



Theoretical journal  
of the Socialist  
Party of Australia

# Australian Marxist Review

- ★ *Problems of Unity*
- ★ *Uruguay's left forces*
- ★ *Electoral experiences in Greece*
- ★ *Principles of unity advanced by the PCPE*
- ★ *Conflicting ideologies and common*
- ★ *security — Statement & Interview*

**QUARTERLY**  
**NEW SERIES No 19**  
**May 1988**  
**Price \$1**

# **Australian Marxist Review**

**Editor: P Symon**

**Editorial Board Members:**

**S Anthony**

**R Gowland**

**A Miller**

**B Rooney**

**Published by New Age Publishers  
for the Socialist Party of Australia  
65 Campbell Street, Surry Hills 2010  
Phone (02) 212 6855**

## CONTENTS

<b>Problems of Unity</b>	<b>Peter Symon . . . . . 4</b>
<b>Unity of Uruguay's left forces — stronger ties with the working masses</b>	<b>Resolution of the CPU . . 9</b>
<b>Electoral strategy: Communist experiences in Greece</b>	<b>Toula Kontou . . . . . 15</b>
<b>Ideological unity of the communist movement — Principles advanced by the Communist Party of the Peoples of Spain</b>	<b>PCPE . . . . . 21</b>
<b>Conflicting ideologies and common security</b>	<b>Joint statement . . . . . 24</b>
<b>Conflicting ideologies and common security</b>	<b>Prof. Otto Reinhold . . . 34</b>

# Problems of Unity

by Peter Symon  
General Secretary  
Socialist Party of Australia

**This issue of the AMR publishes a series of articles on questions of unity. They show that the same processes of unity are going on in other countries although not in exactly the same circumstances.**

In every case the Marxist-Leninist parties are taking initiatives, working patiently and with some success to overcome the divisions in the working class movements to be found in many countries. These divisions have weakened the revolutionary and democratic forces.

Overcoming the differences is not a simple or easy task nor can unity be achieved quickly. But it must be done.

The Socialist Party of Australia (SPA) has published a number of statements and articles and has been promoting the unity process in a practical way for some years now.

By way of introduction to the articles which follow, we set out our approach and what we believe needs to be done in Australia.

When workers come together in united action or when parties co-operate, there is an immediate and tangible lift in enthusiasm and confidence. When the reverse happens there is a weakening of the struggle and despondency sets in.

The yearning of people for unity is reflected in the statement which is frequently heard, "Why can't everyone get together?" It would be helpful if every responsible person listened to that plea.

There is not one single simple unity but at least four distinct levels of unity. They are all interlinked and interdependent but they are not the same.

Firstly, there is the **unity of the Party**. For the SPA this means acceptance by the membership of the policies determined by the Party organisations from time to time and acceptance and use of our Marxist-Leninist ideology.

The maintenance and strengthening of party unity (and unity at every other level for that matter) is an every day task. It has to be worked for and fought for. It can never be taken for granted and it does not come about automatically.

The best sort of unity and the only kind with lasting substance is conscious unity, brought about by an understanding of policies and why they are adopted. An understanding of ideology, and how to apply it, is also an essential ingredient of party unity.

That is why in the present pre-Congress discussion we urge every member to read and discuss the draft Party documents and, if they wish, to submit amendments.

The more collective input the better the documents will become. In addition, reading the documents carefully will inform all members of the substantive policy statements which they contain.

This process will strengthen understanding and hence unity.

While differences of opinion on some questions will always remain, the more single-minded the membership is, the better and stronger the Party will be.

Secondly, we advocate **left unity**. In Australia there are several left parties and although there are left-minded individuals to be found outside any of the parties, the main force of the left is to be found in the membership of the left parties.

At one time the left was to be found in the CPA and the left of the ALP. The breakup of the CPA, which arose because of the emergence of strong policy and ideological differences, altered all that. These differences also spread into the ALP left and into trade unions and weakened them as well. We are still suffering the consequences.

As a step towards the eventual re-unification of the left political organisations into one party based on Marxism-Leninism, the SPA advocates joint and co-ordinated activity on specific agreed policies. Instead of each organisation doing its own thing on every issue, often on the same issue with the same or similar policies, it would be better to work together. That in our opinion is simple commonsense. It is the cause that is all important not the prestige of particular individuals or organisations.

The SPA has consistently put forward this approach to the CPA, CPA(M-L), SWP and ACU.

There has been some success but not as much as the working people are entitled to expect and not as much as the situation demands.

Although joint statements were adopted on the ID Card and on privatisation last year, it has not yet proved possible to get a common approach to elections. Even a joint meeting on the question of wages sponsored by all the organisations with a speaker from each body was not agreed to by the CPA and ACU.

However, the SPA will persist with its efforts as we are convinced that this approach is both necessary and realistic.

Thirdly, **working class unity**. Despite considerable changes in its composition, the working class is the most numerous class and remains potentially the strongest force in the struggle against capital. It is the main force for social change and eventually for socialism.

The capitalist ruling class knows this very well so it ceaselessly works to keep the workers divided.

Progress depends on overcoming these divisions and uniting the workers in a united front. The united front means the unity in action of the workers in support of their economic and political interests at each stage of the struggle against capital.

Without the united activity of millions of working people for their many demands and directed against state-monopoly capitalism, there can be no real prospect of altering the direction of Australia's political life and of winning working class power and building a new socialist society.

There are many issues which provide a firm foundation for working class unity in action.

They include democratic rights, the right to organise, living conditions and jobs, the environment, peace and national independence, problems created by new technology, the maintenance and extension of the public sector, etc.

The united front can be facilitated by agreements between working class organisations and parties to achieve certain policies. Such agreements, by themselves, do not constitute a united front but they can help lead to united action by workers.

The SPA puts forward the united front as a political concept, the essence of which is unity of those forces favouring a revolutionary change to socialism, with those who, as yet, limit their political concepts to the struggle for reforms.

## **Peoples or democratic unity**

The working class is not the only social force which is exploited by big capital and threatened by a loss of democratic rights.

Small farmers and small businesses are being squeezed out. Intellectuals, technologists, scientists, cultural workers, teachers, etc, are also used in various ways by big capital to further its profit interests and maintain its domination of society.

A number of social movements reflect the possibilities of people from various social groups getting together.

The peace, environmental, democratic rights, the women's and the Aboriginal movements, etc, bring together people from different social circles. These mass movements and the organisations which express the aims of these movements play a very important part in political life. They provide a realistic form by which to build a broad and active people's unity in support of democratic and progressive issues and demands.

The members of the SPA participate in these movements to help strengthen them and to win the objectives which they set themselves.

Party unity, left unity, working class unity and democratic or people's unity, while having different characteristics and involving different social forces are all interdependent. The more they are integrated, the stronger the progressive forces become. However, it is a mistake to mix up these different forms of unity and they should not be played off one against the other.

Arising from the experiences already gained in our work to build left unity, the SPA put forward the following principles, which we believe should guide all the left organisations which agree with the objective of left unity.

They include:

- The aim of left unity is service to the working class and the working people generally.
- Each organisation must approach other organisations on the basis of equality, mutual respect and honesty.
- There must be consultation at each step of the process to ensure agreement on policies, tactics and actions.
- An atmosphere must be created in which the results of agreements and steps taken are frankly discussed and evaluated. Mistakes will be made and they should be recognised and corrected during the course of the work.
- Agreements by co-operating organisations should be reached as far as

possible by consensus with voting resorted to only as a last resort and limited to procedural matters.

- Where agreement is not reached on an issue, this issue to be put aside with each organisation free to express its view on the issue using its own facilities.
- Once agreements are reached all organisations are expected to help carry out the agreement.
- Ideological differences should not stand in the way of co-operation on issues held in common.
- A contest of ideas between co-operating organisations is natural and inevitable. This contest or any criticism of one organisation by another should proceed in a manner which does not undermine the unity achieved on agreed upon issues but instead contributes to clarity and strengthens the developing unity.
- Each organisation to be free to publish its views and carry out activities in support of policies which are not the subject of agreement.

To a large extent these same principles can be used on building working class unity and democratic unity.

Building unity at these various levels is a long term task for the party. We must achieve it if the working class and other progressive social forces are to make any significant gains.

In the whole complex of unity processes the role of the party is essential. Sometimes members of the party fall for the idea that the presence and activity of the party is narrow and sectarian. It is sometimes claimed that the mass movement is "broad" while the party is "narrow". Of course, if party members act in a sectarian way that may turn out to be true but it is a fault in their style of work and not the involvement of the party member as such.

Broadness must in principle include the party. When the party members are working correctly and fully understand the party's approach to the different levels of unity, they become very effective builders of unity and accepted leaders in the mass movements as well.

So, we need a strong party with its members working correctly.

# Unity of Uruguay's left forces — stronger ties with the working masses

Final Resolution of a  
National Conference of the Communist Party of Uruguay (CPU)  
held in Montevideo from December 17 to 22, 1985.

**The Uruguayan people have scored a historic victory: they have defeated the fascist dictatorship, which had ruled the country for a whole decade by means of terrorism and torture and which had trampled on the freedoms, plunged the country into economic ruin, and betrayed our national interests.**

The working people and their united trade union centre, the Inter-Union Working People's Plenum-National Working People's Convent (IL yvPP-NWPC) were the decisive force which crushed the tyranny; it depended on them and on the other popular organisations to strengthen and develop democracy.

Together with the other forces within the Broad Front, the Communists intend to do their utmost to make the Front the powerful alternative in this historical period.

The dictatorship posed a threat to Uruguay's very existence. It was a reign of general fear, censorship, destruction of the education system, mass sackings and abolition of all freedoms. All these sufferings were imposed on us for the purpose of realising the economic and social model framed by the international banks, the transnational monopolies and imperialism with the complicity of our country's oligarchy; all that was done for the purpose of halting the development of the liberation process.

Uruguayans, inspired by the ideas of Artigas and their democratic traditions, began to resist the dictatorship right after the coup d'état, and their first step was a general strike in which the working class acted as the chief force.

Even under the most brutal repression, the resistance did not cease at the enterprises and in the trade unions, in the press and in the underground propaganda, in the prison cells and in exile, with the Communists in the front ranks of the resistance.

The broadest unity of our people, political parties and public bodies was forged for the purpose of ousting the fascist dictatorship.

The final milestones on this way of unity and struggle were the 1980 plebiscite, the internal elections in the political parties, the May Day demonstrations, the mass demonstration in Independence Square, the grand student and people's marches, the "saucepan riots", and the demonstrative switching off of televisions sets whenever spokesmen of the dictatorship appeared on the screen. All these acts weakened the dictatorship, drove it to the wall, and ultimately put an end to it.

A new historical stage opened with the collapse of the dictatorship, and it poses the persistent task of restructuring the country for the sake of strengthening democracy and advancing with the prospect of establishing a Broad Front popular government.

In the face of the terrible legacy, the poverty, the unemployment and the impoverishment of the working people, the destruction of the productive apparatus, the internal and external debt, a legacy which the overwhelming majority of our citizens find alarming, we Communists put forward our response: together with the Broad Front, along the way of genuine reconciliation, for national solutions.

We support the program of solutions which emerged in the process of statements by the trade unions, organisations of small and middle producers, members of the liberal professions, students and old age pensioners.

The country needs the realisation of a program which includes: higher real wages and pensions in order to expand the internal market and revive production; a budget to raise salaries and provide for adequate appropriations for education and public health, with a simultaneous reduction in outlays on the army; nationalisation of the banking system to make it serve the country's interests; an effective solution of the problem of the internal debt, especially on the part of the small and middle producers of town and country; the starting of enterprises now fully or practically idle; an extraordinary plan for housing construction for the popular masses; the strengthening of autonomous enterprises and an end to the policy of privatisation; and the establishment of a national health service.

The external debt, which the dictatorship increased from \$720 million to more than \$5 billion, contracted in defiance of the will of the people, a debt resulting from financial manipulations, dirty deals and flight of capital, has developed into a political problem. There is a need to negotiate repudiation of its repayment, with the available funds being used to invigorate the economy and raise our people's living standards.

*Consolidation of democracy* is the task to whose fulfilment we, Communists, devote all our efforts. That is why we are carrying on the fight to do away with all the consequences of the dictatorial rule, such as the bloated repression machine, the nature of the education system, abolition of institutional Act No. 19, and so on.

We must work to heal all the wounds, so as fully to re-establish the function of the democratic institutions. This means primarily complete clarity on the question of the missing persons, the prosecution of the guilty persons in accordance with the constitution and the existing laws, and the fulfilment of the general demand: the arrest of all those who are responsible for the violations of human rights, and for ruining the country by means of criminal and immoral deals.

The government is under diverse pressure in the face of which it has been retreating; there is pressure from the foreign investors, the IMF and the creditor banks, from the Pacheco group in the ruling party, the right-wing circles from the National Party, and the military who are against democracy and the constitution.

US imperialism and the banking oligarchy, which enriched itself under the dictatorship, are the enemies of our homeland, the enemies of freedom, destabilising the democratic regime; the oligarchy now seeks to use what remains of the dictatorship within the repression and state machine. The popular protest must grow even louder and more resolute.

*The development of democracy* is closely bound up with its consolidation and strengthening.

Our political goal is development of democracy along the way of the establishment of a popular government with the participation of the Broad Front.

Reaffirming the ideas expressed in 1983, which have been fully borne out, our party's CC declared in September 1984: "If our goal is to establish a democratic and anti-imperialist power on the way to socialism, the immediate political task, the element capable of setting the whole process in motion, is the task of re-establishing democracy, liquidating the dictatorship, destroying its remnants, and developing the struggle for in-depth democracy. Developing democracy means changing the balance of forces. The future of democratic Uruguay, tomorrow's balance of forces, the Uruguay we shall set

up depend on the role which will be played by the working class, the middle strata, the students, the intelligentsia, the peasantry, the Broad Front, our party and its allies.”

All political forces, public circles and individual leaders prepared to complete the country’s democratisation and restructure it on a new basis can and must unite around the Broad Front in order to fulfil this task.

Developing democracy today means mobilising and uniting the people for the assertion of democracy, and for achieving the solution of the problems of social justice and economic independence. It is simultaneously a struggle for the program of the Broad Front or the Broad Front and all its potential allies.

The experience of the past few months of democratic life has confirmed that no renewal is possible from within the traditional parties or a surmounting of their irreversible historical crisis. The necessary transformations can be carried out only by the Broad Front, epitomising the alliance of the working people, the middle strata, the intelligentsia, the workers in culture, and the small and middle holders.

That is why we set the goal of winning a popular government through a victory of the Broad Front.

We must enhance the role of the Broad Front as the truly alternative power, we must work to strengthen it on a national scale, among ever broader social strata, drawing into its ranks any new groupings which may fall away from the traditional parties.

For the attainment of these goals, we must strengthen the Broad Front and its unity through a militant brotherhood of all its members, asserting it as a coalition of organised political forces, and its ties, unity and solidarity with the popular masses.

We Communists will always do everything that is necessary to strengthen the unity of the Broad Front, which is characterised by the principle of multilateral participation.

Socialism should be more than a definition; it must be socialism in fact, i.e., a system putting an end to man’s exploitation by man on the basis of social property in the basic means of production, a system under which power in the state fully belongs to the working people.

We Communists have defined the ways to socialism in our country, and they fit into the overall picture of the world-wide socialist revolution. In so doing, we take account of our country’s best traditions: the precepts of Artigas, the republican and civic conceptions, and our people’s love of freedom and spirit of brotherhood and solidarity. The way to socialism in Uruguay involves the assurance of a genuine and profound democracy with broad

freedoms, the real right to work, to abode, and to rest, protection of health and access to the values of culture.

Socialism is the broadest freedom and elimination of man's exploitation by man.

The Uruguayan trade union movement has rich and heroic traditions of struggle, and takes pride in its class character and commitment to unity. The working people have forged the IUWPP-NWPC, the united trade union centre, which declared itself to be the crucial force in resistance to the dictatorship and in the struggle for the re-establishment of democracy, by staging its general strike in June 1973.

In the past period, when the top priority was to strengthen democracy, the IUWPP-NWPC put forward a national program of solutions for the revival of our country. The working people within the IUWPP-NWPC played the leading role in the whole political process in the country by their actions and activity.

The main thing here is the working people's firm unity based on class positions, on pluralism, and on democratic participation in the trade unions.

Imperialism, the oligarchy and its heralds have now shown that one of their main aims is to split the trade union movement by mounting a campaign against the Third Congress of the IUWPP-NWPC.

The experience of the Congress has further reinforced our conviction that the urge to bend the trade union movement to the views of this or that party poses a great danger to the cause of trade union unity, and that a correct and constructive analysis of the effects of such strivings must become a part of serious and fraternal discussions among trade union members and their leaders.

The process of national revival, the challenging task of consolidating the just re-established democracy, the struggle for a Broad Front popular government, and the country's whole political life require the presence of a strong communist party.

Throughout these 65 years of its existence, the working class party has always fought for the popular and national interest, and in defence of democracy and the freedoms.

The CPU, now forced to re-establish its organisation after 12 years of persecution by the dictatorship, has started an active political campaign, and has undoubtedly become one of the chief factors of the whole national political process, and one of its protagonists. We Communists have made our contribution by expressing our opinions, putting forward our proposals and acting firmly and with a sense of responsibility in the face of the country's major problems.

Since the establishment of the Broad Front, we Communists have actively worked for its development and unity; we are now striving to turn it into the popular government alternative.

The dictatorship was brought down by the common tremendous efforts of the whole people. The Uruguayan people are aware that we Communists held with honour a place in the front ranks of this struggle and resistance, and paid a high price for doing so, the price of our missing heroes, and the thousands upon thousands of those who were subjected to tortures, incarceration, and exile.

For those reasons, more heed is now being paid to what the Communists are saying than in the past, and that is why public opinion is giving them greater attention. Today, even more people are looking to us, and thousands are joining our ranks.

Our conference urges industrial workers and other working people, old and young, men and women in town and country to join our party for the sake of the country's future,

The Young Communist League (YCL) has sacrificed the life of its heroes to the cause of struggle for democracy, and thousands of young Communists have spent long years in prison cells. Today, 12 years later, the YCL is the largest political organisation of Uruguayan young people. At this new stage, young Communists set themselves the task of winning over the majority of Uruguayan youth for the patriotic, progressive, anti-imperialist and revolutionary ideas and the program of the Broad Front.

*Abridged*

# Electoral strategy: Communist experiences in Greece

Toula Kontou

Alternate Member, Central Committee  
Communist Party of Greece

From an interview by *Political Affairs*,  
theoretical journal of the Communist Party of the United States

## **Question**

Your Party has had many rich experiences in electoral struggles. Can you tell us about the general direction of these struggles over the past period? What were the issues involved?

## **Answer**

In the past six years we have had five big electoral confrontations on an all-Greece level. Included were two general parliamentary elections which took place in 1981 and 1985. The first of these (1981), was a “double”. In other words, the electorate voted for members of the Greek Parliament, and simultaneously for members of the European Parliament. Elections for the European Parliament were also held in 1984. In 1982 and 1986, we had elections for Local Self Government.

Let me first comment on the 1981 election, because this contest was especially important. It put an end to the long period when, except for some intervals, the country was governed by the Right-wing. In that election, the New Democracy Party, the political expression par excellence of big capital and of the regime of dependence (on the USA — ed), lost its parliamentary majority.

New Democracy's defeat was the result of the development of a broad and militant popular movement in support of change. The CPG made a decisive contribution to this movement.

As a result of the election, parliamentary majority was won by PASOK, a social-reformist party, which put forward slogans that paralleled those of our Party: “Change”, “Greece out of NATO”, “Out with the bases”, “No, to the EEC (European Economic Community) of the monopolies”.

In the pre-election campaign our Party stressed that it was not enough for the Right-wing to lose the elections. We argued, what was needed was a policy of national independence and peace, of democratization, ending the privileges of the monopolies, and economic development to the benefit of the people. The course followed by PASOK afterwards revealed, in the most negative way, the importance of our emphasis on these points.

The CPG increased its strength in what was truly a difficult election battle. We polled approximately 11 per cent of the vote. As a result of the elections, PASOK was able to form a one-party government. In great part, this reflected the people’s intense desire to see “the Right ousted and then — as they said — worry about the rest afterwards”.

In the 1985 elections, our aim was to frustrate the ruling class’ plan to impose a two-party system on our country.

It was our view that this aim could be achieved through the formation of a “democratic government of change”, relying on all the progressive forces and the popular movements striving for national independence, democracy and development. The conditions under which this election battle was fought were intolerable. Psychological coercion was widespread. Most often it featured propaganda projecting the concept that the voters faced a “dilemma” — either accept “Right or vote for PASOK”. As a result a part of the electorate’s attitude was determined by this choice — to be part of “the Right or anti-Right” force. The electoral law, the imported foreign style of pre-election campaigning used by the two big parties, the discrimination against the CPG, the creeping rumour-mongering — all these played their role in shaping the election results. Although it suffered a reduction in its percentage of the vote, PASOK, thanks to the undemocratic aspects of the electoral law, once again was able to form a one-party government.

In these difficult conditions, the CPG had a small, one per cent, drop in its share of the vote. Of course we assessed the weak aspects of our own work. These consisted mainly in our unconvincing and incomplete exposure of the role of the two-party game. In addition, we did not always convincingly present to the people the solutions our Party proposed. Nor did we fully appreciate the consequences of the crisis in the country on the consciousness of the people.

As we see it, the electoral returns for a Communist Party in a capitalist country, in the last analysis, are a reflection of the development and character of the mass movement in that nation. The mass movement is a basic factor for

the realization of our immediate and ultimate goals. In rejecting the “electoralistic” conception which measures the activities of the Party “from one election to the next”, we do not, in the slightest, underestimate either the importance of elections or who sits in the Parliament.

The Local Self Government elections had their own characteristics. In our country there is a tradition of Communists polling a much higher percentage in local races than in those for Parliament. Many important and densely populated towns elect Communists as mayors. The experience in the elections of 1986 were of special interest for us because a Left alliance, achieved on a wide scale, had very positive results. In that election our candidates received more than 20 per cent of the vote. Even more important is that this alliance had a significant impact beyond the elections.

**Question**

As you point out, your Party has participated in united-front alliances. How did you go about developing these relationships? What problems did you confront?

**Answer**

Yes, our Party has participated in electoral alliances. Yet, in most cases these have not been restricted to electoral fronts. We made — and make — big efforts to promote unity and common action of the forces of the Left. This is central to making advances — mainly in the trade union movement — in support of the demand for a just electoral system, in the peace movement, and in the fight for the democratization of the mass media, etc.

We would like, especially at the present moment, to stress the discussions and the rallying together of the Left forces because new negotiations are opening on the future of the US bases in our country. The demand of the Left progressive forces and of the broad popular masses, is that these bases be removed from Greece when the present agreement expires.

Of course, there are other fronts of struggle in which we are working to develop co-operation. These include economic development, environmental protection, education and health issues.

Our Party recently called all the forces of the Left to joint action on three issues:

- The adoption of an electoral system of direct proportional representation.
- The removal of the US bases.
- The defence of the working people’s living standards.

In the field of the elections in particular, several first steps were taken in the parliamentary elections of 1985, with the inclusion of non-party, Left candidates on the Party’s electoral tickets. However, the election fronts of the 1986

local campaigns are of greater interest, because, as they unfolded, concepts of co-operation greatly matured and conditions allowed them to be expressed in a more advanced way.

Thus, the CPG played a decisive role in the formation of the unity tickets. We contributed to the ideological and political preparation of the people for unity by building and promoting appropriate initiatives, mainly in the trade union movement.

Our Party stressed the importance of co-operation, not only in the struggle for Local Self-Government seats, but for achieving the broader aim of change — especially in the areas of improving living conditions, combatting unemployment, the high cost of living, struggling to save the environment, provide decent housing, health and education for all the people.

As the biggest section of the Left, the CPG had to be first in setting an example of respect for the principle of equality. It worked creatively and positively for common programs and candidates of common acceptance.

The result was, in most cases, the achievement of joint participation with almost all the forces of the Left.

A characteristic example was the Left alignment in Thessaloniki, the second most populated town in Greece. In Thessaloniki, the alignment acquired the greatest possible breadth.

The local elections, as a result, marked an important advance for the Left. In all, one out of every three elected mayors won office based on support of the aligned Left.

As a result of the bold position of the Party, a long standing imprint was left on the entire election process. Our Party, wherever it was not participating in the second round, refused to lend unconditional support to the PASOK tickets.

Thus a heavy blow was struck against the “lesser evil” concept and the idea that the sole choice in the election was between “PASOK or the Right”.

Naturally, we faced many problems. The most outstanding were related to the position of a certain section of the Left which refused co-operation in Athens and Piraeus, choosing to stand alone. It was also necessary for us to do serious ideological work among our own forces in order to remove reservations about those who co-operated with us. We needed to free ourselves from a spirit of narrowness which was expressed in the view that “it is better if we go it alone”, or which, in the name of a narrow arithmetical conception regarding the relationship of forces, questioned the projection of non-party candidates.

## **Question**

How do you see now the broadening and deepening of the electoral alliance developing in Greece? What is the path to developing it into a national majority?

## **Answer**

Our Party is striving for the formation of a political coalition of the Left. This coalition, however, as we see it, can not be limited simply to electoral co-operation. Our goal is to move Greece in the direction of socialism.

The strategic prerequisite for the achievement of this goal is building a socio-political coalition of the Left. By this we mean the alliance both of the social forces which are interested in an independent democratic course of development in our country, as well as of the forces of the progressive Left.

These two fronts — social and political — are indivisibly bound together. Without alliances at the base with the social forces of change, the political initiatives needed will be limited simply to the leadership; they will be of temporary value, and lacking in strong foundations. Without political alliances, the social fronts cannot be achieved; they cannot find their political expression; they are not able to pose effectively any question of change not, most of all, change in governmental power. Our Party is active in both these directions without over-estimating, or under-estimating either of them.

We consider that the co-operation of the forces of the Left and progress in the mass popular movement give an important impulse to the progress of the coalition of the Left on the political level. Thus, the reactionary assault will be confronted in common as far as possible, and the people's consciousness be raised to the utmost, by acquiring experience of mass struggle.

In our view, only by doing this, only by raising the level of mass experience, combining it with daily ideological work by the Left, can a political and electoral coalition have any future.

In as far as the Left itself is concerned, things have been in a great state of flux. New parties and movements are being formed, many of them have broken away from the ruling party. However, some healthy Left forces are still trapped in PASOK. The possibilities of their changing and being won for the cause of the Left alliance and change are great. There are also citizens who are not organized in political parties. In our view there must be a place for all of them in the coalition of the Left.

Today we are in a phase of seeking — of exchanging views developing common action on smaller questions — with the other forces of the Left. But on a local level we have proceeded much further. In the towns, suburbs, enterprises, factories, public institutions and educational institutions, joint

political committees of the Left are organized on the basis of common positions which go beyond the limited problems of the local areas themselves. We believe that these committees are the rudimentary nuclei upon which a new alignment on a national scale will be built.

In the effort to build and strengthen the political coalition, our Party has called on all in the Left, without exception, to add their strength. We believe that it must be a coalition of equal, and self-contained forces; that the different opinions of each ally must be respected, as well as their right to project them; that an open dialogue must be set in motion along with action in any area where there is agreement.

In this way we hope to pass from unity on lesser questions to the formulation of a common program, which will lay the basis for a struggle for governmental power. This procedure is not at all easy. Some forces have refused to co-operate, mainly those of the Eurocommunist tradition, on the excuse that they have differences and disagreements on questions of a strategic nature, which do, indeed, exist. We are conscious of the fact that this process of building unity needs time and a lot of work. Nevertheless, we are optimistic.

This optimism is based on objective necessity, which is immediate and imperative. As we stressed at the 12th Congress of our Party, which was held last May: two roads are open to Greek society, the road of big capital and dependence, or the road of change in the direction of socialism.

There can be no third alternative.

# Ideological unity of the communist movement — Principles advanced by the Communist Party of the Peoples of Spain

*Aimed at overcoming divisions in the communist movement in Spain and towards building a strong, united communist party, the Second Congress of the Communist Party of the Peoples of Spain (PCPE), held in Madrid on 25 and 26 April, 1987, declared the need not just for unity in a common program of action but for ideological unity based on Marxism-Leninism. The Congress Political Report delivered by General Secretary Ignacio Gallego set out the main principles which the PCPE proposes for discussion with other parties. The relevant section of the report is reproduced below.*

**The unity of all communists is not a technical problem, nor is it limited by time. It is a debate of fundamental content which has not yet commenced seriously.**

Comrades, in pursuance of decisions taken at this Congress, I assure you that we will not form part of any other force. The approach aimed at mere integration of parties works against the unity of communists, because it undermines the process of establishing a clear ideology, which is necessary to advance towards our objective seriously and with credibility and firmness.

In meetings with other forces, in the press and also in international communications, there are those who insist on their belief that integration is a fact. They are not only failing to speak the truth, but they are also doing harm to the authentic unity of all communists.

The PCPE does not accede to the division that exists between communists. We work towards unity. We do not feel we have the exclusive patrimony of communist ideals and we are willing to take part in a wide debate in the direction of unity.

Aware of the necessity to advance towards the unity of all communists, we would once again like to call on all communists without any exception and at all levels, to consider once again the need for a discussion regarding the profound matters which divide us. We shall contribute to this discussion by putting forward seven questions which we consider fundamental, and which can lead to the solution of a number of other matters.

We are awaiting the documents from congresses of other parties and we are eager to learn of the resolutions adopted by their leading members. Their proposals will permit us to organise a more systematic process of debate than the process followed until now. It will create favourable conditions to overcome other problems of the unity process. We are ready to take part as long as a rigorous and extensive debate is held to resolve a problem which is fundamentally of content and not of time.

The seven aspects which we consider should be the axis of the discussion are:

**1. The role of the working class in the revolutionary process in the developed capitalist countries.** We consider that economic and social changes and especially the scientific-technical revolution are producing changes in the internal structure of the working class, particularly in the relative contribution of specific areas of production. But in no way do we understand that there has been a change in the revolutionary role of the working class.

**2. The class character of the communist party.** We think there is a necessity for a party in Spain which exists for the workers and is the organised vanguard of the working class. This doesn't mean that our program or political objectives do not include the advancement of the interests of other sections of the people, as long as these interests correspond to those of the working class. The communist party takes up the struggles of wide social movements, such as for peace, women and youth rights, for the protection of our environment, and so forth, but not as a mere co-ordinator of these struggles, as it does not consider the struggle of the working class as a movement among the above mentioned. The PCPE supports justified struggles in relationship to the working class and orientates these struggles in the direction of the revolutio-

nary transformation of society.

3. We consider as a primary objective **the winning of political power by the working class for the revolutionary process of building socialism and communism**. The communists work in the democratic bourgeois institutions and hope to achieve forms of democracy applicable to the large sector of society. We consider democratic struggle as the most effective way to transform society. We adhere to a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the crisis of capitalism and imperialism.

4. **Our link with the International Communist Movement** is based on mutual respect and independence for the development of a political program in each country, which we consider arises from the common interests of the international working class and the international character of class struggle. "National Communism", understood as a process standing apart from anti-imperialist struggle, has proven to be unachievable.

5. We defend the **characteristics of the Leninist party** as necessary instruments for a revolutionary transformation of society and which are based on democratic centralism and the prohibition of factions. The essential Leninist characteristics of the party are necessary for the party to achieve its objective on behalf of the working class.

Certainly, the working class party can find itself in quite different political circumstances — in power, in an armed struggle, parliamentary democracy, in clandestine circumstances, or other social situations — according to the development and strength of the particular working class. This requires the adaptation of organisational methods, but its Leninist essence remains because such essence cannot be separated from the party's aim or final objective.

6. **We defend a party endowed with a Marxist-Leninist world outlook** which stems from intense ideological struggle and is a consequence of the nature of the society. We reject any idea of a neutral ideology for the party, which inevitably heads towards the idealist ideology of the bourgeoisie. The working class finds itself in revolutionary conditions when it acquires Marxist-Leninist theory.

7. We consider that the party must incorporate the **double condition** of being a vanguard and a party of the masses. Its vanguard character is not acquired by mere definition by the party, but because the party is situated at the head of the popular working class, it puts forward objectives that give a revolutionary purpose to the struggle and it defends the form of organisation which best corresponds to the needs of the masses. The party gains prestige which attracts the recognition of the workers. Its vanguard character is vital and inseparable from its condition as a revolutionary force.

# Conflicting ideologies and common security

A joint statement adopted by  
the Academy of Social Sciences attached to  
the CC of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (GDR) and  
the Basic Values Commission of  
the Social Democratic Party of Germany (FRG)  
and published in Berlin and Bonn, 27 August, 1987.

## **Safeguarding peace through common security**

**The new situation we have reached in world history is characterised by the fact that, henceforth, humanity can only survive together or perish together. Such an alternative is without precedent in history.**

It calls for a kind of political thinking which likewise is without precedent in history — for a new approach to international affairs, notably to the question of how a safe peace can be built. War must no longer be a means of politics in the nuclear age. It would mean the end of politics, and the destruction of everything.

To safeguard peace has become the basic premise for the responsible pursuit of policies.

Any policy designed to step up the arms race and to seek confrontation, military superiority, invulnerability and global hegemony does not conform to this requirement. It would be bound to exacerbate international tensions and to further heighten the threat to world peace. The dictate of the hour is to bring about a policy shift in international relations, involving common endeavours to preserve peace, dialogue and disarmament, compromise, mutual accommodation of interests, co-operation and a revitalization of the process of

detente. It must be implemented against all forces who still believe that they can achieve security by continually adding new means of mass destruction to the existing stockpiles. Such a turn in international developments, however, is not only necessary but also possible.

Peace, an end to the arms race, and detente are in the interests of both systems, all states and all peoples, in fact, of all humanity.

The number of people, organisations, parties, governments and states which take an active stand is growing, notwithstanding social, political, ideological and philosophical differences and contradictions, and their influence is becoming ever more tangible.

In East and West there is a growing number of people who realize that lasting peace and security cannot be achieved in the nuclear age by means of ever greater arsenals and more perfect military arms, but only through political action. It is not the quality of weapons, but the quality of the policies pursued which is decisive for security and stability in the world. The active involvement of all people is required to help this understanding win through and to translate it into practical policies.

Today, peace can no longer be achieved by arming against each other, it can only be agreed upon with each other. This is why common and equal security for all must be organised. This requires each side to take into account and respect the other's legitimate security interests. Only in this way can dialogue, arms control negotiations and concrete peace and disarmament initiatives make headway. Each side must concede the other the same measure of security it claims for itself.

An effective and enduring system of international security must include not only the military, but also the political, economic and humanitarian spheres. For, disarmament, dialogue and confidence-building, the establishment of a just world economic order and a common approach to global problems and international co-operation to overcome hunger are mutually promotive.

The concepts of peaceful co-existence and common security today are in the same way based on this understanding.

Political thinking and action in international relations which are commensurate with the new threat to mankind must be characterised first and foremost by the awareness and recognition that:

- the banning of the nuclear threat,
- the protection of life and provision for a decent human existence for all,
- the preservation of the biosphere and the overcoming of the ecological crisis,

- the fight against hunger, the reduction of debts and economic want in the developing countries,

constitute a task incumbent on all mankind, which has to be tackled jointly in the common interests of all human beings.

The objective of such political thinking and action is a stable and lasting order of peace in Europe and the world at large, which rules out war as a means of politics, prevents the use of instruments of military force (as long as these are not yet eliminated), can settle conflicts between states peacefully on the basis of agreed procedures, and recognises and respects the right of each nation to self determination. Military doctrines which are strictly based on defence and non-offensive capability would also serve this purpose.

The form that relations between the two social systems should assume in order to conform with the purpose formulated above is peaceful competition, non-violent argument about all political and ideological differences as well as co-operation for mutual benefit and advantage. In the process, both systems, given the fundamental socio-economic, political and ideological contradictions between them, must learn how to live with one another and get along well together.

On either side there needs to be:

- a)** predictability, frankness and restraint in the choice of their methods;
- b)** the ability to conduct a dialogue, build confidence, reach consensus, scale down distrust and fears of threats, as well as to establish partnerships to tackle joint tasks.

At present, the most important task is to halt the dynamics of arms build-up and to set in motion a dynamic process of disarmament.

### **Peaceful competition between the social systems**

The relations between the two systems are not only characterised by common, parallel or convergent interests, but also and above all by contradictory interests.

The co-existence of, and competition between, qualitatively differing and opposed socio-economic and political systems are fundamental characteristics of international relations.

But the argument about which is the better social system can only be conducted if peace has been secured and history continues.

Therefore, the competition between the social systems can only take one form, the form of peaceful competition, that is without the use of force.

Either system can show the advantages it claims to have only by example, and one which convinces people inside and outside its boundaries.

The objective of the competition between the social and political systems should be to prove which of the two systems makes the most effective contribution towards solving the key questions facing humanity, which provides the more favourable social conditions for the full development of human values and which offers better opportunities for the people to provide for their interests and rights and to attain their values and ideals.

This is, first and foremost, a matter of the contribution either one of the social systems makes towards a secure peace, the removal of the threats to the environment, and the development of the third world countries.

This includes:

- the mastering of scientific and technological progress from the social aspect;
- the development of active democracy, the implementation and further development of human rights in their interrelation with social, political and personal (individual) rights;
- the establishment of a relationship between the economy and ecology, humanity and nature, for which we can assume responsibility even with regard to future generations.

Competition and co-operation between the social systems do not only not exclude each other but form an integrated, although often contradictory, whole.

Equitable co-operation between East and West to their mutual benefit encourages the necessary change in international relations to be made and serves detente in Europe. This has been proved not least by the experience gained during the period of detente in the seventies. On the other hand, progress made in detente provides greater opportunities for co-operation amongst states in the political, economic, scientific, technological, cultural and humanitarian sphere.

Both social systems need such co-operation, because the inter-twining of the world economy is progressing, the development of the productive forces goes beyond national boundaries and the global problems are coming to a head.

Hence, co-operation between the systems and states becomes a prerequisite for the development of the national economies and the world economy as a whole, for the gradual resolution of the global problems facing mankind, for the elimination of poverty and underdevelopment throughout the world, for exchanges in the fields of culture and information; in short, for the development of human civilization.

We want a Europe which is characterized by friendly co-operation, trust

and good neighbourliness. The reinforcement of the entire CSCE process continues to constitute an important basis to this end. Both German states are called upon to make their contribution in keeping with their historical obligation and political and geographic situation.

There is no longer a sensible alternative to an active policy of safeguarding peace through disarmament and peaceful competition between the opposing systems. Nevertheless, this policy encounters serious obstacles.

Such a policy of competition and co-operation is based on the opposing social structures and principles in the two systems.

Competition between the systems, if it is accompanied by arms reductions, can further and speed up social progress in both systems.

### **A cultured political argument and dialogue is needed**

We German Communists and Social Democrats are agreed that peace in our time can no longer be achieved by arming against each other, but can only be agreed and organised together. This leads to new common interests in the struggle for peace.

Social Democrats and Communists both feel pledged to the humanist heritage of Europe. Both claim that they are perpetuating this heritage, that they are committed to the interests of the working people and that they translate democracy and human rights into reality.

But for seven decades they have argued fiercely about the manner in which this should be done. This argument is even more aggravated by the fact that both often assign different meanings to one and the same term. The Social Democrats see themselves as part and parcel of Western democracy. They consider a democracy organised on the principles of pluralism, with its multiple forms of the separation and control of powers, to be the binding framework which they are prepared to defend, at all costs if necessary, and within which they want to put their notion of democratic socialism into effect. Therefore, they consider the transfer of the most important means of production into public ownership and the political power wielded by the working class in alliance with other working people to be the foundation of comprehensive democratic rights. They understand democracy above all as the genuine involvement of the working people in the management and shaping of the economy and society, and the control thereof.

Social Democrats believe human rights as such have an absolute value and are to be protected and implemented in an ever new way against all forms of economic and governmental power. In the form of basic rights, they constitute the yardstick and objective for governmental action. They base their policy of security in society and equal opportunities in life and education on these fundamental rights and on the basic values of democratic socialism.

Marxist-Leninists claim that they have established the socio-economic foundations for the free development of the individual through public ownership and the resulting relations of political power. They regard social security, full employment, social justice and real educational opportunities for each and everyone as the inalienable foundations for democracy and the full implementation of all human rights. They insist that the implementation of human rights is linked to the further development of their socio-economic system.

Social Democrats think that vital, dynamic and, as far as possible, unrestricted pluralism in the field of culture, science, the arts and the formation of political opinion is an indisputable expression of freedom, but that it is also the prerequisite and, at the same time, a result of democracy in the service of the full development of the individual.

Marxist-Leninists are guided by the principle that the socialist society as they understand it is in a position to link scientific and technological progress with social advance inseparably, so that the individual remains the centre of all things and is not pushed to the fringe, that the creative spirit of all people, their inventiveness and the wealth of their ideas calls for, and encourages, the fulfillment of their multiple interests and needs.

The argument on these fundamental issues will go on, and so will the references to points where the theory and the practice of the one or other side do not coincide. The argument on so distinctly opposing fundamental positions cannot be concluded by resorting either to compromise formulas or appeals to the other's desire for peace. Nor would it help anybody if such contradictions were covered over. But the argument on fundamental positions could become part of a productive competition between the systems if it was conducted in such a way that Communists and Social Democrats take into consideration the policy decisions taken by the other side, do not build up any enemy images, do not cast suspicion on the motives of the other side, do not distort the other side's convictions deliberately and do not defame its representatives.

Both sides will have to face the fact that their achievements and successes as well as their mistakes and failures are the criteria by which they are judged. Communists are firmly convinced that their socialism will develop its inherent advantages — full employment, security and well-being in society for everybody, participation of the working people in preparing, deciding on and following up governmental, economic and social matters, the combination of scientific and technological progress with social advance, education and training as well as a secure future for young people — in an increasingly comprehensive manner, vis-à-vis the capitalist society.

Social Democrats trust — without underestimating the dangers inherent in

capitalist economic operations — that free, unbridled debate, the competition between ideas and approaches is the most likely way of finding appropriate answers to pressing new questions, of using new technological possibilities to achieve a higher quality of life, of mobilizing forces to counter the abuse of economic power, of preparing majorities to bring about necessary changes and to speed up the democratization of society.

Since the Social Democrats are partners in the constitutional consensus of Western democracy, though they can never assume responsibility for other, rivalling forces, they speak for Western democracy on many issues. However, they would welcome other political forces to take part in the controversial dialogue between the systems in a similar way.

## **Attempts at a culture of political argument**

For all practical purposes we are agreed that peace is the basic condition for the implementation of our respective values and principles, that co-operation with a view to preserving peace neither demands nor makes it advisable that we deny these values.

Hence, there are matters on which we are agreed and others about which we will have to continue to argue. We will have to live with the antipodes of consensus and conflict.

What does this mean with regard to the forms and contents of the argument?

**1.** Both sides have to be prepared for a lengthy period of time during which they will have to co-exist and get along with each other. No side must deny the other its right to exist. Our hopes cannot be centred on one system abolishing the other. *They are centred on both systems being capable of reform, and competition between the systems strengthening the will to reform on either side. Hence, co-existence and common security are valid indefinitely.*

**2.** Both systems must see each other as capable of peace.

Both the concept of peaceful co-existence between states with different social orders as advocated by the East and the concept of common security devised above all by Social Democrats in the West presuppose — as long as they are intended as serious propositions and are consistent — that the other side is on principle capable of peace. The theory behind both concepts would be meaningless, and they would not be practicable in the long run if they included the assumption that the other side was on principle not peaceful on account of its ideologies or structure of interests. To be able to pursue a successful peace policy, both sides must, therefore, presuppose an authentic interest in the preservation of peace in the nuclear-armed world on the part of the other — in defiance of all experiences of conflicts endangering peace.

**3.** Either system must seek to avoid being perceived by the other side as intrinsically bent on expansion, in fact, expansion with the use of force.

There was, and still is, the fear in both systems that the other system, given its structure of interests and the prevailing ideology, is intrinsically bent on expanding its sphere of influence and power. In the West, there is the fear that the Marxist-Leninist thesis of the world revolutionary process amounts to an export of revolution and serves to justify Soviet power claims. Marxist-Leninists base their respective fear on Marx's analysis of the nature of capitalist commodity production, on works by Lenin on the nature of monopoly and on their perception and interpretation of the dominant anti-communist strategies and policies of the present day.

For this reason such fears, too, will have to be scaled down in the process leading to common security. Both sides must try to do so even if they feel that such fears are based on misunderstanding.

**4.** Though treaties, accords and institutions are required for a process of jointly safeguarding peace, taken alone they are not enough. The SED and the SPD come out in favour of the development of a culture of argument and controversial dialogue. This culture of political argument must:

- be based on a realistic analysis of the opportunities open to both sides
- clearly state the socio-political contradictions
- not transfer these to relations between states
- rule out force or war as means of settling conflicts and overcome rigid confrontation
- and consequently serve a kind of peace that, in the international context, also builds on settling conflicts without the use of force.

To develop such a culture, norms of dealing with one another have to be developed which are acceptable to either side, which are manageable and give both sides an equal chance of showing their basic values to advantage. This political culture comes about as soon as declarations of intent are turned into ways of conduct and gradually a new practice emerges in daily dealings with each other.

**5.** It must become a normal thing to trade, negotiate and work with each other, while at the same time expressing frank and clear criticism whenever, as we see it, the desire for peace and understanding, human rights and democracy is not complied with on the other side. Co-operation, competition and conflict must become equally accepted forms of our dealings with each other.

**6.** The relations between the systems cannot only be governed by argument, competition and co-operation as separate entities. Competition in co-operation is also necessary. The basic interests of mankind include, alongside

peace, the preservation of the biosphere and the overcoming of hunger and misery in the third world. This calls for comprehensive co-operation between East and West. Such co-operation includes competition for each system's most fruitful contributions to tackling the great challenges facing mankind. All people would be the beneficiaries of competition in co-operation.

## **Basic rules of a culture of political argument**

A culture of political argument which safeguards peace, which, in fact, has to serve peace can only be described in its fundamental norms and rules. In political practice, such rules must be instilled with life through appropriate action by the states with different social systems and by the various social and political forces. They will be all the more successful as they prove capable of learning. Political realism will have to muster its patience. Nevertheless, it is possible to formulate a number of rules:

**1.** Social systems are in no way static. They change and develop from country to country in different ways on their own foundations. They are faced with new tasks which they are unable to fulfil without change, further development and reform. The competition between the systems can even speed up such changes. Thus, the future picture of social systems will be fundamentally different from the present one. Both social systems, capitalist and socialist, must concede each other the capability of development and reform.

**2.** No-one must invoke the right to express clear criticism and polemicise without conceding this right in the same measure to the side that has been criticised. The "sovereign equality" mentioned in the CSCE Final Act also refers to spiritual argument within the framework of the concept of detente. Criticism and co-operation must not rule out one another.

**3.** Criticism of the social relations prevailing in the other system should be based on verifiable facts. It should also be motivated by an attempt to tune in to the logic of the other side, admittedly not with a view to approving of that side's intentions all the time, but in order to understand the motives of its action. Aggressive polemics will not be the sum total of the efforts of those who make such an attempt.

**4.** The decisive aspect for a new culture of political argument is a realistic analysis and presentation of the other side rather than the propagation of wholesale enemy images and the awakening of constant fears and threats. It is necessary to avoid everything that makes the other side look non-peaceful or incapable of peace on principle.

This preparedness for peace becomes all the more credible the more both sides try to avoid or end local conflicts and not encourage them either directly or indirectly.

**5.** The ideological argument is to be conducted in such a way that intervention

in internal affairs of other states is avoided. Criticism, even in a severe form, must not be rejected as an “intervention in the internal affairs” of the other side. Anyway, the principle of sovereign equality also applies in this case to the extent that no side must claim in practice what it does not concede the other side.

**6.** Open debate on the competition between the two systems, their successes and failures, advantages and disadvantages, must be possible within either system. Genuine competition even presupposes that such debates are encouraged and yield practical results. Only in this way is it possible to compare in public the practice and experience of both systems with a view to rejecting failures, recording successes and, where possible, assimilating the latter and developing them further.

**7.** Comprehensive information for citizens in East and West assumes growing importance in the process of safeguarding peace, and assessing competition between the systems. It is therefore necessary that the states of both systems facilitate the dissemination, on their territory, of newspapers and printed publications from the other CSCE states.

**8.** The dialogue between all public organisations, institutions, forces and persons on either side gains growing significance for the safeguarding of peace and the competition between the systems. This also includes visits and return visits as well as the participation in seminars, scientific, cultural and political events across the system boundaries.

### **New way of thinking, new way of acting**

Common security cannot be achieved if ideological differences are fought out in ways that jeopardize or poison relations between states or even make power conflicts appear as an irreconcilable and unavoidable struggle between good and evil.

Common security embraces the renunciation of attempts at interfering directly in the practical policies pursued by other states, and also peaceful competition between the systems, a competition that is kept within the limits of jointly agreed rules and includes a culture of political argument and, eventually, controversial dialogue.

This complies with a policy aimed at safeguarding peace to which the SPD and the SED are pledged.

# Conflicting ideologies and common security

*Neues Deutschland*, newspaper of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED), interviewed Professor Otto Reinhold, Rector of the Academy of Social Sciences attached to the SED Central Committee

Two months prior, on 28 August 1987, the document entitled “Conflicting ideologies and common security” was published. The document, which was prepared jointly by the Academy of Social Sciences and the Basic Values Commission of the Social Democratic Party (SPD) in the Federal Republic of Germany, met with wide public response both in the German Democratic Republic and abroad. *Neues Deutschland* received many letters concerning the document and discussed the questions put by its readers with Professor Reinhold.

## Living together in peace instead of perishing together in inferno

*Neues Deutschland*: Professor Reinhold, you made a substantial contribution in preparing the joint document. How do you assess public response to the paper two months on from its publication?

**Professor Reinhold**: To begin with, I would like to say that the response to the document was remarkable, not only in the GDR and the FRG, but also in many other countries. It was understood that the document is both a result of our policy of dialogue and a contribution to this dialogue. It has become clear that it is of great importance to continue working on a coalition of common sense and realism with all those who are interested in safeguarding peace and are prepared to play their part in achieving this aim, irrespective of their political, ideological, philosophical or other views.

In his address at the international meeting of parties and movements to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Moscow, Erich Honecker said, "This document seeks, for the first time, to answer questions in a constructive manner that are now the concern of the entire working class movement and, moreover, the entire peace movement. It stipulates concrete guidelines for building peaceful co-existence and a reliable security partnership. The document, which both identifies common positions and possibilities of handling controversies in a civilized manner, points to practicable ways, enabling us to live together in peace instead of perishing together in a holocaust."

It is highly significant that the SED and the SPD hold essentially identical positions with regard to the struggle for safeguarding peace. Collective efforts are needed to preserve peace and prevent a nuclear inferno, if we are not all to perish. Of equal importance, however, is the statement that the need for co-operation does not exclude the struggle between the two systems. Rather this struggle and the dispute between the different ideologies are indispensable. This struggle, however, must be waged in a manner which encourages rather than impedes joint efforts in the cause of peace.

The view that the document might be of significance not only for relations between the SED and the SPD but between communists and social democrats in general is widespread. It is understood that the document could be extremely helpful in efforts to build a common European home because it contains many ideas on how states with different systems can operate in achieving this aim.

## **Long and difficult struggle ahead**

Of course, the discussion also provoked the conservative forces in the Federal Republic who oppose the document. Everybody is aware that people who preach, day in day out, the peril from the East, dislike the idea of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries now being presented as being capable of peace. People who repeat, again and again, that socialism is a rigid and dogmatic system are naturally full of resentment when it is established that socialism is open to development and reform and responds to new challenges with new answers that are in line with the very nature of socialism and take account of the interests of the working people.

**Neues Deutschland:** The document brings the need for an exclusively peaceful competition between socialism and capitalism to the fore and, what is more, emphasises the need for co-operation between the two social systems if peace is to be secured and the global issues facing mankind settled. What role does the class struggle have under these conditions? Is it conceivable that the class struggle may cease to play a part in international life?

**Professor Reinhold:** This is, of course, out of the question. The document is based on the premise that peace can no longer be ensured by one against the other but only together. If peace is to be ensured together it needs two sides. The Soviet Union, the GDR, the states of the socialist community have developed a clear program to this end and as can be seen are working hard on implementing it.

We cannot say, on the other hand, that the most aggressive forces in the United States and other NATO countries and, in particular, those who are involved with the military-industrial complex have yet taken a similar position. Despite the opportunities for progress in the field of disarmament that the zero option has opened up, they are going out of their way to proceed with SDI and push through numerous other programs which are at variance with this policy of disarmament. The strategy of deterrence pursued by NATO to date is certainly not likely to ensure common peace. In other words, we must reckon with progress towards that goal being accompanied by a hard and doubtless long struggle against the most aggressive quarters of imperialism.

Obviously, we must learn to live with a contradiction. On the one hand, the number of problems that can be solved only through common effort by states with different social systems is growing: the safeguarding of peace, the abolition of underdevelopment, the protection of the natural environment, energy supplies, the eradication of diseases and others. Peaceful co-existence is therefore a universal requirement. Its purpose must be to enable such co-operation.

On the other hand, the differences between the two systems, that is, between socialism and capitalism, will continue to exist and will even become wider in certain areas. Therefore the conflict between them will necessarily go on. It would be illusory to expect things to develop differently.

And, naturally, the conflict between the two systems is class-based, with the socialist system being represented by the working class and the capitalist system by the rule of monopoly capital. We, the representatives of socialism, surely cannot be expected to become friends of capitalism. Neither is there any reason to believe that the ruling imperialist quarters will suddenly fall in love with socialism. Our clear position is that this conflict must never take on military forms and that different ideological positions must not interfere with the relations among states. However, the conflict between the two systems, which are represented by different classes, does exist and will also in the future bring its influence to bear on international developments.

### **Conflicting ideologies — a form of class struggle**

Different ideologies reflect the interests of different classes, and conflicting ideologies are therefore a form of class struggle. This is particularly true when this struggle is directed against ideologies which are intended to substantiate

the imperialist course of superarmament and erect obstacles against joint efforts for peace. Apart from this there are the class struggles inside the capitalist countries themselves, caused by the system's inherent contradictions. The struggle for peace will, of course, not do away with classes and their opposing interests in the capitalist countries, a fact also made clear by the discussions at the international meeting in Moscow.

At the same time, we are taking a number of new developments into consideration. The two systems can only settle their conflict by peaceful means today and any attempt to resort to military means must be precluded because this would inevitably wipe out both systems. We believe that, in this dispute, ideological differences must not affect the relations between states, and that, in the final analysis, the deciding factor will be which system contributes more to settling the global issues of mankind.

**Neues Deutschland:** Common security requires, as the document states, that either system deems the other one capable of peace. This frequently gives rise to the question of whether the nature of imperialism, the system's inherent aggressiveness, has changed.

**Professor Reinhold:** Of course not. Lenin found that the urge for expansion is in the very nature of the monopoly, with military expansion being merely one possible form. There is also economic and political as well as intellectual and cultural expansionism. You would have to be blind and totally ignorant of any reality not to notice how vigorously the imperialist states and corporations, notably the multinationals, are fighting for their place on international markets and striving to expand. The most striking example of this is probably the technological battle, being fought out between the three imperialist centres.

## **Real opportunities for peace to win through**

Speaking of the capability of peace, we come across one decisive question: Is there a way of bringing about a situation in international affairs where war, which would be fatal for both sides, is no longer possible between the two systems? Yes, there can be no doubt about it.

The only way to live together and get along well with each other is to create precisely this situation. A number of factors indicate that it is feasible. I would like to pick out four here.

Firstly, the strength and the influence of socialism. It is an undeniable fact that the policy of peace pursued by the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community has led to considerable changes in the international balance of forces in recent years. The protagonists of military confrontation have been forced on to the defensive in many areas. We are firmly convinced that the peace policy of the Soviet Union and the socialist community meets with the approval of the majority of the people in the world and will finally triumph ensuring the survival of mankind.

Secondly, those forces in the world who, through their involvement in the peace movement and in other fields, are working for stable and durable peace have been growing. For the first time ever, entire groups of states are coming out in favour of such a policy. The SED and the GDR have made a valuable contribution towards this development through the policy of dialogue. In this connection, I would like to mention, in particular, Comrade Erich Honecker's visit to the Federal Republic of Germany and its results.

Thirdly, we can observe a remarkable process of differentiation going on in the camp of the ruling imperialist circles. There is growing awareness that the policy of superarmament and military confrontation and NATO's current strategy of nuclear deterrence is suicidal, even for the monopoly bourgeoisie. Military confrontation has been rendered obsolete as a means to be employed in the argument with socialism. Any rational person can see that no profit whatsoever can be made in a nuclear holocaust.

Fourthly, the recent crash of the stock market has made it obvious that there are economic limits to the imperialist policy of superarmament. Nothing has had more disastrous effects on the US economy in recent years than this policy. This, too, is a reason why the search for an alternative to military confrontation has begun, why co-operation, which would open up the markets and capacities of the socialist countries is desired.

This makes us believe that it is feasible to create a situation which would exclude any possibility of war between the two systems.

However, as I said earlier, it will require a difficult and certainly protracted struggle against the most aggressive representatives of the military-industrial complex. The capability of peace must be fought for.

In an article published in *Neues Deutschland* on 28 October, Comrade Kurt Hager wrote in this connection: "The task, therefore, is to make imperialism capable of peace, not that this capability is in its nature".

In other words, imperialism, monopolist rule, inevitably arouses the urge for expansion. However, there are, today, factors and objective developments which counteract this expansionist drive and, fully mobilized, prevent war from breaking out between the two social systems thus ensuring the survival of mankind.

The mass media in the Federal Republic, and some representatives of the SPD, said that it was the SED's intention to "reinterpret" some of the fundamental positions in the joint document.

This is not the case at all. Our entire peace policy would be weakly founded if we were not convinced of the possibility of both sides being capable of peace. Of course, we have always understood this is a challenge and a task to be solved together. Otherwise, why should we have included in the joint

document the formulations directed against the policy of superarmament, against those who extend the arms race to outer space and against all military doctrines that are not of a defensive nature? We do not ignore, of course, the theoretical and ideological differences in assessing imperialism and its role in the world of today. On the contrary, the joint document is based on the understanding that neither side abandons its ideological positions.

## **We strengthen socialism with its palpable benefits for all**

**Neues Deutschland:** In the document, the two sides mutually attest the capability of development and reform. How realistic is this with regard to imperialism?

**Professor Reinhold:** I do not feel that I need to go into details here explaining socialist society's capability of development and reform. Our entire policy in building an advanced socialist society is based on the notion that socialism is a progressing society. The Programme of SED says that shaping the advanced socialist society means a process of profound changes in the political, economic, social, intellectual and cultural fields. Our party has been working on translating this notion into reality particularly in the period that began with the 8th Congress in 1971. I need only recall the struggle we have been waging to intensify the economy, the formation and development of the industrial combines, the efforts to improve management and planning, the changes in the education system, and the development of socialist democracy. The 11th SED Congress decided that a new stage must be reached in combining the results of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of socialist society, a revolutionary transformation of the productive forces, to be achieved through the wide application of advanced key technologies. This process is not at all limited to the purely technological side, but involves changes in all areas of society.

And capitalism? Of course, capitalism also has to adapt to new conditions and requirements. The transition to state-monopoly capitalism was an example. Today, all industrialised capitalist countries are struggling to meet the new demands resulting from the scientific and technological revolution and international developments. The conservatives want this process of adaptation to be carried out at the cost of the working class and all working people. The representatives of the working class, and notably the trade unions, are waging a hard struggle against such schemes and are looking for a way which corresponds with the interests of the working people. It is an important aim of the strategy of the communist parties in capitalist countries to push certain reforms through within the capitalist setting. With this policy, they want to achieve improvements in the situation of the working class and the other working people and, at the same time, take steps leading to a revolutionary transformation of society.

Naturally, we should not overlook the fact that communists and social democrats have different ideas about such reforms. Communists consider reforms to be necessary steps on the road to a revolutionary transformation of social relations. Social democrats see reform as their very object.

We see the profound changes in socialist society as a totally normal process which is aimed at strengthening socialism and making sure its advantages benefit all more perceptibly.

The opponents of socialism nurture the hope that development and reform might undermine socialist society and lead socialism back on to the path of capitalism. Of course, they do more than merely hope. We have no illusions about that, and will devote all our efforts to the successful development of socialist society.

## **Enemy images**

***Neues Deutschland***; The joint document also mentions abolishing enemy images. Does this mean totally abandoning enemy images?

**Professor Reinhold**: This cannot be done as long as propaganda centres continue to invent new enemy images designed to harm the socialist countries and socialism as a whole. Hostile clichés, defamations and suspicion used to be massively propagated, particularly under the influence of cold war. The document rightly calls for an end to be put to this way of looking at the other side. As is known, our party has been striving to scientifically analyse the processes in the capitalist world and in international affairs. We will do everything in our power to continue this practice. If we hadn't adopted this approach, the relations that have grown up between the SED and the SPD would not have been possible.

Nevertheless, this does not mean that we won't establish, and say, which are the forces endangering peace, their reasons and motives. And we do what we can to oppose these forces and their schemes. This also means that, in the interests of safe-guarding peace, we make our contribution towards efforts to prevent these forces influencing and determining international developments with their dangerous and portentous politics.