

STP **SUPPLEMENT**

The Struggle of Ideas
in the World Today

**Boris Ponomarev:
Marx's teachings are
a guide to action**

**The ideological
impasses of
"Sovietology"**

**The US "new right
wing" and Reagan's
policy**

The Struggle of Ideas
in the World Today

STP
SUPPLEMENT

SOCIALISM: THEORY
AND PRACTICE

5
1983

Published
bimonthly
in English, French,
German and
Spanish

Abridged articles are marked with an asterisk (*).

Address of the STP
Editorial Office:
Novosti Press
Agency Publishing
House,
7, Bolshaya
Pochtovaya
Street,
107082, Moscow,
USSR

Editing completed July 20, 1983

© Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1983

CONTENTS

THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS

- B. PONOMAREV.
Marx's teachings are a
guide to action 5
- The world revolutionary
process: the question of
power. STP round table 33

EXISTING SOCIALISM AND ITS CRITICS

- Imperialism's ideological
warfare and the crisis of
"Sovietology" 41

US "Sovietology" centres.
Facts and figures 53

PEACE, DETENTE, DISARMAMENT

- R. OVINNIKOV.
The war-hawks are at-
tacking 55
- STP readers on war and
peace 68



STP READERS ON WAR
AND PEACE

Many of the contributions sent for the STP-sponsored competition on the theme "In what do you see the achievements and advantages of existing socialism!" (the final results were published in STP No. 4, 1983) dealt with the role of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the struggle for peace and disarmament. Their authors spoke of the need for joint actions to eliminate the threat of a nuclear catastrophe emanating from international imperialism and adventurous and irresponsible US politicians. Extracts from contributions on problems of the struggle for peace are published on p. 68.

— THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS —

MARX'S TEACHINGS ARE A GUIDE TO ACTION

by Boris PONOMAREV,
Candidate Member of the
Politbureau of the CPSU
Central Committee,
Secretary of the CPSU Central
Committee

We have come a long way from the time when Karl Marx created a teaching which immortalized his name. We live in an epoch which, as Lenin predicted, has brought this teaching the greatest triumph. We have witnessed and are now witnessing the greatest revolutionary changes. The social and class character of many states and the conditions and way of life of the majority of peoples have changed dramatically. Never before has mankind seen changes of such dimensions.

The holocaust of two world wars swept the world in the twentieth century. The twentieth century also saw the Great October Socialist Revolution, which abolished the order whereby one ruling class replaced another, while exploitation and oppression remained. The development of human society made a sharp turn towards socialism, which eliminates for ever exploitation, oppression and the domination of the minority over the majority. Socialism proved its insuperable

Report by B. N. Ponomarev at a meeting on the occasion of the 165th anniversary of the birth and centenary of the death of Karl Marx. Moscow, March 30, 1983.

strength in hard-fought battles with imperialism which tried to turn back the tide of history. Having routed German fascism and Japanese militarism, the first socialist country in the world helped other peoples in their struggle for freedom and independence and made a decisive contribution to creating favourable conditions for the world's further progress. The revolutions in Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia, Vietnam, China, Korea, Cuba and Laos have made socialism a world system. Angola, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, South Yemen, Mozambique and some other countries are treading the revolutionary path towards socialism.

Summarizing the entire history of philosophical thought, Marx formulated his famous thesis: "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point, however, is to *change* it." Inspired by the ideals of socialism, the working class, the people of labour have been tremendously successful in accomplishing this task. Thus the teachings and cause of Marx and Lenin are being put into practice. Their great exploit continues.

Why do we revere Marx? For centuries mankind was plagued by exploitation, national and racial oppression and devastating wars. Marx was the first to explain the social causes of these evils. The main thing was that he discovered their material foundations and the objective possibilities for putting an end to them. His immortal achievement is that he discovered the *objective laws of social development* and created a science showing how to struggle against and defeat capitalism and how to create a new, socialist system.

Marx materialistically explained the course of

world history and worked out a doctrine on the development and changing of socio-economic formations.

He created the only scientifically-sound political economy and discovered the source of the bourgeoisie's enrichment—surplus value—thus unravelling the mystery of exploitation under capitalism and proving the inevitability of the revolutionary overthrow of this formation.

He substantiated the historic mission of the working class, destined to eliminate the last exploiter system and lead the building of socialism.

He worked out a strictly scientific, dialectical-materialist method of studying nature and society, as well as the methodology of a proletarian, i.e., true understanding of social processes and events and a truly realistic attitude to them.

Thanks to these epoch-making discoveries, *socialism, which was once an utopia, became a science.*

But Marx was not only a brilliant scholar. He devoted his whole life to making the science, which he created a means for liberating the working class. "Marx was first of all a revolutionary," Engels said of his great friend. He regarded science as "a mighty lever of history, as a revolutionary force in the loftiest sense of this word."

The combination of revolutionary thought and revolutionary practice gave rise to the *great political ideas of Marxism*, which became the decisive force in the further progress of the world.

These are, in the first place, the idea and fundamental principles of the establishment and activities of a proletarian party, without which the working class cannot develop from a "class in itself" into a "class for itself" and for all mankind.

It is the theory of class struggle and of the dictatorship of the proletariat which, as existing socialism has shown, develops into a state of all people and marks the beginning of the transition to a classless society.

It is also the revealing of the social essence and causes of wars and revolutions.

It is the idea of an alliance of the working class with the peasantry and other strata of the working people.

It is the conclusion about the unity of the fundamental interests of the working people of the colonial powers and colonies.

It is the scientific substantiation of proletarian internationalism.

It is the scientific forecast about two phases of the communist social formation.

These are only the basic tenets of Marxism, which have ensured it the role of a *practical weapon* in the cause of the revolutionary transformation of the world.

It is indicative that the first all-embracing theoretical document of scientific socialism — The Manifesto of the Communist Party — originated as a programme of revolutionary action. With brilliant perspicacity and in a form amazing, considering the force of its impact and beauty, Marx and Engels, for the first time ever, fully expounded proletarian ideology in the Manifesto. The creation of the Manifesto, which is rightly called “The Song of Songs” of Marxism, laid the indestructible foundation of the revolutionary doctrine of the working class. Today, the Manifesto is still the handbook of each Communist, each conscious revolutionary.

In the new epoch Lenin’s genius raised scientific socialism to new heights. The capacity for creative development, which is an essential part of scientific socialism, has been irrefutably proved by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and by the communist parties of fraternal countries. As a result, all social development is increasingly influenced by the eternal teachings of Marxism-Leninism.

As a science, Marxism-Leninism is universal. Philosophy, political economy and the theory of struggle for socialism and communism are fused in it. It has withstood the most difficult, but also the most effective and convincing test—the test of more than a century of *practice*. It has triumphed over dozens of other theories and concepts which have been disproved because they cannot vie with it, neither in explaining the world, nor, even less, in changing it. It is a correct and, for this reason, life-asserting, optimistic teaching.

History has developed, is developing and will develop according to the ideas of Marx and Lenin!

I. “. . .The Struggle between Capital and Labour is General and Ubiquitous; in Short, It Bears a World-wide Character” (MARX)

The social revolutions that have shaken the world have led to the sphere of capitalist domination steadily shrinking. But the capitalist system still exists on a considerable part of the Earth, and it still oppresses a large section of mankind. This must be taken into consideration in politics.

What is happening to capitalism in our time will neither be understood nor correctly assessed if one is not guided by Marx, by the main work of his life — “Capital”. Lenin’s teachings on imperialism are a

direct creative extension of Marx's economic theory. Lenin proved that at this last stage of capitalism every objective condition is created for the transition to socialism and that mankind comes very close to the need for fundamental revolutionary changes.

The opponents of socialism, talking about the "obsolescence" of Marxism-Leninism, usually refer to new phenomena characteristic of present-day capitalism. Yes, the capitalism of the end of the 20th century is different in many respects. Its evolution reflects the enormous growth of productive forces and socialization of labour, the disintegration of colonial empires and the major gains of the working class and the democratic movement. And, of course, the capitalist system feels the strong, multifarious impact of existing socialism, which keeps growing and gaining strength. Capitalism has for ever lost the exclusive right to dispose of the destinies of peoples. It has to adapt itself. The main forms of such adaptation are state intervention in the economy down to direct regulation, the use of the achievements of modern science and technology, the further internationalization of capital and integration, the growth of transnational monopolies and efforts to coordinate the economic policy of capitalist states.

Capitalism has succeeded in prolonging its existence. But this has cost and continues to cost the peoples very, very dearly. Moreover, it has created a threat to life itself on earth.

Nonetheless, the "old mole of history", as Marx figuratively described the processes paving the way for revolution, continues its work, continues because the nature of capitalism, the essence of its basic contradictions, has not changed and its social evils are accumulating and growing.

Far from disappearing, the exploitation of the working class and of all working people *is being intensified*. The antagonism is growing between capital and labour, between monopolies and the mass of the people, between imperialism and the developing countries.

Imperialist contradictions *still exist and are growing deeper*. Rivalry between individual countries and between the main centres of imperialism (the USA, Western Europe and Japan) develops into trade wars, into pitched battles for markets and sources of raw materials.

Economic crises *have not ended, but are indeed ever more frequent*. Marx's prediction on this score has been fully borne out. Life has dispelled the illusions about flourishing and "crisis free" capitalism. The capitalist world is already experiencing its third economic crisis since the early 1970s. In the industrially developed capitalist countries alone there are now over 30 million unemployed, doomed to great hardship, deprivation and moral suffering. The new technological restructuring of the capitalist economy threatens such disasters, such an aggravation of all contradictions that it may well end in a crisis far graver than that in the 1930s.

Far from narrowing, the gap between wealth and poverty, between the majority of the population and a handful of multimillionaires *has widened*—an inevitable result of the general law of capitalist accumulation, discovered by Marx. In the USA corporate profits increased by 50 per cent in the 1970s, whereas workers' real wages fell by almost one-fifth. In the elite of American society each of the 4,500 super-rich people has an annual income of more than one million dollars. In contrast, 32 million people—14 per

cent of the population!— are living below the official poverty line.

Far from decreasing, the contradictions of the capitalist use of scientific and technological progress *keep growing*. Here one cannot help recalling the scathing remark made by Marx to the effect that progress under capitalism, the invention of new machines, exhaust people, bring them unemployment and poverty, that the triumphs of technology are bought “at the price of moral degradation”. To prolong its rule, modern capitalism has been using the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution primarily to develop weapons capable of destroying mankind. In the words of Marx it is truly becoming more and more like “that disgusting pagan idol who wanted to drink nectar only from the skulls of the slain”.

Whatever aspect of bourgeois society you may take—the signs of its general crisis are to be seen everywhere. A number of structural crises, such as the raw materials, energy and food crises are now added to cyclical crises. Constant inflation upheavals in the credit, financial and monetary sectors show that capitalism is in a chronic state. Unbridled militarism and the arms race have especially grave consequences. Spiritual and moral decline—the disunity of people, loneliness, the increase in the number of suicides, cases of drug addiction, crime and terrorism—is clearly seen.

Even many Western figures are compelled to acknowledge that capitalism is an ailing system. There is a lot of discussion on the diagnosis and methods of treatment. But the diagnosis has already been made by Marx. A social system that subjects everything to

the cult of money, to the drive for profit cannot be cured.

History has completely borne out Marx's theses *about the historic mission of the working class*, which has in practice demonstrated its ability to put an end to the system of capitalist exploitation, to lead the peoples' struggle for freedom and equality and to assure the victory of socialism.

In the course of a century and a half, the working class has grown immeasurably, first and foremost in size. In Marx's time, it numbered some 10 million. Now it exists in all countries and in all continents, and exceeds 700 million.

There has been an immense qualitative change in the working class. In a number of countries, it has become the ruling class and has been developing as a socialist working class. Yet even in the capitalist part of the world, its position, composition and its very image have undergone a major change. More and more sectors of the population are becoming members of the proletariat and join the working class. Its allies, close to the workers by their social standing, have been growing more numerous.

Consequently, the political influence of the working class continues to grow. It is this class that feels the need for fundamental change and has faith in socialism as the only way to salvation from the plagues and flaws of capitalist society.

The modern bourgeoisie has come to see the force of the working class. It is doing everything to erode and roll back the working class movement, and cut its advanced contingents off from the masses. Sometimes its efforts do leave their mark. But, in spite of everything, the struggle between labour and capital is mounting. The troubles brought about by the growing

crisis are evoking mass protest. The working people reply to the offensive of monopolies and governments in a proletarian way: by strikes, demonstrations, sit-ins. That is the cast-iron logic of the class struggle. Its rising tide will not be arrested by reprisals or anti-communist demagoguery, or water cannons and tear gas, or police truncheons.

For thousands of years, pharaohs and emperors, kaisers and czars, presidents and other rulers have tried to prevent social change. But all those attempts have invariably failed because what has matured in the womb of society and been conditioned by the objective course of history is irresistible. Its inexorable advance dwarfs those who curse communism, who see socialism, revolutions, liberation movements as the "hand of Moscow" and seek to counter them with dictatorial imperialist practices and "crusades". Revolutions, Lenin pointed out, "arise when scores of millions of people come to the conclusion that they cannot live the old way any longer".

This objective law has been convincingly borne out by all the revolutionary accomplishments of the 20th century. It has also been confirmed by the *anti-colonial revolutions* of our times which Marx predicted as inevitable. There are scores of independent states today on the vast territories of former empires and scientific socialism, which its opponents tried to portray as a "purely European" phenomenon, is becoming an increasingly noticeable factor of social change in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The struggle to overcome centuries-old backwardness born of colonialism, and to oppose imperialism's encroachments upon the peoples' right to build a way of life they want is an important stream of the world revolutionary process.

Marx's ideas about *the role of Communists*, proletarian parties, the communist movement in the revolutionary remaking of society have been corroborated. This teaching holds a key position in Marxism-Leninism. It runs through all of its major components—from philosophical to purely political and tactical. The creation of scientific socialism as a theory was directly linked with the formation of the first genuinely proletarian party.

The Manifesto of the Communist Party and other Party documents, as well as the numerous articles and letters connected with the experience and work of the Communist League, the First International, the first socialist parties of Europe, and the very activities of Marx and Engels as Party leaders, produced the basic principles and ideas for building a working class party. Lenin was guided by them in creating his *great teaching of a new type of party*. They have become part of the treasure trove of the world communist movement.

Nowadays, communist parties operate in nearly a hundred countries. Many of them have become the ruling parties and some have developed into mass parties. Communists are now a force of truly global dimensions. Their total numbers are upwards of 70 million, not just a few hundred as in Marx's day. But the magnitude and complexity of the tasks facing Communists and their responsibility for using the entire modern revolutionary potential have likewise increased immeasurably. And in this context, an idea expressed by Marx is as true today as it was in his lifetime, namely that: "...even under the most favourable political conditions, any serious success of the working class depends on the maturity of the organization which educates and concentrates its forces."

Loyalty to the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin is fundamental to the success of communist parties in fulfilling their role as the most advanced political force of modern times. The history of the struggle for socialism down the decades has shown that it is only those parties that guide themselves by Marxism-Leninism, firmly uphold it and put it into practice, naturally, with due regard for the particular conditions of their countries, that can score victories to the benefit of the working class and the mass of the people. In the long run, the departure from Marxism-Leninism or its revision are always fraught with grave consequences for the working class movement of the country concerned and for the cause of peace and socialism.

The founders of Marxism taught those of a like mind the art of "genuinely internationalist behavior" and called on Communists to guard the principle of the internationalism of the working class movement. At this stage of close class confrontation in the world arena, this is particularly essential. There is no doubt either that the more consistent every communist party is in following Marx's appeal to the world's advanced workers "to stand firm by one another...", the surer and more consistent will be its success in resolving its domestic problems.

II. "...A Union of Free People, Using Common Means of Production" (MARX)

The main conclusion drawn from Marx's teachings points to the inevitability of the victory of socialism and communism. We may take pride in the fact that the first triumphant socialist revolution took place in this country and that the Russian proletariat, led by the Party of Lenin, paved mankind's way to socialism.

It should be stressed that Marx and Engels, who closely followed the situation in Russia, believed that it would be able to play a world-wide revolutionary role and that a Russian revolution would be able to become the "signal for a proletarian revolution in the West".

Of crucial importance for the victory of our people in the struggle for socialism was the Party's creative development and effective application of the revolutionary science evolved by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The ideas, advanced by Marx and turned into an integral theory by Lenin, underlie the construction of socialism in the USSR. This meant, first of all, the establishment of a state of an entirely new, socialist type, the protection of the gains of the revolution and, most importantly, the radical socio-economic and cultural transformation of the country through, as Marx put it, the *national centralization of the means of production* and the organization of work "under a common and rational plan".

Marx and Engels saw one of the main tasks of the proletariat that would assume power as lying in "increasing the sum total of productive forces as soon as possible". Indeed, the first socialist country surprised the world in becoming one of the major industrial powers in a short time. High rates of economic growth are characteristic of the majority of countries belonging to the socialist system. Between 1950 and 1980 industrial production increased by almost 13 times in the CMEA member countries as against less than four times in the developed capitalist countries.

Marx believed that a "realistic understanding" of the specific tasks at every given stage of development was essential for the future builders of socialism. Our Party proceeds precisely from such an understanding.

This approach was reflected in the article, "The Teaching of Karl Marx and Some Questions of Building Socialism in the USSR", by Y. V. Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The article met with the tremendous interest and approval of the Soviet people, of the other socialist countries, and it was extensively commented upon internationally as an example of the creative use of Marx's legacy for the theoretical analysis and practical presentation of problems connected with the consolidation and perfection of socialism. "Of paramount importance today," the article stresses in part "is the need to consider and consistently carry out measures capable of giving full scope to the enormous creative forces inherent in our economy. These measures should be carefully prepared and realistic, and this means that in planning them it is necessary to proceed undeviatingly from the laws governing the development of the socialist economic system. The objective character of these laws makes it necessary to eliminate any attempts to guide the economy by methods alien to its nature."

At the current stage, the aim of the Party strategy is to perfect developed socialist society in all fields on the basis of the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress. Prime importance is attached to specific programmes and practical steps to overcome bottlenecks and difficulties and to eliminate shortcomings in order to further reinforce the foundations on which the socialist way of life is based. This is the aim of the resolutions passed by the November 1982 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee. A great deal of work has already been done to carry out these resolutions. All of us see that the Central Committee, the Politbureau, all Party organizations have started large scale work along the main lines of the country's deve-

lopment at the present stage. Life confirms time and again that the CPSU draws its strength from its profound and indestructible ties with the people and that it puts the interests and requirements of the people above everything else.

By outlining new targets and mobilizing the energy of the working people, the Party persistently continues to assert the Leninist style in all its work. This style combines the scientific soundness of decisions with practicality, realistic thinking with self-criticism, great activity and initiative with strict control by results and with intolerance of any deviations from Party morals and discipline. It combines the ability to look far ahead and to think in large-scale terms with the permanent orientation on tackling concrete practical tasks. The Leninist style provides for the promotion to governing posts of politically mature, competent persons, with a sober-minded view of things and practical aptitude, who incorporate strong ideological commitment with the ability, to quote Lenin, to arrange solid and cohesive work of a large number of people.

In the centre of the Party's work today is the *organization of labour in the broadest sense of this term* to actuate all factors of economic efficiency at all levels of the national economy: from the individual working place and enterprise to the nation-wide level.

The principle of "economical economy" eventually means time saving. The saving of time, Marx wrote, as well as the planned distribution of productive time among various sectors of production, remains the primary economic law on the basis of collective production.

The key role in realizing this law at the present stage belongs to science. That is why the Party lays such strong emphasis on the task of enhancing the role

of science and technological progress. We also agree here in line with Marx's teachings. His idea that in socialist society science turns from an instrument of class domination into a force of the people ranks among his most perceptive predictions. So the Party directs our research and practical workers at doing everything necessary to build-up this "force of the people" and to use it to the fullest possible extent, or putting it in contemporary terms, to fuse the scientific and technological revolution with the opportunities offered by socialism.

The development of science and its introduction into industry and agriculture are of great international significance as well—for the prestige of socialism and for its success in the peaceful competition with capitalism. We are confident of this success because, to quote Lenin, "no dark force will withstand the alliance of men of science, the proletariat and technology".

Marx pointed out that the development of socialism called for inflaming attention to the "organization of production" for "free and associated labour". In our country, this problem was tackled in different ways at different stages. Now, too, when the accelerated transition from the extensive factors of social production growth to intensive factors is the problem of the day, the Party is pressing ahead with radically improving management, planning and the whole economic mechanism.

In this connection the Party has set the task of enhancing both the coordinating role of the state and the creative initiative of work collectives. Social ownership is not an abstract notion; it provides for working people's participation in managing it through their collectives and organizations. That is why the team contract has become a happy medium for utilizing

our industrial capacity to the utmost. That is also why the Party attaches such great significance to introducing the team contract into agriculture. Hence the pressing need to root out all formalism and ostentation from socialist emulation.

We know that the search is underway for other methods of realizing the advantages of social ownership of the means of production, which would meet the requirements of the present day.

The Constitution of the USSR also provides for the development of private labour and private subsidiary farms in the interests of society. This is particularly important for launching a truly nation-wide campaign to implement the Food Programme.

It is also very important that the consistent implementation of the principle of personal and collective interest and responsibility in all spheres of production and social life has now emerged as one of the topical trends in the perfection of Soviet socialist democracy as a whole.

Only socialism creates the conditions for the realization of man's age-old dream of equality, prosperity and confidence in the future. Only under socialism does work give man real satisfaction and enable him to display all his abilities. Nothing can divert us from the path which, according to the founders of Marxism, will "satisfy everyone's reasonable and constantly growing requirements". Reasonable is the word: Marx condemned what he described as "inhuman" requirements, whims and caprices and the love of luxury, which go against the grain of socialism. He also pointed out that the only source of meeting people's needs is the productive force available in society. Only the expansion of this force allows the expansion of the consumption fund. This is an objec-

live economic law. The CPSU is discussing this with Soviet people in a serious and businesslike manner organizing the efficient use of the entire potential and all the labour resources of developed socialist society.

The party is tackling the problems of economic social and political development in close relationship with *ideological and educational work*.

Nothing is farther from Marxism than the underestimation of the role of ideas in the development of society. The following catch-phrase, which Lenin valued so highly, belongs to none other than Marx: "Theory becomes a material force as soon as it is absorbed by the masses." We also all know that in creating the Bolshevik Party Lenin believed that its primary task was to inculcate socialist ideas in the working class movement. In present-day conditions too, the strengthening and spread of socialist awareness among the masses and the use of the conclusions of scientific theory in day-to-day practice are of great importance.

The experience of this country and of other socialist countries serves to show that at each new stage this work requires new and great efforts. Its aim is not only to enable people to overcome the private-property mentality, which has existed for thousands of years and which hostile propaganda is trying to revive in Soviet society. There are also objective difficulties and contradictions in the development of the foundations of socialist consciousness, that is, social relations. The mass consciousness depends directly on the state of the following aspects of these relations: society—collective—individual; leader—performer; city—country; intellectual and manual work, the measure of work and consumption, etc.

The CPSU pays unflinching attention to further strengthening the alliance between the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia and consolidating the social and internationalist unity of the Soviet people. These processes are gradually leading to a classless society which will take shape by and large within the framework of developed socialism.

The raising of the ideological level of the masses is now particularly closely linked with the inculcation of a truly conscientious attitude to work and the spread of production techniques and work habits that meet the requirements of our time. This will depend a great deal on the determination to put an end to breaches of discipline and order and such phenomena as wastefulness, bribery, sponging, embezzlement and all sorts of ways of living at the people's expense. In order to rid society, as Lenin demanded, from the "vestiges of capitalism" and "idlers, scroungers and embezzlers" the Party has launched a vigorous campaign against those who violate the principles of socialism. In this, the Party has the support of the whole people.

This does not at all belittle the immense independent role of ideological work which is bound, as Marx put it, to turn social consciousness into a *social force*.

The present stage of the country's development requires first of all a higher level and the greater practical efficiency of the whole sphere which Marx called intellectual and cultural production, including science, literature, art, journalism and every kind of culture in it.

The Party assesses the level of ideological work for the present and future according to how effectively it shapes the ideological and moral principles of socialism and asserts them in the consciousness and

behaviour of the Soviet people, helps them take an active stand in life and make their own contribution to the great cause of building the new socialist civilization, which is the cause of all people.

The improvement of the work of the mass media on the basis of the criteria of ideological work, which the Party has evolved and which it specifies and develops in accordance with the new requirements of life, also helps build up society's ideological potential.

Perfecting socialism in the USSR is an integral, extremely important part of the growth and consolidation of the positions of the *entire socialist world*. The major features of the world community of liberated labour, which Marx and Engels dreamed of, arise in the socialist community, in the varied experience it has amassed.

Socialism will require "international coordination of the social forms of production", Marx wrote. This forecast is now being realized in socialist economic integration, in those new tasks which the ruling communist parties put forward and on which they reach agreement among themselves.

The firm international positions and the authority of socialism are inseparable from socialist internationalism. It underlies the new type of international relations and includes full equality, mutual respect for independence, territorial integrity and national sovereignty, non-interference in each other's affairs, mutual assistance and comradely cooperation. Having discussed the results of the recent Prague meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states, the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR again stressed that the cause of friendship and

cooperation with the fraternal countries had held and always would hold a special, priority place in our international policy.

The founders of scientific communism foresaw that the countries of triumphant socialism would be "such a tremendous force and such an example" that other peoples would follow their lead. This was really so, and it is and will be so because socialism has been confidently marching forward, overcoming obstacles and difficulties, constantly criticizing itself, just as Marx foresaw, abandoning the obsolete, and boldly adopting and asserting the new.

III. "The End of Wars, Peace Among Peoples, The Cessation of Plunder and Violence, That Is Our Ideal..." (LENIN)

Marx pointed out more than once that wars engendered by the rapacious nature of capitalism were the worst and most dangerous of all of capitalism's flaws. Lenin had all the more reason to point out that pernicious quality in the age of imperialism. Imperialist contradictions produced the two most terrible world wars in all history. And despite the immense casualties and destruction these wars wreaked on the peoples, imperialism, US imperialism, above all, is now posing the threat of yet another world war, this time a thermonuclear war.

The founders of scientific socialism discovered the causes and sources of the war danger. That has played and continues to play a tremendous role in organizing the struggle to end wars of aggression. Marx, Engels and Lenin foresaw that the development of the material means of warfare could pose the whole problem of war and peace in an entirely different way. That is just what happened after the appearance of nuclear

weapons. A world war in such a context would be disastrous for civilization. In our extremely challenging times, when humanity is faced with the question "to be or not to be", nothing could be more important than to remove this threat.

The Soviet philosophy of peace is based on great ideals and values that have come down to us from the humanists of the past and have been naturally assimilated by Marxism. The Soviet peace policy is thoroughly realistic. It springs from a scientific evaluation of the consequences of an unjustifiable nuclear war. It takes into account the alignment of forces between socialism and imperialism and their military parity. It rests on the growing moral and political potential of nations and peoples supporting peaceful coexistence.

"Of all the dogmas of self-righteous policy," Marx wrote over a hundred years ago, "none has caused so much trouble as the dogma that 'if you want peace, prepare for war'. That great truth, distinguished principally by the great lie it contains, is the battle-cry that has called the whole of Europe to arms..." But today the same great lie is at the bedrock of the policy of the American Administration which is shouting from every rooftop that the US military build-up serves the cause of peace. The American President has been repeating this claim, declaring that "the most effective means of keeping the peace is to prepare for war".

In actual fact, this betrays the ambition to break the military-strategic parity, achieve military superiority over the USSR and deprive it of the capacity to carry out a retaliatory strike in the event of nuclear aggression. The Soviet Union will never allow that to happen, it will never be unarmed in the face

of any threat. That was what Yuri Andropov resolutely stated in his answers to the questions of the "Pravda" correspondent. They contain a fundamentally important exposition of our views on the pressing issues of disarmament and our assessment of the American Administration's foreign policy line as dangerous to all nations, to all of humanity. The General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee exposed the unscrupulous tactics the US President has been resorting to in the effort to misrepresent the policy of the Soviet Union and to justify the formulation of ever new versions of nuclear war.

This reckless course is based on militant, fanatic anti-communism. Hatred of socialism and blatant obscurantism are the only explanations for the allegations that the founders of Marxism-Leninism and their followers "reject morality" since they approach it from class positions. On the contrary, it is exactly their class position which expresses the interests of the working people, i.e., the vast majority of our planet's population, that enables Communists to consistently uphold common human moral values. So those who are trying to sanctify the arms race policy in the name of God, by misusing the religious sentiments of believers, who embrace the killers of the peaceful residents of Sabra and Shatila and amnesty the butchers of Song My, who have given refuge to Nazi criminals, who encourage and arm the terrorist and racist regimes in Central America and Southern Africa, who have inspired the aggression against revolutionary Nicaragua, who are planning "victory" in a nuclear war and are cold-bloodedly reckoning up hundreds of millions of victims, have no right to moralize to them.

The vital interests of our Motherland and of the socialist community, together with the need to pro-

tect the gains of socialism oblige us to be well-armed and have powerful defences. It would be appropriate to recall the following wise observation made by Marx in this connection: in the history of mankind, he wrote, there is something like retribution, so by the law of historical retribution the weapon which is forged by the one who wants to dominate is turned against him. The same has happened to nuclear weapons. When imperialism turned that great scientific breakthrough—the discovery of atomic energy—into a weapon of mass extermination, the Soviet Union came up with a counterforce for averting nuclear war and saving mankind.

But we have always been and remain against the stockpiling of nuclear bombs and missiles as a way to peace. No, only the renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons, of the first-nuclear-strike doctrines, and the termination of the arms race can serve the cause of peace. That is why the proposals of the Warsaw Treaty member countries and the constructive and realistic initiatives proposed by Y. V. Andropov have been so widely acclaimed in all countries.

The ideas of universal peace and of preventing a thermonuclear war are taking hold of growing numbers of people. The anti-war and anti-missile movement has assumed a tremendous scale and an unprecedentedly offensive character. Dozens of millions of people have joined this movement in Western Europe, the United States, Canada and Japan. Today, all of them are united by the common desire to defend the basic right of every nation and every individual—the right to live. More than a century ago Marx urged “to work for the simple laws of morality and justice, by which private individuals should guide themselves in their relationships, to become the supreme laws in

relations between nations as well”. Today this call by the greatest humanist could be written on the banner of the army of peace fighters, numbering hundreds of millions of people.

The communist parties are doing everything to step up the struggle of the masses against the danger of war. Like our Party, they stand for the broadest possible cooperation and understanding between the various political and social forces concerned about the danger of nuclear war. The CPSU fruitfully develops its contacts with Socialist, Social-Democratic and Labour parties in order to uphold detente and strengthen peaceful East-West relations. The socialists and social democrats, who head the governments in seven European countries and who have the support of tens of millions of people, bear great responsibility for preserving peace and effectively furthering the great anti-war tradition of the working class movement.

The influence of realistically-minded statesmen on international politics is obvious. In conducting its peace policy, the Soviet Union expects that they too will act, realizing their duty to the peoples longing for peace for themselves and future generations.

Ours is a time when the danger of world war and the forces capable of preventing it are growing simultaneously. The CPSU takes this into account in its foreign policy and in the ideological struggle being waged in the international arena. It will continue to expose imperialism's designs and tactics and to show, in words and deeds, that the Soviet Union proceeds from the inadmissibility of nuclear war. We are against a conflict of ideas becoming an interstate confrontation. There is no, nor can there be a reasonable foundation for relations between states with different

social systems, except for peaceful coexistence. Such is our Party's invariable stand.

* * *

The fate of Marxism is unlike that of any other trend of social thought. In the 100 years since Marx's death, his teachings have been enriched by the tremendous experience of the international working class movement and the revolutionary movement in general. Thanks to Lenin, a whole new period began in the development of the Marxian theory and, most importantly, in this theory being successfully translated into life. At present, scientific socialism incorporates the experience of the triumphant socialist revolutions, primarily, of course, that of the Great October Revolution in Russia, the experience of developed socialist society in the USSR, and the experience of socialist construction in a whole number of countries. Mankind has a priceless asset—the teaching about the construction of socialism as well as existing socialism which was maintained in stubborn fighting against imperialism and is confidently advancing.

In our days, it is impossible either to study, disseminate, or to defend Marxism-Leninism without taking these great and irreversible achievements into account. These achievements also mark a new stage in the Marxist-Leninist doctrine itself. They have shown to the working class, to all working people of the world that the sublime ideals, based on the theory of scientific socialism, are quite realizable. This largely explains also the ever wider spreading of socialist ideas throughout the world. A graphic illustration of this is the great scale of the present celebrations of Marx's jubilee in various countries on all continents. It is becoming generally recognized that the world would

not be as it is now had Marx and Lenin not existed. The idea of socialism as the prospect for all mankind is penetrating the consciousness of the broadest strata of the population on our planet.

We, Communists, Soviet people, must use the great teachers' ideas directly in our present deeds and concerns. Let us recall what N. K. Krupskaya said about Lenin's attitude to Marx. "Lenin learnt from Marx to look at life intently and critically, to analyze its phenomena, and to distinguish the fundamental from the secondary, learnt to link theory with practice...". she wrote. Lenin constantly "consulted" with Marx, and sought the answers to burning questions in his works at the most difficult, crucial moments of the revolution. "Theory enabled Ilyich to read the book of life," N. K. Krupskaya said with inspiration. Soviet Communists learn from Lenin how to study Marx and, at the same time, how to study Lenin himself and how to translate their teachings into reality.

According to Lenin, Marxism "has assimilated and processed everything valuable in more than the two-millennia-long development of human thought and culture". Marx himself personified a principled attitude, scientific conscientiousness, honour and responsibility; he was distinguished by his great self-discipline and tireless work, enthusiasm and unbending will in reaching the goal which he set himself. That is why the knowledge of Marx, as well as of Engels and Lenin, is not only the best way to master genuine culture. It is also an inexhaustible source of education, ideological, intellectual and cultural enrichment and ethical cultivation. And we use this source to successfully accomplish the pressing tasks of our life and struggle.

To study, defend, develop and skilfully use scientific socialism in practice under the most varied conditions—this is how our Party's attitude to it can be characterized.

Scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism, was, is and will be an inspiring source of light and reason, a reliable and wise guide to action for the CPSU, for all genuine fighters for the interests of the working class and for the peoples' freedom and happiness.

Great historic victories have been won on the basis of Marxist-Leninist teachings.

Under the banner of Marxism-Leninism let us go on to new victories for the sake of peace, democracy, socialism and communism!

Pravda, March 31, 1983

THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS: THE QUESTION OF POWER

Today new prospects are opened up for the working class and communist parties in the struggle for socialism. In the developed capitalist countries broader opportunities have appeared for the peaceful, gradual transition to socialism, whereby the working class and the Communists can use the positions gained in the bourgeois system of democracy and law.

These manifestations have brought new problems which can only be solved with the help of the tried and tested methods of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary science.

The Scientific Council on Problems of the Modern Revolutionary Process at the Academy of Social Sciences of the CPSU Central Committee sponsored a number of symposiums which discussed important aspects of the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist revolution. The materials of one of these symposiums are published below.

Prof. Yuri KRASIN, Ph. D., pro-rector of the Academy of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee: The leading role in the alliance of democratic forces must belong to the working class.

The revolutionary events of our time furnish new valuable material for theoretical generalizations. At the same time, they pose before us the same fundamental questions and reveal the same tendencies which first surfaced in the course of the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 in Russia.

The changed conditions, the new possibilities in the struggle for socialism, the new forms of this struggle facilitate the further elaboration of our ideas about the relationship of the general and the specific both in theory and in the policy of communist parties.

Take the dictatorship of the proletariat. Some theoreticians writing in the West European workers' press have hastened to declare the idea of proletarian dictatorship too "narrow" and

incompatible with the "democratic road to socialism". Is this really so? Of course, not. Marxists-Leninists defend this fundamental principle of socialist revolution because without proletarian dictatorship (and this is cogently proved by the record of history) it is impossible to carry out radical socialist transformations. At the same time, we cannot ignore the new circumstances confronting the working class in its advance to power in capitalist countries.

One of these is the expansion of the range of the workers allies in the capitalist countries. They are represented by numerous parties. The alliance of anti-monopoly forces led by the working class is impossible without the political alliance and blocs of Communists with these parties. However, the latter do not accept the dictatorship of the proletariat. The political platform of broad democratic unity cannot, therefore, include the demand of the dictatorship of the proletariat and must be oriented on a state of a democratic alliance in which the working class would play the leading role. It is necessary to appraise the class nature of this state and its relationship to the socialist type of government.

Many other cardinal problems of the theory of socialist revolution call for creative elaboration. All of them in one way or other are connected with the relationship between the general and the specific in the revolutionary process. It may be said that this is the focus of the major methodological problems in the theory of socialist revolution.

Prof. Boris LEIBZON, D.Sc. (History): Is it possible to dispense with the dictatorship of the proletariat?

To begin with, the word "dictatorship" in Marxist theory means not the form of power, not the degree of compulsion applied or the scope of democracy, but its class content above all. The dictatorship of the proletariat may assume different forms depending on specific conditions but in any case it means political power of the working class allied with the broadest masses of people.

In Russia, this power was established as a result of armed uprising and it was immediately confronted with the need to wage frantic struggle against counter-revolution which counted not only on its military superiority but was confident that it would be able to isolate the working class and undermine its alliance with the peasants. All this accounted in a large measure

sure for the specific forms the working class power assumed in Russia and for the definite forms of violence. Bourgeois and social-democratic propaganda tries to prove that this is the only possible form of dictatorship and there can be no other. Yet Marxism-Leninism has never denied the diversity of the forms of proletarian dictatorship. Our ideological opponents deliberately ignore the profoundly democratic character of Soviet power which from the very beginning expressed the interests and aspirations of the overwhelming majority of the people.

Today, when the ruling monopolies are exploiting all social strata, the alliance that may be formed round the working class may be very broad, truly all-embracing. This lends urgency to the question of the forms and content of the power structure which is to replace the domination of the bourgeoisie. And it so happens that attention is focussed sometimes on the form of power rather than its content. On the plea of fighting dogmatism attempts are made, while criticizing the specific forms assumed by the dictatorship of the proletariat as created in October 1917, to sidestep the question of the substance of the power without which there can be no transition to socialism.

In our days the peaceful triumph of socialism in the developed capitalist countries is possible. But this is not just the road of electoral battles. Nor does the experience of the Chilean revolution, despite the fascist coup of 1973, annul the conclusion about the possibility of a peaceful path, though it shows the need of drawing lessons from this experience. One such lesson, as many Popular Unity figures of Chile admit, is that the revolution was bound to the formal bourgeois-democratic rule of law, that it did not realize the need to establish a revolutionary system of law and order. V. Teitelboim, a member of the Political Commission of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Chile, writes that "as the revolutionary process developed in Chile almost the same importance was attached to the forms of struggle as to its aims. The form was in a way raised to the rank of the category of substance..."

The positions won by communist parties among the masses in a number of capitalist countries make a peaceful assuming of power by the left forces quite possible. Yet this does not imply the usual change of government through elections, which create only governments but not the power itself.

Prof. Georgi VODOLAZOV, Ph. D.: Marxist interpretation of the national and international.

In Western theoretical literature the dictatorship of the proletariat is often associated with the problem of the national and international in the revolutionary process, the latter being treated as something generally common to nations, while the former is interpreted as specific peculiarities distinguishing them from each other. The methodological fallacy of this approach is in the separation of the national and the international, in the formal, mechanical isolation of the one from the other and the loss of the connection between them. Dialectics do not at all reduce the general to similarity in different phenomena. The category of the "general" indicates that objects or phenomena belong to some special entity, to a single whole.

In relation to the problem under discussion the general (international) means above all the one goal towards which world social development is advancing, i.e., the goal which all revolutionary national contingents of the world are striving to attain, namely, socialism. This, naturally, presupposes general principles in advancing to this goal: abolition of capitalism and, first of all, its main attribute in the shape of private ownership of the means of production; creation of a proletarian state; abolition of exploiting classes, etc. The national is a specific form of attaining the common aim. Consequently, the national exists not somewhere outside and alongside the international but is incorporated into the international.

This approach to the problem sets the Marxist-Leninists apart from the leftists who view the international as just some common stereotype patterned on some specific experience and also from those who, speaking of some "nationally coloured" socialism, forget about the objective existence of a single common aim and, willingly or unwillingly, stay shut up in their "national flat".

Prof. Mikhail SELEZNEV, Ph. D.: Concerning the relationship between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the "democratic road to socialism".

Why do some West European theoreticians of the working class movement question the need for the dictatorship of the proletariat? In their view, the reason is that it is incompatible with "the democratic road to socialism", with a "democratic

revolution". It would be in place to get things clear on the Marxist-Leninist conception of "democratic revolution".

First of all, this concept is used to express the socio-economic and political orientation of a revolution. This is the meaning of such terms as "bourgeois-democratic revolution", "anti-monopoly democratic revolution", "anti-imperialist democratic revolution". The outcome of such democratic revolutions is the abolition of either feudalism and feudal survivals or the power of the monopoly oligarchy or else foreign imperialist domination.

Further, the concept "democratic revolution" is used by Marxists-Leninists to characterize the driving forces of a revolution. A democratic revolution is accomplished by the masses, i.e., the working class, the peasantry, middle strata and the intelligentsia under the hegemony of the proletariat. In the event of a victorious conclusion of a democratic revolution the popular masses establish their dictatorship, i.e., the rule of the people.

Lastly, the concept of "democratic revolution" is used to indicate the form which the revolutionary forces intend to give to the rule of the people. Such a form of people's rule is the democratic republic which ensures the maximum rights and freedoms for the working masses.

Naturally, the real form of this democratic republic will depend on the relationship of extra-parliamentary mass organizations of working people (like the Paris Commune¹, Soviets, the Popular Front², etc.) and elements borrowed from the country's traditional democratic institutions.

¹ The Paris Commune was the first government of the working class in history, a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was set up as a result of a victorious popular uprising of March 18, 1871. Its government was a bloc of the proletariat and petty-bourgeois revolutionaries. The Commune carried out broad democratic and revolutionary transformations. It dismantled the bourgeois state apparatus, dissolved the old army and created the National Guard, separated the Church from the state and proceeded to improve the conditions of working people and undertook bold transformations in the cultural field. The Paris Commune existed for 72 days and fell under the blows of monarchists—*Ed.*

² The Popular Front—a form of association of the popular masses which arose in the 1930s in capitalist countries on the initiative of Communists, in the struggle against the onslaught

It is important to stress that both the non-peaceful, armed road of an anti-feudal, anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist revolution and the peaceful road are equally democratic, for they bring to power the democratic lower strata associated in their own political organizations.

If some West European theoreticians of the working class movement identify the concepts "peaceful road", "parliamentary road", "democratic road of the revolution", this is, in our view, the direct consequence of the bourgeois interpretation of democracy. For it turns out that the peaceful road of the socialist revolution is more democratic than the non-peaceful one and the parliamentary road more democratic than the non-parliamentary one, because, it is said, the peaceful, parliamentary road ensures equal political rights for all citizens, namely, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. This presentation of the question is fallacious if only because it implies a supra-class power ensuring the equality of the oppressor, the bourgeoisie, and the oppressed—the proletariat. It is fallacious and dangerous also because it creates the illusion that the bourgeoisie can agree to a historical compromise and class collaboration with the proletariat in the struggle for socialism, collaboration which removes the need of proletarian dictatorship.

Prof. Mikhail BASMANOV, D.Sc. (History): The bourgeoisie puts its stake on the degeneration of communist parties.

In the changing conditions the monopoly bourgeoisie changes its tactics and resorts to various theoretical ploys. Its ideologists try, on the one hand, to present the programmes of a

of fascism and the threat of the Second World War. The social base of the Popular Front is the association of all democratic forces of a country on the basis of the alliance of the working class and the middle strata. Apart from the anti-fascist struggle, the tasks of the Popular Front included the struggle for the expansion of democracy, for social progress with the use of the legal opportunities afforded by a bourgeois parliamentary republic. The initiative in forming the Popular Front belongs to the French Communist Party. At the parliamentary elections in France the Popular Front parties won the day and formed their government (1936-1938). In Spain, this government was in power from 1936 to 1939. Marxists define Popular Front governments as a form of transition from monopoly power to proletarian dictatorship—*Ed.*

number of West European communist parties as ordinary reformist programmes and, on the other, hope to influence these parties in the spirit of "social democratization". In these efforts the bourgeoisie finds allies in right-wing social democrats who have long been pursuing the same aims. Willy Brandt, the leader of West German social democrats, hopes, for example, that the views of Communists would be converted into social democratic views. Social reformists and revisionists believe that not far off is the time when some Communists will be convinced of the superiority of the "strategy of reforms" over the plans of the socialist reorganization of society on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory. Speaking of the peaceful road of revolution, social-reformists insist that Communists should jettison a series of their programme provisions (including fundamental ones): concerning the break-up of the bourgeois state apparatus, the leading role of the working class in the socialist reorganization of society, the vanguard role of the communist party, etc. Thus the international communist movement is faced with the task of upholding and creatively developing the fundamental principles of revolutionary theory and policy.

* * *

Yuri KRASIN, summing up the discussion, emphasized that it had helped spot some new aspects of the character of power during the transition from capitalism to socialism.

Lenin, he said, gave many definitions of the dictatorship of the proletariat which reflect its different aspects. The most inclusive of them is this: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is a specific form of class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the working people, and the numerous non-proletarian strata of the working people (petty bourgeoisie, small proprietors, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, etc.), or the majority of these strata, an alliance against capital, an alliance whose aim is... the final establishment and consolidation of socialism."

This definition fully corresponds to the new balance of forces in the developed capitalist countries where it is possible to get along without the forms of violence which were imperative during the time when Russia's bourgeoisie put up fierce resistance and unleashed civil war. Today, the proletariat's class alliances may be very broad and a decisive factor shaping the particular features of proletarian dictatorship in a given country.

From the standpoint of Marxist dialectics, form has its content. Here I would like to stress, Krasin continued, that since forms change, the content must also change. Thus, the dictatorship of the proletariat inevitably transcends the boundaries of the bourgeois law and order. But the form of this advance outside the framework of bourgeois law may be different. And this inevitably leaves its imprint on the content of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In some developed capitalist countries Communists accept the possibility of going over to the socialist system of law and order while retaining certain rights won by working people in the framework of bourgeois democracy. In other words, the question is one of changing the class substance of laws while preserving the continuity of the rights already won, and deepening and expanding them so as to make them more meaningful, expressing the will of the working class, the majority of the people.

The world revolutionary process poses many problems before theoreticians. Communists are searching for answers to them, without renouncing the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat and applying it creatively in the new historical conditions.

A chapter from the book
*Problems of the World
Revolutionary Process*, Moscow,
Mysl Publishers, 1982 (in Russian) *

EXISTING SOCIALISM AND ITS CRITICS

IMPERIALISM'S IDEOLOGICAL WARFARE AND THE CRISIS OF "SOVIETOLOGY"

In the modern world the positions of socialism are being actively consolidated and the balance of forces is being tilted in its favour. This tendency leads imperialist ideologists to do everything possible to maintain the positions of the capitalist system bowing out of the historical arena or at least to preserve the present correlation of forces and even to try to take revenge in a crisis situation in international relations, in the development of socialism. This is why the imperialist powers are using their ideological machinery to discredit existing socialism by means of various falsifications, slander and distortion of the truth.

From Ideological Struggle to Psychological Warfare

Modern anti-communism and its "Sovietologist" vanguard aim their blows at the fundamental provisions of Marxist-Leninist theory and falsify the essence of the world revolutionary process, the strategy and tactics of the struggle for communism, the fundamental principles of the policies of communist and workers' parties.

The strategic aim of "Sovietology" and anti-communism at the present stage is to switchover from isolated acts of ideological subversion to all-out psychological warfare, replacing the ideological struggle by psychological warfare.

The ideological confrontation between the two

systems extends to all spheres of class, party and state life. It pervades all forms of social consciousness and influences the views and psychology of the masses. There is no peaceful coexistence between the opposing ideologies. The struggle here is developing according to the law discovered by Lenin: . . . "the only choice is--either bourgeois or socialist ideology. There is no middle course here."¹

When crisis situations arise in the world or crises erupt in the development of socialism, imperialism intensifies its ideological subversion. The methods and stratagems of psychological warfare, come to the fore. A typical example of this are the fabrications concocted by Western propaganda-makers around the events in Afghanistan. Fred Holliday, head of the Institute of the Policy Studies in Washington, said that statements coming from "sources in Kabul" should be viewed sceptically. He wrote in "The New York Times" that the US embassy in Kabul had been systematically turning out false reports since the spring of 1980. As an example he referred to the information given in the Western press to the effect that one of the Soviet divisions had reached the approaches to the Iranian oil-fields. The Soviet units mentioned in the press, he said, were actually 1,000 miles away from the Iranian frontier. Such lies have become the most common tool in the psychological warfare unleashed over the "Afghan question".

The Western propaganda services used ideological subversion to the full in connection with the crisis events in Poland.

The aggravation of the ideological struggle at the present stage also reflects the clash between the forces

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 5, p. 384.

of detente and anti-detente. Many "Sovietologists" completely deny the concept of detente, declaring that it has "withered" and that it is "complex" and try to intimate to the Western public that detente is lulling people's fears and anxieties in the face of existing socialism, of communism as a political trend.

Contrary to commonsense, they say that the socialist countries are "responsible" for political events in other countries, for civil and national liberation wars. Ordinary people are being frightened by "hordes of Russian tanks". The idea is being peddled among them that the USSR and other Warsaw Treaty countries are building up their armaments on a huge scale, "preparing a war against Western Europe". This misinformation and slander, which have lately assumed particularly vast proportions, are just one more manifestation of the crisis of anti-communism and "Sovietology", for the success of detente has not only inspired and strengthened the forces of peace and socialism but has also stirred up the forces of reaction and militarism and put on their guard those who would like to bring the world back to the times of the cold war and to the brink of a nuclear catastrophe.

The Crisis of "Sovietology"

"Sovietology" denies the objective laws of social development and also man's ability to cognize and use these laws in his practical activities. Hence, it denies the category of developed socialism, the historical inevitability of the new system.

The crisis of "Sovietology" is manifested, firstly, in the fact that it cannot, by its class nature, objectively recognize the undeniable historical truth that socialist society is not only a special entity but that

it is also the result of its own historical development governed by objective laws independent of the subjective wishes of people, that it passes through historically necessary stages of growth which cannot be avoided and that existing socialism is therefore a developing and always concrete socio-historical reality.

Secondly, "Sovietology" is going through a crisis because, unable to scientifically or realistically analyse the tendencies, laws and prospects of the present stage of world socialism, it identifies the ideal with the reality and thus creates a convenient object for criticism. This object is neither the ideal nor the reality but it gives them the grounds for rejecting both the one and the other. "Sovietologists" take great pains to prove that existing socialism is far removed from the views and ideas of Marx and Engels and even Lenin and that Marx, Engels and Lenin are utopian in their judgements about the world's socialist and communist prospects.

However, Marx, Engels and Lenin never idealized socialism. Marx wrote: "What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as it has *developed* on its own foundations, but, on the contrary, just as it *emerges* from capitalist society; which is thus in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually, still stamped with the birth marks of the old society from whose womb it emerges."² He shows the real historical potentials and also some problems and defects which are "inevitable in the first phase of communist society as it is when it has just emerged after prolonged birth pangs from capitalist society".³

² K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1973, vol. 3, p. 17.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

Thirdly, "Sovietologists" try to distort the essence of developed socialist society and its place in the historical development of the new civilization in every possible way. They apply the standards and criteria of the transition period from capitalism to socialism to the mature stage of the new society failing to see any substantial differences between these stages and extending the contradictions and problems typical of the transition period to developed socialism. They thus distort the picture of the development of socialist society and its stages in the effort to prove the impossible—that socialism is not a social system which can radically solve antagonistic contradictions, ensure great progress in the quality of all spheres of life, and create the basis, objective and subjective conditions for the gradual transition to communism. The aim of this is quite clear: to suggest to the public that socialism differs only slightly from capitalism in its social and economic structure and in the cultural development of society, and thus to bring the public to the conclusion that a "mixed society" is inevitable.

Fourthly, the crisis of "Sovietology" is expressed in the fact that, today, its proponents are compelled to camouflage their true aims more and more thoroughly. Many of them pass themselves off as "a kind of Marxists", quite often not just completely rejecting socialism but even posing as advocates of "improving" it. Their "studies" are full of "recommendations" for increasing the effectiveness of socialism in order to make it greater fit the conclusions of the founders of scientific communism. In the writings of some "Sovietologists" existing socialism is presented almost as the anti-model of the scientific forecasts of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, as something with no historical right to existence.

"Sovietologists" portray existing socialism in deepest black, as a unified society devoid of any diversity. They deny important feature of socialism such as unity in diversity and ignore the dialectics of the general, particular and singular in socialist development.

Today, even some representatives of "Sovietology" are forced to admit that it is going through a crisis in one way or another. Thus, Professor Jerry Hough, a lecturer in political science at Duke University (USA), wrote in his book "The Soviet Union and Social Science Theory"⁴ that it must be openly admitted that the level of participation of the Soviet population in political life is much higher than in Western countries.⁵ Guided by our paradigm of governed society, he continued, we do not notice such phenomena as high productivity of the social activity of Soviet citizens, which does not fit this paradigm. And if we do state such facts, we interpret them quite differently than we do this in relation to the West.⁶

Internationalization of the Ideological Struggle

The internationalization of the present-day class struggle is an objective tendency. In the focus of this struggle are the most widely differing socio-economic and socio-political problems of our time which are increasingly coming to the fore in the general confrontation of the two world social systems. And here socialism and capitalism differ widely in their ways of solving these problems, including problems affecting all of mankind.

⁴ Hough J. F., *The Soviet Union and Social Science Theory*, Harward, 1977.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 124.

The internationalization of the ideological struggle visibly affects international imperialism's tactics. Nowadays, all the major anti-Soviet, anti-socialist propaganda campaigns in the West are planned and coordinated on a state, on a government level. The monopoly bourgeoisie of different countries pursues common aims in the ideological struggle against socialism. These aims unite its different contingents, which, however pursue their own specific interests.

The common aims of imperialist bourgeoisie in different countries are: to achieve imperialism's military-strategic superiority over the world socialist system, weaken socialism economically and politically, quash the revolutionary mood of the masses in capitalist countries, counter the anti-imperialist national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, block the way of the young states to real independence and political sovereignty, and draw them into the wake of imperialist policy.

The organizational basis of this policy is a network of regional military and political pacts. Their main functions are to serve as an instrument of intimidation and aggression, stem the growth of the forces of socialism and to counter the influence exerted by the ideas of communism, the power of the socialist example, to put up a barrier to the national liberation movement of the peoples. NATO is in the forefront of these military and political alliances.

NATO has its own headquarters of ideological struggle against communism—the so-called committee for information and cultural relations. It formulates directives and recommendations on methods of ideological warfare against peace and "dangerous" detente, as it is defined in the opus "Ideological and Moral Aspects of Defence". It is recommended, for instance,

not to use the word "democratic" when speaking of socialist countries, which should be presented as the "exact opposite" of democracy. Even such expressions as "democratic republic", "people's democratic republic" have been declared unsuitable when speaking of these countries. It is also recommended not to use the term "socialist countries". The press and radio broadcasts should refer to them only as "communist", since, in the view of those making these recommendations, this will appear more intimidating.

The ideological consolidation of imperialist states in the struggle against world socialism is accompanied by the aggravation of contradictions between the strategic aims and tactical tasks of particular imperialist states, which are due to their regional antagonisms and those of international competition.

The community of the imperialist powers' class interests in opposing the growth of world socialism is an objective basis for the temporary easing of their contradictions and for their forming a common front in the acutest of struggles against all progressive forces of today.

In League with Revisionism

Right-wing and left-wing revisionism is, today, the source from which "Sovietology" draws various "innovations", which can no longer be produced by bourgeois thinking itself.

Take left-wing revisionism, for example. Its role as a kind of reserve of "Sovietology" is expressed in various forms. Thus, proceeding from abstract ideals, the Leftists criticize socialism, come out against state institutions, discipline in the army based on subordination to those of higher rank, etc. They lament the absence of "democratic control" on the part of "direct

producers". Even such an opponent of existing socialism as Alec Nove, Director of the Institute of Soviet and East European Studies at Glasgow University, writes in his book entitled "Political Economy and Soviet Socialism" that the Leftists have not concretely shown anywhere how these "direct producers" should manage the economy. The Leftists, he continues, do not realize that economic efficiency cannot be achieved under centralized planning without administrative mechanisms and that this is all the truer of such a vast socialist state as the Soviet Union.

The ideological opponents of world socialism are very well aware that revisionism begins where and when the universal in phenomena is ignored and the singular and the particular are made absolute. "Sovietologists" also try to incorporate into their services the dogmatism of those who emphasize only the general, reducing the diversity of concrete historical conditions to one scheme, disregarding the specific features and concrete situation in this or that country.

Reformist and revisionist theoreticians have long been adept at making imagined "improvements" in socialism. The concept of bourgeois socialism and the reformist doctrine of "democratic socialism", a counter-weight to scientific communism designed to adapt capitalism to the new historical conditions merge in the modern "general Sovietological" "development" and "specification" of Marxism. There are also revisionist trends hostile to Marxism-Leninism which now and again arise in the working class and communist movement and which in fact deny the general laws of socialist revolution and the building of socialism.

This ideological merger furthers the interests of monopoly bourgeoisie which, in the process of consolidating the anti-socialist forces, tries to attract the

middle and petty bourgeoisie and also the privileged section of the working class—the “labour aristocracy” and “labour bureaucracy” as their allies.

Unable to offer the working masses any constructive prospects, “Sovietology” uses every possible means to divert them from the class struggle against capitalism. Just like reformism and revisionism, it negates the revolutionary foundations of Marx’s theory and skilfully exploits the influence bourgeois ideology exert on the working class movement. As Lenin pointed out in his time, “Revisionism—revision of Marxism is today one of the chief manifestations, if not the chief, of bourgeois influence on the proletariat and bourgeois corruption of the workers.”⁷

One fashionable “Sovietological” concept, for instance, holds up socialism as a “corporate” society, interpreting its essence in a bourgeois spirit.

Frankly bourgeois and right-wing socialist “Sovietologists” have one common aim: to undermine the role of the socialist state as the main instrument in building the new society and replace it with some amorphous “social organizations”, to put an end to the leading role of communist and workers’ parties and thus leave the working people, the fighters for socialism, without reliable leadership in face of the imperialist enemy and various hostile forces. In the long run, they seek to erode the socialist organization of social life from within, to make the respective countries depart from the socialist road of development and renounce their programme aims and tasks.

“Sovietologists” of all shades also try to impose the concept of “market economy” on existing socialism.

⁷ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 29, p. 322.

They repeatedly “recommend” decentralization, the free play of market forces, make a show of concern for raising the economic growth rates in socialist countries, etc. All this is presented in the traditional “Sovietological” vein of a “conflict” between increased production efficiency and planning by decree and centralized management. In short, according to them, not the fundamental interests of socialist development but the dictates of the market should determine whether enterprises be closed down or opened, whether capital, labour and material factors of production transferred. In trying to identify the socialist market with the capitalist market, “Sovietologists” say nothing about their fundamentally opposing social functions, which set these two economic systems apart.

But despite all the options which “experts” on socialism from the “Sovietological” centres of the West try to impose on existing socialism, planning remains the central link, the core of economic management under socialism. The socialist system of planning established in the new society is developing and being perfected in accordance with the dictates of socio-economic progress.

* * *

“Sovietologists” call existing socialism “a closed society”. It is precisely under this flag that the ideological struggle coordinated by monopoly bourgeoisie on a world scale is being waged against it. In reply to this allegation made by anti-communist ideologists Marxists-Leninists say: “Existing socialism is indeed a society closed to imperialist exploitation, ideology and morality, to subversive activity by the imperialist states—economic, military or ideological. But existing socialism was from the very outset, is still today and

will remain in the future, a society open to everything positive, not only in the sphere of contemporary material and spiritual culture but also everything in the entire previous development of mankind."

Capitalism has nothing to put up against the theory of scientific communism, despite its active quests in this direction. The growing influence of Marxism-Leninism as a manifestation of the change in the balance of world forces in favour of socialism, its increased might and prestige, the deepening crisis of "Sovietology" and bourgeois ideology in general are the objective tendencies of the ideological struggle.

From the book entitled *Developed Socialism and the Crisis of "Sovietology"*, written by a team of authors, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1982

US "SOVIETOLOGY" CENTRES

"Sovietology" centres, specialized research institutions, play an important role in shaping US policy apropos the Soviet Union. They "study" the theory and practice of existing socialism from anti-communist positions and work out, on this basis, a pseudo-scientific "argumentation" to support anti-Soviet propaganda and issue practical guidelines for the global strategy of imperialism aimed against the USSR, the entire socialist community and the world communist movement.

The strategy of "detering communism", formulated in the "Sovietology" centres, has furnished the theoretical groundwork for the current aggressive course of the United States. Exploiting the myth of the "communist and Soviet threat" to the countries of the West these centres provide an ideological backing for the "crusade" against communism which Reagan announced in 1982.

The leading centres operate under the auspices of the famous universities such as Harvard, Columbia, Indiana, Stanford and other universities. The traditional thrust in their activities is to train 'experts' on the USSR and the East European socialist countries for the US state apparatus (including the State Department, the CIA and the Defence Department) and for the press and other mass media, and the teaching staff for US universities and colleges.

At present the United States has some 150 "Sovietology" centres.

An exhaustive idea of the numerous functions and structures of the "Sovietology" centres is provided by the activities of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace (based in Palo Alto, California), which is one of the oldest and more influential centres of "academic anti-Sovietism" in the USA. In the words of Herbert Hoover, its founder, a leading industrialist and politician, the paramount goal of the Institution is to expose the evils of the doctrine of Karl Marx.

The Institution gives special attention to the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the world communist movement.

The Hoover Institution regularly publishes works falsifying the history and the policies of the governing parties in the

countries of socialism. It publishes a unique weekly on international communism presenting a biased survey of the more important events in the world communist and working class movements.

The activities of the said organizations are subsidized mainly by liberal donations made by the major monopolies. Via their system of "charity foundations" (primarily the Rockefeller, Ford and Carnegie Foundations) they cover from 70 to 90 per cent of the cost of "Sovietology" activities. Funds are also furnished by the federal government, the Pentagon and other state organizations and departments.

According to US press reports, the monopoly foundations and government agencies have been showing a growing interest in sustaining and promoting "Sovietology". The directors of the powerful Rockefeller Foundation decided to furnish a lumpsum grant of two million dollars to several research centres engaged in the study of Soviet foreign policy. The Harriman Foundation has allocated 1.5 million dollars to Columbia University for expanding studies of Soviet economy. The Reagan Administration has also decided to do its bit. It sponsored and placed before Congress a bill providing 50 million dollars to finance research programmes on the USSR and East European socialist countries and train special personnel for the State Department, other departments and institutions.

Being the top echelon of the anti-Soviet propaganda setup the "Sovietology" centres play the leading role in distorting the real image of socialism in the eyes of the mass of the American public. The centres formulate recommendations for subversive radio propaganda, for anti-socialist literature, and their staff members regularly take part in broadcasts by "The Voice of America", "Radio Liberty" and "Radio Free Europe".

Thus, the "Sovietology" centres are, according to the apt definition of "The Nation" magazine (USA), steadfast allies of the military-industrial complex, an instrument for sustaining the socio-political system in the USA itself and for carrying out counter-revolutionary activity abroad. The anti-Soviet "factories of ideas" are one of the main supports of the US aggressive foreign policy course.

THE WAR-HAWKS ARE ATTACKING

by Richard OVINNIKOV,
D. Sc. (History)

In its attempts to break the deadlock of the social and economic crises, the American ruling class has made a dangerous turn from detente to a new buildup of international tension.

In its policy in the early eighties, the US took a sharp turn towards the arms race and thermonuclear war preparations. As is known, the American ruling class then found itself in a predicament. Inside the country, the Watergate scandal which had shaken the US political structure to its very foundations, was compounded by growing economic difficulties and social unrest. On the international scene factors, which were worrying for Washington, such as the growing efforts of the liberated countries to cast off the fetters of economic colonialism and the further strengthening of the positions of world socialism were added to the ignominious defeat in Vietnam. The inability, or more precisely the unwillingness of the powers that be to look for a way out, based on a judicious approach to our realities, triggered an upsurge of adventurous hegemonistic aspirations in the midst of the more aggressive circles of US imperialism which intended to settle all its problems by staking on military force.

R. OVINNIKOV—D. Sc. (History), a noted political analyst who specializes on questions of detente and disarmament.

This is why war-hawk politicians, whose mentality and practical deeds are stamped by most reckless adventurism, now rule the roost in Washington.

This political about-face forced its perpetrators to seek ideological backing, justification, in the eyes of the US and world public, for their reckless course leading to further confrontation and fraught with the danger of a nuclear catastrophe. To this end, they mounted a sweeping propaganda campaign in which the tone was set by sundry reactionary organizations. They set about vigorously inciting chauvinistic, conservative and militaristic moods in the country.

Mustering Forces

In 1974, the forces which, up till then, had sat tight and snug in the "cold war" trenches, began to reorganize. The self-styled Coalition for a Democratic Majority, whose members were a handful of US intellectuals with patently right-wing political views, fired a trial shot at detente. The central argument they raised in pressing for a "crusade" against the USSR is the thesis of "ideological incompatibility". Hence they have come to the conclusion that peaceful coexistence with socialism is both inexpedient and undesirable.

The next step by the ideologists and theorists of anti-detente was to enter into an alliance with the Pentagon "hot war" specialists. In Dec. 1975 a secret conference was held in the underground headquarters of the US Stratcom in Omaha, Nebraska. As one of its participants later recalled, it was the first time that such a motley and versatile group of experts had gathered at such a level of secrecy. What did they discuss specifically? The "relative diminution" of the US milita-

ry budget during the years of detente is alarming; it is, therefore, necessary to promptly increase Pentagon allocations and spur on the US allies in NATO. The above conference participant said that they were reassuring themselves that the US Air Force would have a fine new bomber—B-1 before long; the Pentagon bosses said that the development of the MX ballistic missile and the new Trident submarine had to be accelerated (and they began taking steps in that direction soon afterwards). The development of the neutron bomb for the European front was contemplated. Thus, literally underground, they cold-bloodedly began planning a new round of the arms race in the hope of enabling US imperialism to regain its lost military superiority. At the conference held in the reinforced concrete bunker the tone was set by Paul Nitze, a senior Pentagon official since the 1950s, dubbed by the US press as an uncompromising hardliner towards the Soviet Union all throughout his political career. Nitze made an alarmist statement, claiming that the Soviet Union was about to acquire a "war-winning capability". Under this pretext he urged repudiating the SALT-2 Treaty (a year earlier, he had demonstratively resigned his position as member of the US delegation at the SALT talks).

The troubadours of the new round of "cold war" gradually closed their ranks. A close-knit, if small, group of outstanding figures in the USA began to meet on a regular basis. The group included Eugene Rostow, Paul Nitze, former US Defense Secretary James Schlesinger, among others.

In November, 1976, a Committee on the Present Danger was formed in Washington on the initiative of this group. It was called after an organization which emerged in the early 1950s and later, when incorpora-

ted into the Truman¹ Administration, exerted pressure with the object of increasing military allocations. Eventually managed to have them trebled!

An analysis of the original 141-member committee shows that besides a number of leading industrial and financial magnates it solidly represented two other constituents of the ruling class who, from the very outset, had been ardent champions of resuming the "cold war"—the so-called neo-conservative ideologists and the military men of action.

Another feature was immediately obvious which marks this outfit from many other reactionary organizations now mushrooming in the USA, and which, as later developed, played a decisive role in inducing a considerable part of the US ruling circles to switch over to ultra-nationalistic and militaristic positions. From the very outset, the committee represented the extreme right wing of a major centre of the leading US tycoons for influencing US foreign policy, namely—the Council on Foreign Relations based in New York. Therefore, it is not fortuitous but rather logical and natural that forty per cent of the members of the Committee on the Present Danger and two-thirds of its leaders were also members of the Council in 1976.

The Hour Has Struck

Having grown sufficiently in strength, the Committee on the Present Danger got down to fanning the flames of psychological warfare against the Soviet Union. Some of its activities were blatantly aimed at whipping up military psychosis in the USA. Others were designed to fire the nationalistic feelings of the

¹ Harry Truman was US President from 1945 to 1953.

American philistine. However, the core of the Committee's political programme, its primary aim, was to preclude the very possibility of concluding the SALT-2 Treaty. In their pursuit of nuclear superiority the "hawks" strove to destroy the main foundations for the normalization of relations between the USSR and the USA, thereby delivering a crippling blow to detente.

The Committee on the Present Danger mounted a broad campaign on disseminating its views, exploiting nationalistic and conservative moods. It made special efforts to change the thinking of the members of the main foreign-policy "brain trust" of the US ruling class—the Council on Foreign Relations, in the heart of which it itself had been born.

In the years of detente, the main strategic guideline promoted and sustained by the Council on Foreign Relations was the "world order" doctrine. Integral to it was the idea that international peace and security could not be maintained without a measure of cooperation with the Soviet Union. Consequently, the attempt at forecasting international events for 10-15 years ahead, undertaken by the Council in the mid-seventies on this basis, was fairly well-reasoned and balanced. However, the thoughts and voices of reason were suppressed until, in 1979, the whole project was declared "naive" and "insufficiently based on political realities". The question of the ideological justification of the new round of the arms race and the toughening of the positions-of-strength policy was placed on the agenda of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Against this background the Committee on the Present Danger further stepped up its activities. In July, 1980, a delegation of the Committee's leaders visited R. Reagan, who had just been nominated the Repub-

lican Party's Presidential candidate. According to the US press, he was told that the country had to implement a large-scale re-armament programme and resume the policy of deterrence towards the Soviet Union. After Reagan was elected President, wrote a US journalist, the world view taken by the Committee on the Present Danger became national policy, it seemed. But it not only seemed to be so.

R. Reagan, a member of the Committee, became US President. Several dozen members of the Committee were appointed to important government posts. A survey of the posts they occupy in the Administration shows that the members of the Committee on the Present Danger have gained control of the principal mechanisms enabling US imperialism to pursue its positions-of-strength policy and of meddling in the internal affairs of other states, i.e., they installed themselves in those organs of government control of which gives them a fair chance of blocking any steps towards peace, cooperation and disarmament.

The main strongholds of this team of anti-Soviet-ers are the US National Security Council, the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency. The staff of the National Security Council was originally headed by Richard Allen; Richard Pipes became its chief expert on Soviet affairs.

Equally important posts were occupied by members of the Committee on the Present Danger in the Pentagon. Fred Iklé became Assistant Secretary of Defense, Richard N. Perle was appointed the Assistant Secretary of Defense for policy, John Lehman became Secretary of the Navy. Finally, William Casey, also a member of the Committee, was appointed head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The installation of the Committee members in the posts connected with the disarmament talks made any serious progress in this field impossible. Eugene Rostow became Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. P. Nitze was appointed US representative at the Soviet-American negotiations on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. Even the conservative "New York Times" was forced to admit that virtually every high-ranking office-holder in the current Administration, concerned with the limitation of strategic arms, is a sworn opponent of the 1979 Treaty, i.e., of SALT-2.

Finally, members of the Committee gained control over the major international channels. Jeane Kirkpatrick became US Ambassador to the UN; Michael Novak was appointed US representative to the UN Commission on Human Rights; Max Kampelman was appointed US negotiator at the Madrid talks concerned with implementation of the Helsinki agreements. As soon as these people were appointed to their posts, the United States mounted a strident slander campaign in all these organs against the USSR and other socialist countries.

Trade as a "Big Stick"

In 1982 the "Foreign Affairs" journal pointed out that the USA had taken an about-face in its approach to trade with the Soviet Union. Earlier, said the journal, the USA had regarded this trade as one of the keys, if not the main key, to reaching political agreement with Moscow, now it regards this as an instrument of "punitive sanctions". Predictably, the Committee members were among those who initiated and actively carried out this change.

In the autumn of 1978 a special group in the Council on Foreign Relations nominally examined the role of the Soviet Union in the world economy. Urging the curtailment of Soviet-US trade relations this group alleged at one of its sittings that the Soviet Union had gained "disproportionately" great benefits from trade, inasmuch as the USSR's "social gain" significantly outweighed the "private gain" made by US companies which vie with one another while the USSR pursues a centralized policy. It is plain to see that the Soviet Union is thus blamed for the advantages afforded by its socialist social system and the state monopoly of foreign trade.

Some US researchers into East-West trade openly declared the intention of US imperialism to take advantage of imports of US technology to the Soviet Union in order to undermine the Soviet economy. According to their schemes, imports of US technology to the USSR could be likened to a pair of crutches on which the patient grows so dependent that after a while, he cannot do without them. But the Soviet Union has not fallen into this dangerous trap. This, again, is reason enough for them to urge the curtailment of trade.

The awareness of their own impotence increasingly enraged certain circles in the United States, and the Reagan Administration placed subversion of trade with the Soviet Union upon a "planned" foundation several months after it had taken office. However, the first attempts to force the US allies to start converting trade and economic relations with the USSR into a cold war weapon, made at the summit meeting of seven Western countries, held in Ottawa in July, 1981, were unsuccessful.

The failure in Ottawa did not deter the US Admi-

nistration, which continued to exert pressure on its allies. A special US delegation was sent to Western Europe in January, 1982 with the "mission" of securing the curtailment of East-West trade. It was headed by James Buckley; Fred Iklé was the second in command. In March, 1982 the Buckley-Iklé delegation made another tour of the West European capitals, this time for the purpose of securing "possible new economic sanctions" against the Soviet Union. Their actual intention was to frustrate the construction of the Urengoi-Western Europe transcontinental gas pipeline and have Western loans to the USSR annulled. The crude pressure and blackmail from across the Atlantic proved unsuccessful, however. The West European countries, involved in the construction of the pipeline, rejected the solicitation of the US Administration. It had to backtrack and reluctantly annulled the sanctions.

However, the bellicose anti-Soviet forces in the US Administration did not lay down their arms. They have been trying hard to change the very character of trade relations between the West and the Soviet Union. The Reagan Administration has, in effect, declared a trade-and-economic war on the socialist world.

An Insane Course

The essence of the "new military strategy", proclaimed by the Reagan Administration, is the course for direct confrontation with the USSR both regionally and world-wide. The "active counteraction" concept envisaging the use of strategic nuclear weapons in various ways is part and parcel of this course. Another constituent is the concept of "geographical or

horizontal escalation". "The New York Times" wrote that its essence consists in the readiness of the US armed forces to become involved in a protracted world conflict, using conventional arms with the revived deterrent of nuclear weapons. This element of the Reagan Administration's strategic doctrine was devised by F. Iklé and J. Lehman, both members of the Committee on the Present Danger, now occupying leading posts in the Pentagon.

Back in the middle of 1980, Iklé, then aide to R. Reagan, Presidential Nominee, put forward the thesis that the USA must, by all means, turn its confrontation with the Soviet Union into a protracted military conflict, in the course of which the USA would gain the opportunity and time for mass producing arms and munitions. Iklé stressed that the USA could not afford a passive and indifferent attitude to the political colour of the map of the world and so must gain an advantage, in territory and resources, over the USSR in many regions of the world. Such was the cynical recipe for starting an armed confrontation with the USSR, first of all for establishing "the proper order" in the rear echelons of the US military all along the line of the projected global clash. Iklé believes that the US Navy should play a key role here. It is not by chance, that J. Lehman, the new Secretary of the Navy, stated immediately upon being appointed to the post that it was essential for the USA to secure "naval superiority".

The plans of US imperialism for an uncontrollable arms race began to gain substance. It was announced that the US Navy would be increased by a third and the number of warships would be brought up to 600. In his militaristic frenzy Lehman informed the press that he would "bottle up" the Soviet Navy to prevent

it from hindering his operations. At the same time, schemes were elaborated, according to which during the first year of the war with the Soviet Union the USA would double or treble its munitions output (as it did during the Korean War) and, three years later, it would increase this output eightfold (like it did during World War II). Other schemes envisaged that upon unleashing a protracted war against the USSR and other socialist countries, the US would treble its budget, and half the country's gross national product would be funnelled for such a war.

By the spring of 1982 this scheme had already been divided into three specific stages: horizontal escalation—global conflict—protracted war. According to the Pentagon's own calculations, the preparations for implementing this plan would require a further 750 billion dollars in military spending, over and above the unprecedented sum of 1,600 billion dollars the Reagan Administration allocated for the coming five-year period. Such schemes are not just irresponsible. Nor is this even "brinkmanship"; this is insane betting upon a world war.

Having made their nests in Washington in the upper echelons of the power structure, and having set their course for all-out confrontation with the world of socialism, the war-hawks of anti-detente and militarism are going all out to make US policy more and more aggressive with every passing day. They vehemently protest at any "hold-ups" along this path.

In the spring of 1984, the members of the Committee on the Present Danger launched an all-out offensive, both inside and outside the Administration, to realize their adventuristic plans, and have since been steadily increasing their efforts.

R. Perle, for one, declared that vis-a-vis the Soviet Union the policy of detente was a wrong policy then, is a wrong policy now, and it is not "our policy" at all. R. Pipes clamours for the practical preparations for nuclear war; the probability of nuclear war breaking out has, in his view, reached forty per cent.

On March 8, 1982 the Committee complained that US military spending was only "minimal" and, therefore, had to be increased sharply. In May, they made another move. Norman Podhoretz, in a lengthy article published in "The New York Times" sharply criticized the Administration for its failure to deploy US land-based forces in the Persian Gulf area, for having been forced onto the defensive in Latin America and, most important, for not being vigorous enough in countering the Soviet Union. He said that all this had reduced the neo-conservatives to a state of political despair and added that he hoped for a miracle and that the Reagan Administration would rectify its "mistakes". After reading the article, President Reagan personally phoned the author to reassure him that American policy was not one of detente. This was only the beginning of a new dangerous ziz-zag in the policy of official Washington under the pressure of the extremist forces. The US President made a couple of overtly anti-Soviet speeches, one in London on June 8 and the other in the UN on June 17.

* * *

The present situation, with the USA ruled by circles whose insane adventurism should have made the very idea of their guiding the leading capitalist power inconceivable is not only dangerous; it is also utterly unnatural. The US public is increasingly coming to realize that the only "prospect" being opened up

before it by the out-and-out anti-Sovieteers is the all-consuming fire of a nuclear conflict. This suicidal gambling with the possibility of triggering off a nuclear war has a whiplash effect and extremely alarms the broad American public.

The power of reason versus the might of muscle, the strengthening of peace versus nuclear catastrophe --this is the substance of the debate now sweeping the United States. For the first time in the history of that country millions of people are involved in it. The sympathies of ordinary Americans are not with those in the Administration who are brandishing nuclear bombs over them and the whole world.

Kommunist, No. 2, 1983

STP READERS ON WAR AND PEACE

MANKIND'S COMMON ASSET

Dasi MODOGO
Kinshasa, Zaire

The first legislative acts issued by Soviet government were the Decrees on Peace and Land. The Decree on Peace branded war as the worst crime against humanity. The proclamation of this document in the very first hours following the victory of Soviet government proves that socialism is essentially incompatible with war. Lenin, a brilliant thinker, the founder of the world's first socialist state, fought steadfastly to make peaceful coexistence an immutable principle in governing relationships between states with different social systems. Faithful to this behest of Lenin, the USSR and other socialist countries have been working consistently to promote peace, halt the arms race and achieve disarmament. But in so doing they must not forget for a moment that the danger of war is substantially real and, so, take the necessary measures to secure their defences.

Imperialism is adventurist by its very nature; it is capable of putting the vital interests of mankind at risk in order to achieve its self-seeking goals, in order to establish its domination over other countries and peoples.

Peace is the common asset of mankind; it must be preserved, and the USSR and other socialist states play the leading role in this. Now that the USA is trying to turn the arms limitation talks into a lever for changing the alignment of strategic forces in its favour and for enabling it to achieve military superiority, the USSR is consistently putting forward ever new proposals aimed at removing the threat of war and strengthening peace. The Soviet Peace Programme for the 1980s put forward at the 26th Congress of the CPSU, held in 1981, expresses the USSR's honest and clear intention to sustain detente and carefully consider all constructive proposals advanced by other countries towards halting the arms race. The Peace Programme for the 1980s is an effective counter-measure against imperialism's militaristic position; it exerts its growing influence upon world developments.

Peace is not only the absence of war; it is also fruitful economic development, international cooperation and friendship, and an effective system of protecting the environment by the concerted efforts of all countries. The leading role of the USSR and other socialist countries in these fields is beyond question. They expand multilateral cooperation with developing countries without infringing upon the latter's interests, without exploiting them; they are the steadfast allies of all fighters for national and social liberation.

The forces of socialism and peace are sufficiently influential and powerful to hinder imperialism from dictating its policy, fraught with the danger of war, to other countries and to avert the threat looming over the world.

THE ONLY RIGHT PATH

Sonia LLANA
aged 24, Madrid, Spain

The policy of imperialism, which uses "divide and rule" tactics, is aimed at sowing discord among peoples and enriching the monopolies at the expense of working people. The monopolies, producing mass destruction weapons, have a vested interest in the continuing war threat. How very short-sighted are these gentlemen who do not wish to understand that there would be no winners or losers in a nuclear war. The only right way is disarmament.

Socialism has no interest in wasting vast amounts of money on arms because it does not want war. But so long as there is the real threat of outside aggression, socialism will be obliged to strengthen its defenses in order to defend the gains made by the working people of the socialist countries.

The myth of the "Soviet threat" plays into the hands of the USA which exploits it by imposing its diktat upon the NATO countries. The neutron bomb developed by the USA to the accompaniment of the clamour of the "Soviet threat" is intended for the European continent. In order to allay the fears of the peoples of the European countries, they are told that this is a defensive weapon. But, in reality, this is an offensive weapon: for it leaves airports, cities, bridges and roads intact and "only" kills off humans. How cynical the Pentagon experts are—to them Europe is only a testing ground which is to dissolve into thin air in a nuclear war. Therefore, the security of Western Europe cannot be guaranteed if missiles will continue to be deployed on its territory. But the NATO member

states refuse to take disarmament steps. Moreover, they are going to admit a new member, Spain, contrary to the wishes of the Spanish people.

Today, the danger of a new war has caused a wave of protests against imperialism's militaristic policy in all countries of the world. And everywhere people of goodwill support the international policy being pursued by the socialist countries, a policy based on the principles of sovereignty, rejection of the use of force and of the threat of force, non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, respect for human rights, solidarity with peoples fighting for their independence and social liberation.

THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE TO PEACE

Gustav A. MERGULHAO,
India

The struggle for peace is the struggle for the safety of our civilization, for the welfare of mankind, for social progress. The policy of peace pursued by socialist countries has become one of the main factors of international life, the main guarantee of mankind's peaceful future.

There is no alternative to peace, the language of peace is the language of reason.

The anti-nuclear movement with demonstrations and peace marches in various parts of Europe and the growing resentment against the policy of Reagan has put the US Administration into a very embarrassing position. In order to escape from world ridicule, the United States knows only one answer: threaten the world with still more deadly weapons of mass destruction.

Today, we are confronted with a greater peril to world peace than ever before. We appear to be on the brink of a deadly nuclear holocaust, on the virtual brink of a world catastrophe which, if allowed to take place, may perhaps obliterate human civilization from the face of the earth. A grim prospect indeed! In the context of this dismal possibility it must not be forgotten that there are some statesmen in this world who dream of the "possibility" of winning a nuclear war against the USSR and its allies.

The USA was the first to drop atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Its history shows a record of acts of aggression against many countries. Again, the United States is out to jeopardize world peace by its unabashed support to the Israeli extremists to the detriment of the majority of the peoples of the Arab world.

Such is the ugly face of US imperialism which sees itself in the role of a "world gendarme". The unsurpassed arms race followed by the United States is leading to an aggravation of the danger of a global war.

ПРИЛОЖЕНИЕ № 5 К ЖУРНАЛУ
«СОЦИАЛИЗМ: ТЕОРИЯ И ПРАКТИКА»
№ 9, 1983 г.

на английском языке

0-35

The Soviet monthly **SOCIALISM: THEORY AND PRACTICE** and supplements to this magazine are digests of the political and theoretical press featuring the vital problems of Marxist-Leninist theory, the practice of socialist and communist construction, the peoples' struggle for peace, democracy and socialism, and world-wide ideological struggle.

All inquiries should be addressed to:
SOCIALISM: THEORY AND PRACTICE
7, Bolshaya Pochtovaya Street,
107082, Moscow, USSR
or to the Information Department of the
Soviet Embassy