Democracy and Socialism

In an interview published in the *Suddeutsche Zeitung* of 1/6/71, Luis Corvalan, General Secretary of the CP of Chile, was asked whether the democratic road used to achieve Socialism would be retained once Socialism had been achieved. Corvalan replied:

“I have made it clear in Moscow that Chile’s national characteristics must be respected. Parliamentary democracy, created by the bourgeoisie and for a long time used by the bourgeoisie as an instrument of power, has nevertheless become in Chile an institution recognised by the whole people.”

Does this mean that after the achievement of Socialism, there may be many parties, even an opposition? Corvalan replied:

“In Chile, definitely. . . Even if reactionary forces should try to change the situation by force, we would not use this as an excuse for breaking with Chilean traditions. Democracy will be maintained. . . It is clear, of course, that we do not pretend to be a model for other countries.”

Greek black colonels — Nazi Quislings

“One of these quislings is head of the current junta, George Papadopoulos, according to the well informed *Le Monde Diplomatique* (May 1969): ‘The president of the government, Papadopoulos, during the occupation served under Major Koukoulacos (rewarded after the junta’s coup with the governorship of Greece’s Agricultural Bank), commander of a battalion armed and equipped by the Germans — like all the other so-called Security Battalions (*Tagmata Asphalias*) — which conscientiously played its role as a security unit . . . against the ‘Communist’ resistance fighters!’


Movement for Socialism in Venezuela

“The CP of Venezuela split in December last year. The dissidents — representing a majority of Party members — formed the ‘Movement for Socialism’ on January 14 and elected Pompeyo Marquez, former Politbureau member of the CPV, as its General Secretary. In an interview in Paris, Marquez said, inter alia:

The MAS was formed after three years of hard controversy in the CPV. There were two streams, of which one was conservative, the other for renewal. . . The differences related particularly to the estimation of the present situation inside the country. . . The reasons for the rule of monopoly capitalist relations of production are to be found not in the USA, but within the country. . . Other
differences relate to: the question of armed struggle and the lessons of our defeats in the sixties; the estimation of the conditions of struggle within our country and of the classes which will form the vanguard in this struggle; the question of allies; the problem of internationalism, independence and sovereignty of every movement; the role of the USSR in the communist world movement; the question of socialist democracy... We do not believe in the possibility of peaceful transition to Socialism in Venezuela... But we do not believe that under present conditions, armed actions are a good means to organise the masses and stimulate mass initiative... As far as our relations with Communist Parties are concerned, we have met Rumanian, Spanish and Greek comrades. We have taken up contact with the Chinese, Cuban, North and South Vietnamese comrades. We have had unofficial talks with members of the CP of France. We are now travelling to Yugoslavia.” Politique hebdo (Paris) 8/4/71.

Crisis among the Black Panthers

“The line represented by Newton and Hilliard considers the creation of a Party of a Leninist type and the organisation of the black communities around this Party as most important... The other trend — represented by Cleaver — puts the revolt of the American lumpenproletariat and the armed struggle in the forefront... The Angela Davis case played an important role in the split. The Central Committee supports Angela Davis as a political prisoner... Cleaver has however described her as a ‘puppet’ of the CP of America, which is trying to win back the black movement and to destroy the influence of the Black Panther Party... Other areas of conflict centre on Castro: Cleaver, who was expelled from Cuba, describes the Cuban leaders as ‘revisionists’, while Algeria is described by the Central Committee as ‘reactionary’.”—Tagebuch, (Vienna) May 1970.

Sartre on the Middle East

“The war can hide the class struggle which is going on in Israel as in the Arab countries... Ask the revolutionary forces which exist on both sides to unite in order to forge together a solution to the conflict which is tearing them apart. This solution must be neither a return to the status quo, nor a simple compromise drawn from mutual concessions and therefore necessarily provisional, nor the crushing defeat of one of the belligerent parties by the other, but rather a step towards the international Revolution. The divisions among the European left on this subject have no other effect than to harden the positions of the hawkish right on both sides. If, for example, we deny Israel’s right to exist, it becomes impossible to find any response in that country when we condemn its government’s policies.”—Israel-Palestine, July-August, 1970.