in the development of natural sciences, technology, and the production, cannot be maintained in the long run.

In the long run, mind you. The contradiction between the development of the forces of production and the political institutions in the countries with "advanced socialism" will not lead of itself or through the power of things (which always proved to be extremely weak) to socialist democracy. The development of the forces of production in the scientific-technical revolution constitutes the basis and condition for political change. However, such a change must take place at the political level, as was the case in Czechoslovakia during the "new course," which was generated by the contradictions between economic requirements and the inability of the political structure to fulfill them.

#### VIII. A New Course is Still Possible

The "new course" in Czechoslovakia inspired me. In its progress and development I saw proof of the fact that people capable of transition to a form of socialist democracy could be found not only in a country but also in a communist party which had been among the most disrupted, disunited, and most deformed by tyranny, persecutions, and illegality. I realized that this transition, this transformation of socialism from the ground up without tragic incident, without a complete break with the past was possible even though - certainly! - not without shocks, conflicts, and complications.

It was possible. But is it possible today?

---

4. German: Richta Report, Makol Publishers, Frankfurt, 1971.  
Review by Lutz Holzinger: Socialism of Technocrats. NF, Oct/Nov 71,  
p. 17 ff.

I would like to give exactly the same answer that my colleague Havemann gave to this question in his latest book.<sup>5</sup>

Robert Havemann, resistance fighter against national socialism, sentenced to death by Hitler, Communist and Marxist, was completely excluded from public life in the German Democratic Republic during 1965 and 1966. He was expelled from the party, relieved of his university professorship and dismissed from the Academy of Sciences. (Havemann is a noteworthy physicist.) He now lives as if in exile in his own country like the poet Wolf Biermann, some of whose unpublished poems can be found in Havemann's book. Havemann's book is a journey through his life, from his arrest because of an anti-Nazi plot through the beginning of the 1940's until the arrest of his gradchild in 1968 because she wrote "Long Live Dubcek" on walls. The book is also a journey through the misery and disgrace of state socialism, of a dull censorship - and police state. After having related all this, Havemann ended his book with the words:

"A very great number of internal political conditions and events in the GDR produce at least the appearance of the continued existence, if not a new upsurge, of fascist conduct and attitudes... I don't want to enumerate them here. I do not want to justify any of these political decisions. On the contrary, I believe they deserve strict condemnation. But I have tried to explain why I welcome this state as a decisive advance in German history and why I consider it to be the part of Germany which can decisively contribute to the defeat of capitalism and fascism in Germany.

Nevertheless these backward trends discredit socialism and distort its image in an intolerable manner. Today I see many people who have lost all hope that there is a way out of this difficulty. I also see many, especially among the young, who consider our revolution in the socialist states to have failed definitively, but who hope for the victory of socialism in large capitalist centers.. And I see the radical leftists who adhere to Mao Tse-tung. They see no value in this entire decayed western world, whether it be capitalist or socialist.

I personally firmly believe that the socialist states, and thereby also the GDR, have not yet passed by the juncture with the future. The 20th CPSU Party Congress and the Prague Spring of 1968 are the two great historical events which have strengthened me in this conviction."

I also agree with this conclusion with the additional comment that the time remaining for a relatively peaceful and "painless" preparation of a "new course" seems to be menacingly short.

---

5. Questions, Answers, Questions, From the biography of a German Marxist, Piper, 1970, Cf. Havemann in NF: "Are Materialists Naive?", Jan 70. "Vindication of Dialectics," early Feb 70; "Dialectics of Modern Physics," mid-Feb 70; "Marx Re-Ideologized," Dec 69; "Christianity and Marxism -- Today," March 1966.

History seldom repeats itself because a historical situation is constantly changing. Institutions, parties, and human consciousness are short-lived when a change in course which is by its nature inevitable and historically necessary is prevented, as was the case in Czechoslovakia in 1968. Since the change is inevitable, it will happen; but from year to year, from month to month it will become more and more probable that the change will occur with a break which will be all the more radical, painful, and "costly" the longer the existing situation is maintained by an "anti-historic" force.

IX. Concluding Remarks

Unfortunately I anticipate that my conclusions will be condemned as "anti-Sovietism," "anti-Socialism," and "bourgeois revisionism" as were Dubcek and his followers, not to mention Havemann. But nevertheless these thoughts have come to me because of my deep ties with the USSR, because of my love for the Great Socialist October Revolution and for the construction of socialism in a number of European countries as has occurred historically, and because of the wish to make a fraternal and honest contribution to the overcoming of the current crisis and to the continued development of all glorious possibilities for the liberation of socialism.

SHORT SUBJECTSPOLES REVEL IN NEW FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATION

The British journal, The Listener, recently published an accurate and well balanced article on Edward Gierek's policy of closing the information gap between the regime and the people. The writer interviewed Vice-Minister for Information, Wlodzimierz Janiurek, who viewed his job as a combined state spokesman and Ombudsman whose main chore is to stimulate a two-way flow of information--from party and government to the press, radio and TV, and upwards from the people to the leadership. To implement the latter, Janiurek instituted an immensely successful two-hour TV show, "The Citizens' Tribune" in which Poles country-wide are invited at state expense to telephone in questions or complaints and have them answered on the air by ministers and party leaders. Complaints range from low standards of lavatories in provincial inns to bureaucratic backsliding and bottlenecks in industry. The fascinated public is already beginning to assess their once remote masters in terms of how they come across in extemporaneous TV appearances.

One interesting side-effect of this freer communication is the sharp decline in the number of anonymous letters to editors or ministers. A traditional gauge of atmospheric pressure in Eastern Europe, anonymous letters still are prevalent in Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria. In Poland, however, about 60 percent of the letter-writers now are willing to sign their names. Though censorship still exists--"it is necessary for the protection of the state"--rules have been eased and very few subjects are taboo.

Polish intellectuals, having tasted this limited freedom, already are pushing for more. However, now that the "lack of communication" issue has been cleared to the regime's satisfaction, party leaders probably will not go much further; after all, their goal is public cooperation for economic advancement and not liberal reform.

\* \* \* \*

THE NOISY NORTH KOREANS

The Foreign Ministry in Cairo has issued a new diplomatic list. The space where there should appear the name of the Ambassador from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is blank. It seems that very quietly last spring Egypt's President Anwar Sadat told

the North Korean ambassador, Kim Yong-Sun, to go home. According to a late-May UPI item from Beirut, the ambassador was declared persona non grata because of strong suspicions of North Korean involvement in the student disturbances of last January. Apparently another long-time irritant that helped bring matters to a head has been the North Korean flouting of Egyptian rules regarding printing and circulating of propaganda.

Diplomatic sources in Cairo say that since the North Korean ambassador went home, the personnel at his former embassy have become a very subdued lot even to the point of toning down their aggressiveness toward South Koreans in Cairo. North Korean hostility to their southern neighbors found expression in shouting insults at South Koreans when both sides happened to attend the same social functions and a chance street encounter never failed to evoke shouted epithets. Now, quiet reigns and the North Koreans even have stopped putting out their propaganda leaflets and the Cairo press no longer carries their full-page advertisements of noisome propaganda. At a time when North Korea is so eagerly wooing support for its position on the Korean question in the United Nations, this story has a message.

\* \* \* \*

#### FORTHCOMING EVENTS

During the first half of June, President Tito of Yugoslavia will pay an official visit to the Soviet Union. His meeting with Soviet leaders, following so close on the heels of the Nixon summit in Moscow and West Germany's ratification of friendship treaties with the USSR and Poland, is likely to be viewed by Soviet leaders as a key to their delicate balancing act in Europe. Soviet policy walks a tightrope as it tries simultaneously to hold on to its East European empire while opening up contacts with Western Europe. The influence that the indomitable independent-minded Tito can have on Eastern Europe is a hazard to Soviet policy.

Tito's last trip to Moscow was in April 1968. Four months later the Soviet-led Warsaw Pact armies invaded Czechoslovakia and Tito declared: "No socialism can be built with bayonets." Three years of tensions followed between Yugoslavia and the USSR. The thaw began last September when Soviet Communist Party chief Leonid Brezhnev visited Yugoslavia. And then in mid-May the Soviet Union awarded Tito, once so reviled by Moscow as a renegade, the Lenin Prize and a Soviet journal published a biography lauding Tito's wartime role. However, Tito can be expected to exact a higher price than superficial gestures of amity for a settlement of differences between Belgrade and Moscow.

\* \* \* \*

July 2 - 7 the USSR will host the 9th Congress of the International Association of Gerontology at Kiev. Fate has played a trick on the Soviet Union. Since the site for the 9th Congress was decided upon some time ago, Zhores Medvedev, one of the "fathers" of Soviet gerontology (the science of aging), was arrested by the KGB and imprisoned in a psychiatric hospital because he had written a book exposing the corruption of Soviet science under Stalin (The Rise and Fall of T.D. Lysenko). The book also paid tribute to courageous Russian scientists who died in prison camps for opposing the Lysenko theory of genetics, a theory that has been repudiated by scientists world-wide. Dr. Medvedev wrote another book called The Medvedev Papers, which figured in his psychiatric imprisonment. The Medvedev Papers describes the current restrictions imposed on Soviet scientists by Communist ideologists and the secret police, and calls for more scientific freedom in the Soviet Union, as well as granting Soviet scientists the right to travel abroad to international scientific meetings. The latter point was of direct interest to Dr. Medvedev since he had been denied permission to attend the 5th Congress of the International Association of Gerontology held in San Francisco in 1960, at which he was to present a paper. Dr. Medvedev's imprisonment in 1970 caused such an outcry within the Soviet Union by scientific and other elites, that he was released after a few weeks, but like all free thinkers in the Soviet Union he lives under the threat of KGB harassment, if not outright imprisonment. Scientists from all over the world who will be attending the 9th Congress in Kiev will be keenly aware of Dr. Medvedev's persecution. One wonders which the Soviet Union will decide is more embarrassing -- to permit or not to permit Dr. Medvedev to attend the international congress being held in his own country.