

WED 0111
RECEIVED IN
- 8 APR 1982



CONFIDENTIAL

Red for Osborne
Mark
Mr James
Mr Collins
Mr Donnelly

BRITISH EMBASSY
MOSCOW

April 1982

Mr D G Manning
EESD
FCO

Mr Manning copy to Mr Beal
Miss Lewis
WED
1st Dept.

Dear David

PCI/CPSU RELATIONS

1. You may have seen press reports of yet another article in *Kommunist* No 4. I enclose a copy of the English version published in "New Times" no 11 (to FCO and Rome only).
2. This is a coolly argued rebuttal of PCI views which claims to have been stimulated by continuing criticism of the Soviet Union by the Italians, specifically by two Berlinguer interviews published since the Pravda article of 13 February which stated that the CPSU was not interested in further polemics. This latest piece in *Kommunist* repeats the latter point and does not attempt to sharpen the tone of the dispute although it does criticise Berlinguer and Pajęta by name.
3. *Kommunist* repeats many of the points of the earlier Soviet statements. The achievements of real socialism in the USSR are described to the point even of claiming that despite PCI allegations to the contrary the most diverse viewpoints are aired in the Soviet press and in discussion of, for example, the draft of the Soviet constitution. The struggle for peace and against American imperialism, Poland and Afghanistan are mentioned. In demanding the repeal of martial law in Poland the PCI leaders were actually abetting the plans of imperialist reaction.
4. The interest of the latest article is, however, perhaps in its focus on questions of fundamental ideology (as perhaps befits *Kommunist*, the CPSU's theoretical journal). It repeats the Soviet disavowal of any pretensions to being the one and only "model" of socialism, but Soviet experience was of international value. The PCI leadership's entire recent ideological activity revealed "an ever greater departure from the theory of scientific communism". The road to socialism may have to suit the particular circumstances of each country but the basis had to be the emancipation of labour, the replacement of private capitalist ownership by public, socialist ownership. However, the PCI leadership did not proceed from the necessity of primarily resolving precisely this issue. They seemed to give higher priority to the bourgeois-parliamentarian political system. The article goes on to criticise the "three phases" "third road" theories. The latter was vague and muddled and the emphasis on "nationwide consensus" contradicted the intrinsic laws of the class struggle. "To promote the revolutionary working class movement in Western European countries it is necessary to fortify international solidarity of all the revolutionary forces, including existing socialism, the countries of the socialist community". *Kommunist* summed up: the PCI as seen by its leadership was a Communist Party without ideology, without a system of views giving expression to the fundamental interests of the working class.



CONFIDENTIAL

5. This article again leaves open the possibility for reconciliation with the PCI in the future and is probably designed to appeal to the more traditional elements in the Italian party. However it reveals even further the depth of the rift between the CPSU and the present PCI leadership, stressing that the differences are not just ones of tactics (how best to achieve power) or of differing responses to issues of the day but of underlying ideology. This poses the question of the relative importance which the Russians attach to attacks on their self-esteem (on Socialism as practised in the Soviet Union) challenges to their foreign policy and defence interests (to their peace campaign), and to ideology as such.

6. While the Soviet central press has been refraining from direct attacks in the name of the CPSU or Soviet public opinion it has published a lengthy ~~attack~~ ^{columnist} on the PCI and defence of the Soviet Union by Gus Hall, the American ~~columnist~~ ^{columnist} (Pravda, 10 March) and reports of meetings of or with other Communist parties have given some prominence to support for Soviet positions and to the importance of the unity of the world Communist movement. The latter have not always mentioned the PCI by name but a lengthier than usual Tass report of the Syrian party's plenum (published in Pravda on 20 March) concentrated on the latter's "condemnation" of the PCI leadership. Pravda on 22 March carried a letter from an Italian Communist called Donatelli, which Unita had refused to publish, expressing the friendship of the "vast majority of the Italian Communists" for the USSR and support for Soviet achievements and foreign policy positions.

Yours ever,

Christopher Hoya

p.d S D M Jack

cc: Chanceries Rome
 UNO & NATO
 Washington
 Paris
 Bonn

WANT MORE CONCERNING THE POSITION OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE ICP

After the publication in the U.S.S.R. of two detailed articles in reply to the polemics started by the leadership of the Italian Communist Party, Pravda published a brief rejoinder setting forth the attitude of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Italian comrades' reaction to the above-mentioned articles and stating that the CPSU was not interested in continuing the polemics.

Soon afterwards, however, Enrico Berlinguer gave two interviews, published in L'Unita and in other press organs, in which he generalized and in some cases gave added emphasis to the sallies against the CPSU and the real, existing socialist system. The journal Rinascita carried a pretentious critique—regrettably based not on Soviet realities, with which the Italian Communists have long had every opportunity to acquaint themselves firsthand, but on the Western Sovietologists' threadbare stereotypes and gossip—of the development of Soviet society over the past 20-odd years.

For more than two months now, the ICP leadership has been doing its utmost to turn the main front of the ideological struggle against the CPSU and the socialist community. This at a time when the Italian working-class movement is faced with a multitude of urgent internal problems, which are becoming ever more acute, and when imperialism daily whips up militarist hysteria against the Soviet Union, Poland and other socialist countries, taking ever more dangerous practical steps with the object of setting off a new round in the arms race now already including chemical weapons, in effect sabotaging the SALT-2 and Geneva talks, and blocking progress at the Madrid meeting.

For all these reasons the CPSU considers it impossible not to react to this flood of public statements.

Whatever the leaders of the ICP may say, their entire ideological activity of the recent period reveals an ever greater departure from the theory of scientific communism, shows that their activity is aimed at denial of the progressive role of victorious socialism, the experience of its upbuilding and its international significance. On the foreign policy plane efforts are

directed at questioning the peaceable nature of the socialist countries. This is the tenor also of Enrico Berlinguer's interview "Reflections on Peace and the Third Way" (L'Unita, February 21, 1982), which gives concentrated expression to a negative attitude to the socialist system that has struck firm root and is continuing to develop in a number of countries on three continents.

Socialism and the Attitude Towards It

Making a conspectus of Hegel's fundamental work "The Science of Logic" during his philosophical studies in the first world war years, Vladimir Lenin formulated sixteen elements of dialectics, methodological principles of genuinely scientific thinking leading to the truth. He called the first of these principles the objectivity of consideration.

It is precisely this that the ICP leadership lacks when it declares today its attitude towards real, existing socialism. In their opinion, "the starting point of reflections on the society of a socialist orientation... relates to the harm caused by adopting a single model, the model of the Soviet type, in the countries of Eastern Europe: both in the economic sphere and primarily in what concerns the political system." At times the Italian comrades' fulminations against the "model" acquire a truly pathetic ring. But the trouble is that all this pathos is inspired by nothing but a myth—incidentally, of the type of many myths manufactured by bourgeois propaganda.

The point is that the CPSU has always believed that there is no such thing as a Soviet or any other "model" of socialism—and this view is shared by other Communist and Workers' parties. It was on the initiative of the CPSU that, back in 1957, it was stated in the Declaration of Communist and Workers' Parties: "Marxism-Leninism calls for a creative application of the general principles of the socialist revolution and socialist construction depending on the concrete conditions of each country, and rejects mechanical imitation of the policies and tactics of the Communist parties of other countries. [Emphasis added — Ed.] Lenin repeatedly called atten-

tion to the necessity of correctly applying the basic principles of communism, in keeping with the specific features of the nation, of the national state concerned."

What our Party and other Communist and Workers' parties have is not some "model," but, first, the Marxist-Leninist teaching on socialism, which is certainly carried into practice in different ways in the concrete conditions of different countries, and, second, the actual experience of socialist and communist construction in the course of several decades, an experience which is of international value.

We believe that this was well expressed by Alvaro Cunhal, General Secretary of the Portuguese Communist Party, who stated on February 18 in an interview with the newspaper *Diário de Lisboa*:

"We are prepared to approve any project [of transition to socialism.—Ed.] if it is based on the experience of the world revolutionary movement and socialist construction and not on armchair reflections and speculations. So far as Portugal, for instance, is concerned, our way of building socialism will be different from that of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Cuba, Romania, the U.S.S.R., etc. It will be a Portuguese way, but taking account of the general laws of social development, with the scientific knowledge needed for analyzing reality and the experience of other revolutions as regards the role of the state. We counterpose our project, not to the realities of the socialist countries, but to the realities of capitalism. Socialism in Portugal will be Portuguese, but we want it to be real socialism."

And now let us hear what was said by a Polish veteran Communist in a talk with a group of Soviet journalists in Warsaw in the summer of 1981:

"The Soviet 'model' of socialism in Poland?" He shook his head with unconcealed bitterness. "Regrettably, by far not the Soviet one. To be sure, there was your example, the example of the world's first country to accomplish the socialist revolution. In our country, as in yours, power was taken by the working people. Former workers became ministers. They would sit down in ministerial armchairs, and their bones would begin to ache—from

accustomed to sitting at a desk. You, we dreamed of building socialism. Yours was the only experience then. But in our country the conditions were different. And the practice of building socialism also proved to be very, very different. You don't have to look far for examples. Several days ago there was the funeral of a cardinal. This funeral was shown on our television for five and a half hours! Is that the Soviet 'model' of socialism? And to borrow recklessly from Western banks without thinking that these loans could lead to economic and then political dependence on capitalism—are these Soviet methods of building a socialist economy? And the neglect of ideological work among the masses in recent years—is this the Soviet 'model' of socialism? And irresolution in the struggle against the ideological adversary—is this Soviet experience? Now, what about the corruption in the top echelons of the party—is this some foreign experience brought in by somebody? No, esteemed gentlemen, it is our own 'model' and our own experience, to our great regret...

What is socialism? This question can be answered only in a scientific way and only proceeding from the objective trends and realities of the society that precedes socialism, i.e., the capitalist society. Marxists-Leninists reduce socialism not from arbitrary abstract "models" or good intentions, but from the real law of socialization of labour and production which was discovered by Karl Marx and which already operates forcibly in capitalist conditions and serves as the principal material basis for the preparation of conditions for the transition to socialism. To this objectively corresponds the economic essence of socialism: transfer of the basic means of production to public, national and collective ownership, to state ownership, and the replacement of capitalist production by socialist production in accordance with an overall plan in the interests of the working people.

Without comprehending this basic nature of the society that supersedes bourgeois society one can talk of all sorts of liberal projects, but not of socialism.

However, it is incorrect to think that, regarding the socialization of labour and production thus, the Soviet Communists and other Marxists-Leninists reduce it "merely" to changing the production relations and the character of ownership" (L'Unita, February 21, 1952). Equally dear to us are the aims of democracy and social justice, the freedom of the individ-

ual, his harmonious allround development and creative self-fulfilment but we know that they are unrealizable on the basis of private-ownership relations, that their realization should rest on an unshakable material foundation. The whole of our, and not only our, experience of many decades confirms Lenin's brief conclusion: "...If freedom runs counter to the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capital, it is a deception." (V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 29, p. 351.)

And what has real socialism given the peoples? Socialism eliminated the exploitation of man by man. After the publication of our replies, the Italian comrades, in the polemics they had initiated, apparently agreed with this. Yet this is a basic issue, an epoch-making world-historic fact testifying to the resolution in the countries that have built socialism of the agonizing contradiction between labour and capital in favour of labour. The elaboration of the "new, innovative and concrete proposals" about which the ICP leaders speak, regrettably, does not proceed from the necessity of primarily resolving precisely this issue.

Socialism has created all conditions for the working people to be confident of the morrow. It has achieved this by organizing systematic ascending development of the economy subordinated to the general task of satisfying the growing material and intellectual requirements of the population. On this road socialism has demonstrated unparalleled high rates of development of production in the course of many decades. The policy of the CPSU is pivoted on concern for the good of the workingman. It is common knowledge that full employment has been ensured in the U.S.S.R. for more than half a century now. At the same time, in the Common Market countries alone unemployment has again topped the 10-million mark. Why do the ICP leaders forget that existing socialism has ensured free medical assistance for the population? Under the law all factory and office workers and collective farmers and members of their families are entitled to old-age and disability pensions. The capitalist countries do not know of such a universality of provision of pensions with a lower retirement age.

Finally, about housing. There are no homeless people in the U.S.S.R., no poor quarters, no flats remaining vacant because of the high rent; no one will ever think of throwing a man out into the street. The right to housing is a constitutional right and is strictly observed.

Rent in our country remains the lowest in the world.

Socialism has accomplished a veritable revolution in the spiritual image of the people by providing unprecedentedly favourable conditions for introducing the masses to the achievements of national and world culture. In no small measure this is ensured by the system of absolutely free-of-charge education.

Would all the achievements, which we can only briefly mention here, have been possible if the working people had not taken over the means of production.

And what kind of socialism, in the opinion of the Italian authors, is needed in Italy? A tremendous number of words have been uttered on this score, and, as a rule, they concern measures of a secondary, tertiary and, mostly, of a superstructural character, realizable through reforms within the framework of the bourgeois-democratic system, by means of "varnishing" it without affecting the foundations. "...The idea of socialism," Berlinguer declared in an interview with L'Unita on February 21, "...is a very rich and complex idea." But what does he include in it? In his words, "socialism conforming to the modern epoch and modern requirements" presupposes such benefits as 1) "employment," 2) "health protection," 3) "education," 4) "defence of the rights of children and old people," 5) "protection of nature and of the environment," 6) "full emancipation of women," 7) "a reliable right of the working people to participate in trade unions," 8) "productivity of labour and effectiveness of the economy," 9) "political pluralism," 10) "freedom of information, of cultural and artistic pursuits, etc." As we can see, the General Secretary of the ICP associates his "model" with ideas of a derivative and not fundamental order. But the question arises: is socialism, this "rich and complex idea," conceivable without the emancipation of labour? And in whose hands will the power be? Judging by the essence of this interview, it will remain in the hands of monopoly capital. At any rate, in this "new socialism" there is not a single word about the abolition of large-scale private ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange, which is an indispensable feature of a real, socialist revolution. The ICP leadership assigns the social priorities in its own way, and the top priority among them is given, undoubtedly, not to the replacement of private capitalist ownership with public, socialist ownership as it has always been with Marxists, but to adherence to the

bourgeois-parliamentarian political system.

The Italian comrades persistently insist, from one document to another, on the necessity of combining socialism with democracy, pretending that some Marxists dispute this necessity. What is really in question here is the elementary primary-principle outside which socialism could not even come into being. The establishment, as a result of the October Revolution, of the world's first state of workers and peasants signified a gigantic stride towards genuine government by the people. However, it is precisely the present socialist democracy of the entire people that is subjected to the most vicious attacks. It is not difficult to understand such actions by adherents of the omnipotence of monopoly, but how can one understand the virtual support given them by adherents of socialism!

In polemizing with Pravda, L'Unita asks what it thinks is an irrefutable question: "at what Party meeting, at what trade union or production conference, at the sitting of what Soviet (discounting discussions and criticisms of special aspects of a practical or organizational character) can a dissenting Communist, a citizen who disagrees on general political questions express this disagreement, and when was this publicly reported?" One merely has to know our press, to follow it from day to day, and a definitive answer will be found; that which L'Unita is so concerned about is done constantly, systematically. During the discussion of the drafts of major laws and directives of Party congresses any Communist, any citizen, has the right to state his pros and cons on any question under discussion. Agreement and disagreement on both particular and general questions, including political ones, is expressed in the pages of Soviet newspapers and magazines. We have already called the attention of the Italian colleagues to such general political discussions as the discussion of the draft of the U.S.S.R. Constitution or of dozens of major state draft laws. In the course of these discussions, which were covered in the press, to say nothing of thousands upon thousands of oral utterances at meetings of oral utterances and non-Party people, the most diverse viewpoints, often not concurring and mutually opposing, were expressed. But as distinct from what, apparently, is desired by the IPC leaders, these disagreements are not sensationalized in our country; and then, they are uttered in the interests of the matter at hand and are dictated by concern for correcting short-

comings, for improving the work for the common good, for strengthening socialism in the interests of the entire people. Regrettably, the Italian Communist press writes practically nothing about this. There was an instance when, by way of creative co-operation, the editorial board of Critica Marxista, the journal of the CC ICP, asked the editorial board of Communist, the journal of the CC CPSU, to organize an article on the nationwide discussion of the draft of the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., to be published in Italy. Such an article was prepared and sent to Rome, but it was never printed. Evidently the information it contained did not suit the Italian comrades. And this is not an isolated instance.

Or take such manifestations of democracy, engendered by the new system, as the socialist labour emulation of millions, an inexhaustible source of popular initiative, of the justified pride of production collectives in their achievements, and the honour and nationwide respect with which the Soviet people building communism surround front-rank workers. Not by chance did Rinascita only a year ago speak of the "privileged position of the working class" and of the predominance of the "ideology of labour as a value" in Soviet society. "The worker (and it is always the skilled worker that is popularized)," the magazine wrote, "is the symbol of labour itself and of the foundation of socialist society. One meets the image of the worker everywhere. He constantly forms the ethical canons of the socialist state and thus strives to evoke a sense of duty and fidelity to socialism." But today all this is of little interest to the comrades from the ICP leadership. Their thinking runs along different lines.

Citizens' letters (individual or collective) sent to bodies of state authority and administration, to Party committees, the CC CPSU included, to newspapers and magazines and to public organizations, are a major form of expression of public opinion in our country. Every year hundreds of thousands of such letters are received. They are examined in a mandatory order by the bodies to which they are addressed. Also in a mandatory order, concrete measures are adopted on them. In the period between the 25th and 26th congresses of the CPSU, the CC CPSU alone received more than three million letters from working people. The opinions and suggestions expressed in them are carefully taken account of in all the work of the Party; they are system-

atically summed up by the Central Committee, and special decisions are adopted on some, the most important, of them.

If the comrades from the ICP leadership and the L'Unita editorial board took the trouble to study our practice in this respect attentively and without prejudice, if they grasped the mass and conscious character of the citizens' active participation in deciding topical issues of our life and social development, they would probably realize the utter groundlessness of L'Unita's "irrefutable" question. But evidently an objective approach is not what they want.

Indeed, is this what L'Unita is talking about? The comrades from its editorial board surely know that businesslike criticism is an organic feature of our way of life and style of work. What do they want then? Isn't it criticism of a "dissident" character and freedom of scurrilous abuse of the socialist system by individual turncoats? There must be complete clarity on this score: we, naturally, will never let ourselves in for the popularization of such utterances. Let this not be expected from us by the ICP leaders, who, by the way, themselves adhere to a highly selective attitude towards the publication of materials.

On the strength of what has been stated above, we shall allow ourselves to reject as unfounded also the contentions regarding "constant and serious infringements" of rights and freedoms in the U.S.S.R. and the "absence" of an active participation of the population in government. These contentions, once temperamentally made much of by Mr Carter, are refuted by the daily practice of Soviet society, by the very atmosphere and tonus of the socialist way of life. Incidentally, previously our Italian friends also participated in this refutation. "The Soviet political system possesses an extensive, comprehensive and all-embracing mechanism of involving the masses in management," wrote Rinascita. "It is a matter of participation and of consensus, within the reach of absolutely all who avail themselves of this mechanism..."

One has only to read our papers, magazines and books to see that Soviet people are better aware than anyone else in the world of the shortcomings in the U.S.S.R.'s economic and cultural development, of the "growing pains" of the new, collectivist social system. Rodney Arismendi, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uruguay, justly pointed out that "the Soviet Union is not a 'paradise,' but a victory over the inferno of imperialism and capitalism..." (R.)

... Leninism - Banner of the
... Primary Transformation of the
World. Moscow, 1979, p. 147. In Russian).

Our Party has frankly stated that the U.S.S.R. has so far not solved all the problems, say, in farming and supplying the country with food. It has not merely made statements, but has worked out and has been implementing concrete measures, included in a comprehensive food programme. Despite adverse natural conditions, the output of farm products in the country in the 1941-80 period increased by 150 per cent, with grain production nearly doubling. Today the U.S.S.R. is growing more wheat than the U.S.A. Nevertheless there is still much to be done, and the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress have duly oriented the people on the tasks. Meanwhile we are importing certain quantities of the products we need. There is nothing unusual about this. The U.S.S.R. sells some products and buys others.

ICP leaders have repeatedly stated that the socialist system in the form in which it emerged and is developing in other countries is unacceptable to Italy. "The lines along which, until now, socialism has been developing," Enrico Berlinguer said in Madrid on May 10, 1980, "have no appeal to the youth, even that part of the youth that recognizes the historic importance of proletarian, people's and national revolutions executed since the October Revolution of 1917."

Speaking on the same subject, Luigi Longo in his time said: "Let us ask the question: who is freer—the Italian toilers, the unemployed or those who are in fear of losing their jobs, or the Soviet working people, who have guaranteed jobs and do not even know what unemployment means? Who are freer—the young people who are left without jobs or are unable to continue their studies, though they wish to do so and have the aptitude and brains, or the Soviet youth, which enjoys access to all kinds of work and culture? Are the hundreds of thousands of Italians freer who are forced every year to leave their country and families to go abroad in search of work they cannot find at home? Who are freer—the women and girls discharged from Italian factories, or the millions of Soviet women that have access to top and highly-skilled jobs in all fields of production activity, in all fields of public life? Are the Italian doctors, writers and scientists oppressed by the outdated order freer than the specialists of a country in which

science and creative research have secured unprecedented heights thanks to the socialist system?" (Luigi Longo, Selected Articles and Speeches, Moscow, 1975, Pp. 564-565. In Russian). This gives us reason to question the validity of the statement Berlinguer made on behalf of the Italian youth. Or, perhaps, the position of the youth radically improved during the acute crises of the 1970s?

Nobody is trying to compel the Italian Communists to imitate others. On the contrary, it is their inalienable duty to work out, with due account of the experience available, ways of effecting socialist changes that would be in keeping with the conditions and traditions of Italy. It is quite possible that the new life in that country will be built more easily and with less privations and hardships, but this will be precisely because there exists the socialist world system, the mighty community of socialist countries. A form of society cannot be mechanically transferred from one country to another. However, one cannot help drawing the conclusion that the ICP is in fact being, as Lenin put it, "diverted" from the truth about socialism and its achievements, that the masses are being frightened away from the socialist system.

By discrediting the reality in socialist countries the ICP leaders are in effect confining the working people of their country to the capitalist structure, inviting them, as it were, to be content with its "values," and prompting them merely to improve it. What a narrow, pessimistic prospect! And no prospect of a transfer to socialism.

Problems Bearing on the Theory of the Revolutionary Process: the "Third Phase" and "Third Road"

The main "innovation" in this sphere is the idea about shifting the centre of struggle for socialism to Western Europe. To substantiate it a new periodization of the world revolutionary process is proposed and a "three phases" theory constructed on its basis. In his report to the January plenary meeting of the ICP Central Committee and Central Control Committee, Berlinguer referred to the "first phase" as the "socialist and social-democratic phase of struggle..." It allegedly originated late in the 19th century with the emergence of big economic, trade union and political organizations of the working-class movement. The "second phase" was ushered in by the

October Revolution. The Italian theorists believe that this phase has "exhausted its motive force." At present the "third phase" is setting in. The ICP document on Poland reads in part: "It is necessary to give an impulse to and open new horizons before the struggle for socialism in Western Europe in order to open a new phase for socialism throughout the world and to promote democratic renewal of East European societies."

The artificial character and, frankly speaking, extreme pretentiousness of the "three phases" theory, the fact that it is divorced from any concrete analysis of the actual content of the present epoch cannot but give rise to objections.

Though the epoch which has been ushered in by the Great October Socialist Revolution is highly complex, multifaceted and contradictory in character, its main content and its basic trend of development are obvious: transition from capitalism to socialism on a world-wide scale.

How should the division of the world revolutionary process into "three phases" be appraised from this standpoint?

We shall not dwell on the "first phase." We shall merely remark that even in those days there were two conflicting trends in the working-class movement: the reformist and the revolutionary. But the Italian theorists prefer not to mention this fact. As a result, they have negated the continuity of the revolutionary movement of the pre-October stage and the revolutionary epoch of October. At the same time, the "socialist and social-democratic phase of struggle" is, so to say, superimposed on the "October phase." By doing so they have, wittingly or unwittingly, slurred over the fact that the Great October Socialist Revolution marked a basic, qualitatively new turning point in the development of mankind. The ICP leaders do not deny the role of the Great October Socialist Revolution in history. However, according to them, this role clearly belongs to the past, to the early stages of the world revolutionary process it sparked off. The essence of the concept is in the "third phase." As Berlinguer put it, the Western working-class movement is becoming the "epicentre of the new phase in the struggle for socialism."

It is above all obvious that the "three phases" theory presumes to exclude existing socialism from the revolutionary transformation of the world which is taking place in our time, and have the experience of the October Revolution and of the

upbuilding of a socialist society appear as merely a "part of the historical achievements." The cardinal contradiction of the present epoch, which is the key to an understanding of the mechanism of class struggle today, has been excluded from the "third phase" together with existing socialism. The events of the last few years have shown with increasing clarity that the pivot of world development today is the contradiction between socialism and capitalism. It imbues and ultimately determines the entire content of world politics and, of course, affects the relations between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

Contrary to their "three phases" theory, the CP leaders themselves have frequently been compelled to admit that victorious socialism is playing the decisive role in the world. Thus, in his concluding speech at the January plenary meeting Berlinguer said: "Within the system of the present world equilibrium the Soviet Union is a counterbalance to the force and aggressiveness of American imperialism." But if you say "a," you must say "b." If the Soviet Union, the country that built socialism, is a counterbalance to imperialism, it follows that socialism is above all the guarantor of the progressive development of the world revolutionary process. Can one speak seriously about the prospects for a stable peace, about the triumph of the working-class movement in the main citadels of the capitalist system, about success in the struggle of the peoples for national liberation and social emancipation and at the same time ignore existing socialism and even cast aspersions on it?

It is not at all necessary to persuade us that solidarity of the working class in capitalist countries with the peoples fighting for their liberation is a major political force. However, one must be aware of the fact that the national liberation revolutions would stand a slim chance, were it not for that "counterbalance to imperialism," the socialist world system, were it not for its economic, socio-political and military potential. In characterizing the role the socialist countries are playing in the world today, Georges Marchais, General Secretary of the French Communist Party, said at the 24th FCP Congress: "These states are the mainstay of the liberation struggle waged on our planet, in particular, the struggle for national liberation."

This is a present-day fact the "three phases" theory has chosen to

ignore. What forecasts in the world revolutionary process can there be, if the impulse imparted by already existing socialism has been exhausted? What in that case are the hopes for the new "phase" of struggle for socialism based on? The analysis Berlinguer gives in his report at the January plenary meeting of the reasons for the shifting of the "epicentre" of this struggle to Western Europe appears rather naive and unconvincing.

Here are these reasons. Western Europe represents the "height of world culture." European capitalism is one of the highest points of the system. The activity of influential trade union and political organizations of the working class here occurs in the context of a profound crisis of the said system. Two military-political blocs confront one another in Europe, which is primarily threatened with a nuclear conflict.

Even if we abstract ourselves from the touch of "Eurocentrism," we will see that the aforementioned points bear out the importance of the tasks facing the working-class movement in the West European countries and its revolutionary vanguards.

If the capitalist system were to be breached at its "highest points," as the Italian comrades put it, this would, beyond doubt, catalyze the world revolutionary process. But if we choose to proceed from the facts, as our opponents propose, we will see that, regrettably, one cannot so far speak of a revolutionary breach of the capitalist system at its "highest points."

We would like to ask the Italian comrades: what has prompted the conclusion about the "practical development of socialism" in European capitalist countries? What do they mean by socialism "in its historico-political concreteness"?

If they mean that the industrially developed capitalist countries are objectively ripe for socialism, it would be correct to point out that it was Lenin who said that some 70 years ago. If they mean that capitalism is incapable of solving the problems it has created, that is precisely what the CPSU and many other Communist parties say. But that is not enough. To go over to socialism the subjective factor of socialist revolution has to mature too. It should be pointed out that Marx, Engels and Lenin linked, given the objective initial conditions, the shift of the centre of the world revolutionary process precisely with this factor, with the readiness and ability of the working class and its allies to execute a socialist revolution with the

scope and depth of the mass movement for socialism.

In the developed capitalist countries the requirements to the subjective factor of socialist transformation of society are particularly high. Indeed, in the main citadels of capitalism the working class is opposed by a most powerful enemy, namely, the experienced and well-organized monopoly bourgeoisie relying on an elaborate state, socio-economic and ideological machine, equipped with an enormous arsenal of means to influence the working-class movement and various and crafty methods for integrating the opposition forces in the existing system. Western Europe is one of the main bases of an international economic, political and military alliance of the monopoly bourgeoisie of the imperialist powers.

To stand up to such an enemy and to fight him is not easy, and we know this only too well. We know, and appreciate that despite this, the communist and working-class movement of France, Portugal, Italy, Greece, Finland and a number of other West European countries has achieved no mean successes in post-war years. However, in view of the obtaining conditions, so far the working class of West European countries, perhaps, with few exceptions, has been unfolding social class battles on remote approaches to "practical development of socialism."

In this connection it would be appropriate to mention the danger of provincialism Palmiro Togliatti pointed to. He saw this danger in the emergence of an idea which could lead to someone regarding himself "as the hub of the universe, to believing it his mission to superficially criticize the other parts of the movement, without making any effort to study the conditions of their development." (P. Togliatti. Selected Articles and Speeches. Vol. 2, p. 661. Moscow, 1965. In Russian).

The late 1970s and early 1980s have revealed an increasing number of signs which show that the world revolutionary process is entering a new stage. Combating its "growing pains," existing socialism is reaching a higher level of progress. Major qualitative shifts are occurring in newly-free countries. The reformist strategy of adapting capitalism to the new situation is experiencing a profound crisis. The explosive energy of mass protest is accumulating in the depths of the system to erupt with increasing frequency in various forms. Profound revolutionary changes are maturing.

New possibilities and ways of struggle for socialism are now open-

the working-class movement in European countries. This is by no means a local, national phenomenon, but the result of fundamental shifts on a worldwide scale. Therefore, it would be courting trouble to struggle to utilize these possibilities from a position of negating the achievements of existing socialism. To promote the revolutionary working-class movement in West European countries it is necessary to fortify international solidarity of all the revolutionary forces, including existing socialism, i.e., the countries of the socialist community.

Since the war the theoretical thought of the communist movement in Western Europe has persistently sought the answer to the question: what should be the approach and transition to socialism in the developed capitalist countries? This theoretical work is fully in keeping with Lenin's conclusion regarding the many forms of transition to socialism. And theoretical thought has produced definite interesting ideas. However, some of the propositions are of a hypothetical character, they require verification and more profound substantiation. "This is understandable: a quest is a quest," Leonid Brezhnev has said. "What is important is that it should proceed in the right direction."

It is from this standpoint that we appraise the concepts of the "third road." We must note that this is not a continuation of the theoretical quest begun by Antonio Gramsci and Palmiro Togliatti, but movement in the opposite direction.

What is implied by the "third road"? The Italian comrades do not give a clear answer; ICP documents and statements of representatives of its leadership suggest that, as far as progress along the "third road" is concerned, the preceding experience of revolutionary struggle the working class has acquired, and the experience of existing socialism are only of negative importance. Despite this, the leadership of the Italian Communist Party is urging "all the forces of the European working-class movement" to embark on this still rather nebulous road.

Just as in the appraisal of existing socialism, the "third road" concept centers on the idea of organic unity of democracy and socialism. One might repeat that the idea as such is not new. Marxists have long regarded it as an axiom. However, the point raised in ICP documents is of a different kind.

Here again the question arises: what sort of democracy is meant? In a class society democracy is always

of a class character. Democracy for whom? For a chosen few, for "the rich," as Lenin used to say, or for the majority of the population, for the working people? As the ICP leaders see it, democracy is not a class, but a national category.

ICP documents mention the struggle of the working class too. But it is a fact that the idea of a "nationwide consensus" is in contradiction with the intrinsic laws of class struggle. As the transition to socialism becomes more practicable, the objective logic of class interests will increasingly urge the ruling classes to resist revolutionary changes. Marx pointed out and Lenin repeatedly warned, and we know from life itself, that revolution gave rise to counter-revolution. It follows herefrom that a revolution, mastering all effective forms of struggle, must learn to defend itself. The entire historical experience of the establishment of socialist societies shows that the revolutionary process is inconceivable without intervention with respect to power and ownership. Engels was right when he wrote: "A revolution is certainly the most authoritarian thing there is." (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. 2, p. 379.)

Hopes to effect social transformation on the basis of universal accord and justice, underestimation of the roots and inevitable aggravation of class struggle in present-day bourgeois society are echoes of liberal ideas about revolution and socialism.

Regrettably, such ideas are evident also in the economic programme entitled "For a New Development of Italy" (L'Unita, December 13, 1981) the ICP leadership proposed for their country. It reads in part: "At present Italy is on the threshold of the club of selected industrially developed countries, but has not yet entered its door. By the end of the decade or even earlier it may definitely find itself beyond the threshold. Thus, on this road, in the context of a highly acute political and state crisis, the problem of national community arises."

And so here too the idea of "national community" is being brought to the foreground in order to gain admission to the "club of selected countries." The aggravation of the internal contradictions of state-monopoly capitalism has prompted the conclusion on the need to concentrate the efforts of the entire nation to secure for Italian capitalism a better place in the European Common Market. To this end the task is set of moulding a "collective consciousness of the nation."

Thus the ICP's economic programme does not open up the perspective of socialism and does not encroach on the main positions of the capitalist system. By its objective essence it is directed at rationalizing capitalist production and modernizing Italian state-monopoly capitalism, in which the working class, at best, could take up more advantageous positions only in defence of its daily interests.

True, in an interview to the newspaper L'Unita on February 21, Enrico Berlinguer remarked: "We not only want a genuine liquidation of capitalism but, as I have tried to explain, we are convinced that this is necessary." The intentions are praiseworthy. But more important is the objective meaning of the proposed economic programme.

The thesis, addressed to the working people, about "austerity measures" (in the conditions of capitalism) encountered sharp criticism inside the party on the eve of the 15th Congress of the ICP. That is why it no longer figures in the programme. But set forth are demands for a sober approach, thriftiness, for a revision of the strategy of wages and labour remuneration, etc. The working people are urged to make sacrifices for the sake of the attainment of vague and ambiguous aims.

Of course, Communists cannot be observers in the sidelines, indifferent to the economic calamities showered by capitalism on the working people. And within the framework of the capitalist system they are pressing for constructive solutions of socio-economic problems of a national character. But Communists are revolutionaries. They always bear in mind the socialist perspective and cannot, should not carry out operations to save and strengthen state-monopoly capitalism at the expense of the working class.

Luigi Longo rightly spoke about the need of an organic connection between economics and politics. "The constantly growing interdependence between the monopolies and the state," he wrote, "makes ever more obvious the class nature of the state and its institutions and sets forth the task of unitarian struggle against both the monopolies and the state." (Luigi Longo, Selected Articles and Speeches, p. 239.)

Complex questions indeed face the theoretical thought of the communist movement in countries of developed capitalism. By what means can democratic transformations on the soil of the capitalist system lead to cardinal socialist transformations, what transitional economic, political

ages and forms will be required? These questions can be solved only by a principled Marxist analysis of new phenomena and processes of the bourgeois society, by verifying and correcting theoretical conclusions in political struggle. Artificial schemes and invented abstract notions will be of no help here.

How many arguments there were over the concept of "historical compromise." But now it has vanished from the ICP documents. Attempts to implement the "historical compromise" in practice resulted, as was noted by the ICP itself, in a blurring of the party's revolutionary image in the eyes of the population, in a weakening of its influence, especially among young people.

Will not a similar fate befall also such concepts as "three phases," "third road," etc.? The more so since these concepts are very hazy and full of "blank spots." It is reasonable to ask: why contrapose so categorically still loose concepts to really existing socialist practice, to the accumulated historical experience of the establishment and development of socialism?

Now just a few words about the developing countries which have chosen a socialist orientation. Their singular and multifaceted experience is a big contribution to the world revolutionary process. The breaching of the chain of imperialist domination in this zone confirms once again the existence of objective conditions on a world scale for cardinal social transformations directed eventually towards socialism. And among these objective conditions are, in the first place, the changes in the alignment of world forces, the strengthening of the socialist world system. The victorious nature of the contemporary national liberation struggle confirms also another important idea—about the role of the subjective factor, of the ability of the resolute revolutionary vanguard to utilize the readiness of the masses to conduct struggle in all its forms till victory, while relying on the effective international support and solidarity of other progressive forces and first of all the socialist states. In the light of what the ICP leaders are now saying it is especially important to underscore that the vanguard forces of countries of socialist orientation are leaning precisely towards real socialism, are attentively studying and using its experience to solve their own pressing economic, social and cultural problems.

What do the Italian theoreticians offer these countries? Also a sort of a "third road," but an even more confusing one: it differs from the

"typical models of the capitalist West" but at the same time must be protected also "from those who strive to arbitrarily press them into schemes and ideologies characterizing the regimes of Eastern Europe" (L'Unita, Jan. 12, 1962).

Perhaps the comrades from the ICP possess some theoretical "open sesame" and universal experience which is capable of radically helping the peoples who are throwing off the chains of social and national slavery? Alas, the leadership of the Italian Communist Party has nothing of the sort. "We do not have a definite model," Gian Carlo Pajetta admitted in an interview to the Epoca weekly. "That is true. We reject both the Soviet model and the Social-Democratic model." Nevertheless, the ICP leadership finds it proper and possible for itself to speak now not of the "Italian road to socialism," on which it had polemically insisted for a long time. The thesis about the "Italian road" has now been replaced by the "third road" concept, which lays claim to international significance.

Thus, the "new phase" means, on the one hand, a negation of what has been won by other peoples in the struggle for socialism, i. e., it is entirely of a negative and not constructive character, while on the other hand, it consists of demands that do not go beyond the framework of the bourgeois-democratic system.

Such, alas, is the principal "weapon" the Italian Communist Party leadership turns against the Marxist-Leninist teaching about socialism and, against the really existing socialist system, the "weapon" that can most accurately be defined as ideological disarmament in face of the class enemy. This indeed is a strange call "to nowhere" addressed to the entire working-class and liberation movement!

Now let us turn to the concept of the so-called new internationalism which is being promoted in documents of the Italian Communist Party leadership for a number of years.

Serving as the initial premise is the fact of the substantial expansion of the composition of the revolutionary and democratic forces in the modern world. But this position is immediately contraposed to proletarian, socialist internationalism, this tested principle of the workers' and communist movement since the times of the Manifesto of the Communist Party. Proletarian internationalism, it is stated, for instance, by Gian Carlo Pajetta contrary to historical experience and modern practice, "was more limited, often based on illu-

sions and in many respects marked by the stamp of sectarianism."

The supporters of the "new internationalism" repeat much of what is long being said (and implemented in practice) by the CPSU and many other communist parties—that the present global problems transcend the framework of the interests of the working class alone and concern the destinies of all sections of the population, of all the peoples, and that today international solidarity should encompass a wide range of democratic and progressive forces and be filled with general human content. But it does not follow at all from this that proletarian internationalism has supposedly become obsolete and is no longer needed.

Proletarian internationalism is a historical concept which develops together with the international communist and workers' movement and takes into account the changes that are taking place. The present expansion of the framework of international solidarity, of ties between revolutionary, democratic forces is precisely the further natural development of proletarian internationalism, evidence of its viability, of its ability to draw ever new public forces into the orbit of the liberating and transforming activity of the vanguard class.

But the ICP leaders reduce proletarian internationalism solely to solidarity of proletarians or even Communists. But that is definitely not so. For in the days of Marx and Engels, too, proletarian internationalism was not some kind of barrier that separated the working class from other strata of the working people. The meaning of that concept is that in the course of its struggle the working class, the most progressive class both in its socio-economic nature and in its internationalism, unites on an international scale, sets an example and facilitates the development of solidarity of all the other exploited and oppressed, of all those striving for peace, democracy and social progress.

The ICP document on the situation in Poland declares obsolescent "the idea of a homogeneous communist movement isolated from all the forces of the international working class movement, that is, from socialist, progressive, and liberation movements."

Let us say from the very outset that this exaggerated notion of a "homogeneous" and "isolated" international communist movement is not supported by any Marxist-Leninist party and, of course, not by the CPSU. Refuting such caricature concepts with ease, the theorists of the "new international-

at the same time jettison every idea of an internationalist communist movement. More, question the very existence of such a movement. Instead they propose orienting on equalizing relations with all political forces of the revolutionary and democratic movement, irrespective of their class positions. But this means dissociating from the most influential, militant and authoritative international movement of our time.

Fortunately, however, it is not within the power of the Italian Communist Party leadership to "shut down" the international communist movement. It is absurd seriously to present proof that the movement exists. Suffice it to point to the colossal anti-communist activity of the class enemy, the world bourgeoisie, which, needless to say, would not be investing so much energy and money in it if the communist movement did not represent such a powerful international force.

The dangers inherent in the "new internationalism" in its Italian interpretation are clearly revealed in the international policy of the ICP—in the weakening of its ties with Communist parties of the socialist community, in promoting contacts with political forces of an anti-communist persuasion, with anti-socialist personalities and organizations, often against the views of the Communist party concerned. While averring readiness to conduct a dialogue with everyone and on many questions, the ICP nonetheless declined an invitation to the 1980 Paris Meeting of European Communist and Workers' Parties which discussed so pressing a problem as peace and disarmament. All this damages international solidarity and the struggle of the democratic and progressive forces.

In its international activities the CPSU is consistently guided by the principle of voluntary internationalist responsibility to the world communist movement. And at the same time, its international contacts with other workers' and democratic parties and organizations are much more extensive and, more important, more effective than the contacts of those who claim that the principles of proletarian internationalism are restrictive, "sectarian." The CPSU, for instance, maintains bilateral ties and long-standing contacts with 20 Socialist and Social-Democratic parties and with 35 revolutionary-democratic parties in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

International Relations, Peace and Détente

ICP documents and speeches of its leaders contain many correct

statements and words about the present extremely strained international situation, the dangerous arms race which is pushing the world to the brink of nuclear catastrophe, the need to ban nuclear weapons, the need for gradual, balanced and controlled reduction of conventional weapons, for immediate talks on acute problems, and primarily on the problem of nuclear disarmament.

While recognizing the growth of international tension, the ICP leaders lay the blame for the tension on both the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., the Warsaw Treaty and NATO. Along with irresponsible critical outpourings about the state of affairs within the U.S.S.R. and certain other socialist countries, it has now become a regular practice for the ICP leadership to distort and compromise individual foreign-policy actions of our country and its foreign policy in general. Contrary to the actual situation, which is understood by all peace forces and by all objective-minded people who support the Soviet Union's decisive contribution to détente and to the fight against the war danger, the ICP leaders deny this incontrovertible fact. Enrico Berlinguer stated at the January plenum: "Especially after 1975, we have encountered and continue to encounter political and concrete actions by the Soviet Union which did not, and do not, represent a contribution to the peoples' struggle against imperialism. More, far from favouring the process of détente and the struggle for peace, they actually impede it."

This is beyond comprehension: here are Communists saying such things of a country which has done everything possible to prevent a world war, is advancing concrete proposals for the accomplishment of this great task. It is primarily thanks to the U.S.S.R. that the peoples of Europe have now for 37 years been spared the horrors of war. There is no room here to recount the history of the peace efforts of the U.S.S.R. and the other Warsaw Treaty countries. Let us recall only the recent initiatives of the CPSU and the Soviet government, taken in complete agreement and with the full support of its Warsaw Treaty allies.

All these initiatives are based on the Peace Programme for the eighties adopted by the 28th Congress of the CPSU which envisages measures of both political and military nature relevant to the situation in Europe, as well as in the Near and Far East. The Programme relates to nuclear-missile and conventional

weapons and to ground, naval and air forces.

Basic to the Soviet Union's political positions in the international arena is resolute rejection of all "doctrines" propounding the permissibility of every "variety" of nuclear war. "Only he can start a nuclear war in hopes of emerging as the victor in it who has made up his mind to commit suicide," Leonid Brezhnev has stressed. This position of the Soviet Union finds the broadest international support, as was vividly demonstrated by the adoption by the 36th U.N. General Assembly of the Declaration on the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe which qualifies first use of nuclear weapons as a crime.

Needless to say, the Soviet Union, like any other state, seeks reliably to safeguard its security. But in doing so it proceeds from the fact Leonid Brezhnev pointed to, that "in the nuclear age this cannot be done by counting on winning the arms race." And the Soviet Union is demonstrating in deeds its desire to halt this insane race and to reverse it. It was ready honestly to live up to the SALT-2 treaty. The U.S.S.R. proposes agreement to terminate not only all nuclear weapon tests, but also the production of these weapons with a view to limiting and later totally abolishing all of their stockpiles. The Soviet Union urges the prohibition of the development of new mass destruction weapons of all kinds and the prohibition and destruction of the existing ones, chemical weapons, for instance.

Leonid Brezhnev has formulated a concrete and realistic plan for scaling down nuclear weapons in Europe projected at the abolition of all nuclear weapons on the continent, medium-range as well as tactical. In view of the fact that the West is not ready for such a radical solution, the Soviet Union proposes to begin by agreeing on the reduction of the present numbers of medium-range nuclear arms by two-thirds or even more. The fact that while working for the solution of this the most pressing issue of the day, it proposes to effect to far-reaching unilateral measures to scale down the military confrontation is eloquent testimony to the political position of the Soviet Union. But it will of course have to take steps to safeguard its vital interests if the United States unleashes a new round in the arms race.

The U.S.S.R. entertains no thought of securing its well-being at the expense and to the detriment of the legitimate interests of other countries. "The freedom and security of other states," Leonid Brezhnev has said, "is an essential condition of our own freedom and security. And at the

...time our freedom and security
an essential condition of the
and independent development
of other countries."

Applying this principle in practice, the Soviet Union supports, for instance, the idea of creating non-nuclear zones in various regions of the world, voices its readiness to give guarantees to all non-nuclear countries that do not allow nuclear weapons to be deployed on their territories, and pledges itself never to use these weapons against them. The same objective is pursued by its proposals for concrete, just measures to reduce tension and to remove seats of conflict over vast areas from Central Europe to the Far East, including the Middle East, the Persian Gulf, the Mediterranean and the Indian and Pacific Oceans.

Of great significance in this respect is the call issued by Leonid Brezhnev on April 27, 1981, during the visit of Moamar Gaddafi to the U.S.S.R., to all states to adhere in their mutual relations to the "code of behaviour" incorporated in the U.N. Charter, the Helsinki Final Act and relevant agreements concluded in the seventies between states with different social systems.

The Soviet Union's constructive approach to international affairs is expressed also in its orientation on the all-round development of political, economic, scientific, technological, and cultural co-operation with other countries. This is evident also from its efforts to carry forward the all-European process and to ensure the success of the Madrid meeting, its contribution to the work of the United Nations Organization and from many other things.

Honest, equal negotiations and the political settlement of all existing international problems as well as those that may arise—this is the constant and firm policy of the U.S.S.R. The only "preliminary condition" the Soviet Union insists on is that negotiations, as Leonid Brezhnev has said, should "translate the principle of equality and equal security into the language of concrete commitments of the sides." And anyone is badly mistaken who thinks that this demand "retards" détente. Renunciation of this principle in no way reduces complications in international affairs, it only impedes the struggle of the peoples against imperialism.

All this is clear and concrete evidence that the U.S.S.R. is pursuing its declared policy: it threatens no one, does not seek confrontation with any state in the West or the East. Nor does it seek military superiority. It has never initiated a new round of the arms race and never will. And it is prepared to

restrict, prohibit, on a mutual basis, by agreement with other countries, all types of weapons. In other words, practice—and practice is the most reliable criterion of the truth—has more convincingly than anything else demonstrated the peaceful aims and realistic constructive initiatives of Soviet foreign policy.

More and more people throughout the world are coming to realize that the Soviet Union is sincerely and consistently working for détente, for the limitation and cessation of the arms race.

The U.S.S.R. is a socialist state, and socialism stands for constructive endeavour. There are no classes or social groups in our country interested in war or profiting from the arms race. We paid a terrible price in the last war, twenty million lives.

The only choice for our planet, for all its inhabitants, is between enduring, reliable peace, and nuclear catastrophe. The position of the CPSU is clear. As Leonid Brezhnev emphasized at the 26th CPSU Congress: "To safeguard peace—no task is more important now on the international plane for our Party, for our people, and, for that matter, for all the peoples of the world."

But we are told that this policy "does not promote the détente process." The chief argument here is Afghanistan, an absolutely groundless argument. We have to repeat, and not for the first time: the limited contingent of Soviet troops was sent at the request of the Afghan government in full conformity with Article 51 of the U.N. Charter. This was an act of internationalist assistance to a friendly people attacked by imperialism, which hurried to the aid of the forces of internal counter-revolution with the simultaneous aim of creating one more bridgehead threatening the security of the U.S.S.R. immediately on its southern frontier. Once the export of counter-revolution to Afghanistan is stopped, once the undeclared war against our peaceful neighbour comes to an end, the Soviet troops will leave. The Afghan government has repeatedly called for negotiations, for a political solution of the crisis. But a peaceful solution is the last thing certain Western countries, and primarily the U.S.A., want.

The second argument—more surprising still—is Poland. There is much overt and incontrovertible evidence that the United States is interested in maintaining and fomenting the crisis in Poland. The sanctions, bans and restrictions against Poland are clear proof of that. As Wojciech Jaruzelski, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party,

remarked at the February plenary meeting of the CC PUPW, Poland "is looked upon as an instrument, as a lever for pressuring the Soviet Union and the socialist community. The real interests of the Polish people, their frontiers, their tranquillity and way of life, the security of their state, are of no consequence in this game.... Poland has been cast in the role of a fuse under the edifice of peace, that rests on the inseparably linked Yalta and Potsdam agreements. Poland was meant to be the starting point of the disintegration of the socialist community, the starting point for turning European history back a whole epoch."

One gets the impression that in demanding the repeal of martial law, which, as the improving situation in the country clearly shows, was at the close of 1981 the only possible means of preventing catastrophe and bloodshed, the ICP leaders are actually abetting the plans of imperialist reaction. And it is by no means accidental that many bourgeois politicians in different countries, as well as the Right-wing press and politicians in Italy itself, are lavish in their praise of the ICP leadership's stand on this question. Small wonder! For it has supported the utterly false Reagan and NATO version about some "responsibility" of the Soviet Union for the measures taken by the Polish leadership, which acted with full sovereignty and independence on the basis of the constitution of that country.

The purpose of the introduction of martial law in Poland is to stabilize the situation in a country in the centre of Europe. Consequently, this is a move that helps to preserve peace not only on our continent, but throughout the world. "Martial law in our country," Jaruzelski told the PUPW Central Committee plenum in February, "has, in effect, become an anti-war factor. For it has pushed back, and considerably reduced the danger of confrontation. By solving its problems by its own forces Poland can become a much more important, indeed, a key factor in preserving peace. History will doubtless some day note that just as the second world war started because of Poland, a third world war did not start because of Poland."

The imposition of martial law in Poland has not stopped the peace movement, as the ICP leaders, contrary to all the facts, maintain, nor could it stop it. The introduction of martial law is a temporary measure, while the peoples' movement for peace will continue so long as there is a danger of nuclear war. And, incidentally, the above-men-

proposition of the ICP leader
uted by the anti-war move-
over the past two months: the
the demonstrations in Western
Europe, the continuous reports from
West Germany, Britain and other
countries of influential political and
public organizations voicing their
resolve to prevent the siting of new
U.S. missiles on their territory,
mounting protest against the militar-
ist hysteria, with the help of which
the U.S. wants to stifle everything
positive in East-West relations. There
are signs of a massive upsurge of
the anti-war movement in Canada
and Australia, of its growing
momentum in Japan. There is more
and more opposition to Reagan's
policy of confrontation with the
U.S.S.R. in the United States itself.
Suffice it to mention the campaign
to freeze nuclear weapons now
gaining momentum there.

In his interview in L'Unita of
February 21, Enrico Berlinguer
again refers to the so-called
"bloc policy." "The international
class struggle," he says, "should not
be equated with the two military
 blocs." As if the CPSU had ever
been guilty of such oversimplifica-
tion. The ICP leadership continues to
insist that the root cause of all the
evils in international politics are
"the blocs," NATO and the Warsaw
Treaty Organization in equal
measure. The ICP leaders have said
and written much on the subject of
the "logic of blocs," which they un-
derstand as the desire of the Great
Powers to retain and expand their
spheres of influence by the use of
force.

Equating U.S. and Soviet policies,
the activities of NATO and the
Warsaw Treaty, is a gross distortion
of the reality and is indicative of a
retreat from class positions, from an
objective appraisal of the policies of
the two military-political organiza-
tions. It is strange and dangerous
when Communists are blind to the
fundamental differences in the class
essence of NATO and the Warsaw
Treaty, their opposite roles in in-
ternational relations. Only by wholly
ignoring the facts can one ascribe
identical aims and activities to the
aggressive NATO bloc and the
Warsaw Treaty Organization, which
from its very inception has been an
aggression factor in preventing ag-
gression in Europe.

In this context, we could remind
the Italian comrades, who are
always demanding a relying on facts,
that beginning with 1955, practically
as soon as the treaty was signed, the
Warsaw Treaty powers have re-
peatedly proposed simultaneous dis-
solution of the two blocs, and in
1968 they proposed to dismantle—at

least as a first step—their military
organizations.

NATO has not responded to that
initiative. The last thing it wants
is to dismantle an alliance that so
faithfully serves the military-indus-
trial complex in organizing the
arms drive against socialism, and
the reactionary forces, in the fight
against democratic movements in the
NATO countries and against the
liberation movement on other con-
tinents.

And we can recall the appraisal
of NATO given by Palmiro Togliatti
at the 10th ICP Congress in
December 1962: "What does
membership in NATO mean today?
To say that it is necessary to promote
security is a mistake. . . . It is not an
alliance. It is a chain, a yoke which
would lead the nation to the loss of
its right to shape its own destiny."
(P. Togliatti. Selected Articles and
Speeches. Vol. 2, p. 776. In Russian.)
And what has changed in NATO
since then? If anything, the change
has been for the worse. The militar-
ist ambitions of its leaders have in-
creased. Washington's overlordship
has become more insistent. As for
Italy, in recent years it has often
been the object of gross pressure
and bullying by NATO, especially in
order to prevent victory of the Left
in parliamentary elections.

...

Let us do a little summing up.

In connection with the critical
articles in Pravda and Communist,
emotion-charged terms such as
"supreme judgement," "indictment,"
"anathema," and "excommunication"
cropped up in the Italian Communist
press. Actually there was nothing
of the kind, besides which no one
can be "excommunicated" from the
international communist movement.
A party belongs to the communist
movement not on anyone's instruc-
tions or depending on the opinions
of other parties, but by virtue of
the character of the given party, its
programme, aims and mode of action,
its policy and its fidelity to the
ideals of the working class, to the
great revolutionary science whose
founders were Marx, Engels and
Lenin. A party can leave the move-
ment, place itself outside it, solely
of its own volition.

In the seventies marked changes
took place in the ideological
and theoretical position of the
ICP. At first its theoreticians re-
duced the essence of Marxism-Lenin-
ism to method (as if there could
be method without theory). Then
came renunciation of Marxism-
Leninism on the pretext that it
had turned into a "dogmatic system."
Now ICP leaders openly aver that
the Communist Party has ceased to

be a "party of one ideology" and
propound "ideological pluralism." In
other words, a Communist Party
without ideology, i.e., without a sys-
tem of views giving expression to
the fundamental interests of the
working class.

ICP theoreticians have launched
a whole series of abstract concepts,
such as the "historical compromise,"
"third phase," "third road," "new
socialism," "new internationalism."
The content of these concepts is neb-
ulous, eclectic, ambiguous. In the
ranks of the Italian Communist Par-
ty itself the interpretations given
them vary and futile debates over
the real meaning of one or another
concept have been going on for
years. Why is this so? The matter is
that these concepts are not
built on strictly scientific ana-
lysis of the facts, but are
arbitrary, speculative, armchair
constructions. Theoretical analysis
presupposes not merely the group-
ing of facts in a general pattern, but
the exposition of the political con-
tent of these facts. And this cannot
be done by proceeding only from the
day-to-day, superficial phenomena.
What is also needed is a theory re-
flecting the experience of world
history and through it the laws
governing social development.

Marxism-Leninism is precisely
such an integral theory worked out
by the international working class
and communist movement and re-
presenting an organic amalgam of
philosophical, economic, and polit-
ical ideas and methods of investiga-
tion. As the sum total of historical
experience shows, renunciation of
revolutionary theory sooner or later
leads to the loss of correct direc-
posts of policy and is fraught with
great dangers for the working class
and the entire people of the given
country.

In conclusion it should be said
once again that in the interest of
the defence of peace and the secu-
rity of the nations it is imperative
to unite all the forces of the working
class, communist and liberation
movement, all who cherish peace
on earth, to wage an active struggle
for these great aims. It is against
the aggressive deeds and designs of
imperialism that the thoughts and
actions of the masses should be
directed. The CPSU is not interested
in polemics with the leadership of
the Italian Communist Party. But
erroneous, biased and often un-
founded contentions in respect of
the essence of the social system in
the U.S.S.R. and the domestic and
external policy of the CPSU will
certainly be given a rebuff.

(From the Journal
Communist, No. 4, 1982)