

**SOCIAL MOVEMENT, SOCIAL
CHANGE: THE RE-MAKING OF
LATIN AMERICA**

edited by
JORGE GILBERT

with the assistance of: CARMEN GILBERT
CECILIA GOMEZ
MARION HARRIS

Copyright TWO THIRDS EDITIONS
All rights reserved
Address: O.I.S.E.
Department of Educational Planning
Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S 1V6

ISBN 0919509-02-9
Printed and bound in Canada

1982

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Social Movement, Social Change

Proceedings of a conference held at the
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education,
March 29-30-31, 1982.

ISBN 0-919509-02-9

1. Latin America-Social Conditions-Congresses
 2. Social Movements-Latin America-Congresses
- I. Gilbert, Jorge.

HN110.5.A7S62 303.4'098 C82-094788-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Introduction <i>Jorge Gilbert</i> | 1 |
| Opening Remarks <i>Joseph Farrell</i> | 7 |
| South America Today <i>Tomas A. Vasconi</i> | 15 |
| The North American Media And Their Treatment Of The Latin American Social Movement | 37 |
| <i>Eric Mills</i> | 37 |
| <i>Paul Knox</i> | 43 |
| <i>Carlos Chamorro</i> | 47 |
| <i>Maria E. Saul</i> | 56 |
| <i>Robert Hoogendorf</i> | 60 |
| Reagan's Policy On Latin America. <i>Jalme Osorio</i> | 69 |
| The Juridical Power In Chile In Relation To The Political Crime. <i>Fernando Zegers</i> | 77 |
| Popular Resistance In Latin America During The 70's And The 80's <i>Luis Hernandez</i> | 83 |
| Revolution In Latin America During The 80's : Strategy And Tactics. <i>Ruy M. Marini</i> | 91 |
| Canada And Latin America:Focus On Central America. <i>John Foster</i> | 111 |
| Evolution And Development Of The Salvadorean Situation <i>Carlos Vela</i> | 133 |
| Nicaragua Today <i>Carlos Chamorro</i> | 159 |

REVOLUTION IN LATIN AMERICA DURING THE 80s: STRATEGY AND TACTICS

Ruy Mauro Marini

Ruy Mauro Marini is a professor at the Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, and Director of CIDAMO (Centre for Information, Documentation and Analysis of the Workers' Movement). Professor Marini is a very well known researcher/writer in the field of dependency studies, and his main contribution to this topic is his book "Dialectica de la Dependencia", published in Spanish by Ediciones ERA, Mexico, 1974.

I shall be speaking tonight about the recent revolutionary process in Latin America. I shall begin by stating that this process is part of the world's socialist revolutionary process. What interests me basically tonight is to bring into discussion the specific contribution which the Latin American process is making to world socialist revolutionary processes.

The means of revolution, as we know, are basically two: by reforms and by armed force.

When we talk about reforms, that is to say, reformism in the strict sense, we are talking about gradual or progressive changes in the capitalist society. These reforms, on the one hand, point the way to, and on the other, assure the gaining of power on the part of the revolutionary classes. This occurs with rapid changes until the dominant class is displaced by the revolutionary sectors which are taking its place.

For those who favour the way of reform the principal elementary approach is the parliamentary

approach. An objection which is normally raised against reformists is that at a certain point the forces unify and from then on the revolutionary classes threaten the very existence of the dominant class. This class responds with methods which are no longer parliamentary. These means can be fascist, for example, the use of right wing popular groups, or may lead to a military coup, or what is most common now, a combination of the two.

On the other hand, the sectors who favour the revolutionary way propose gaining power in order to remove the dominant class. This means the use of violence, a method central to this approach in its different forms. The objection to this approach, apart from the obvious cost to life caused by violence, is that this method involves the risk of destroying the economic achievements won in the previous period, as a result of a civil war. But also holds the possibility, and this is the most serious, of restraining the socio-political process.

Once the violent situation is created, the necessity of repressing the counter-revolution can result in many disillusionments because of the need to suppress political freedom, not only of the counter-revolutionaries, but also the revolutionary sectors. It is well known that one of the normal results of a victorious military revolution is the loss of technical people, professional people, teachers and so forth through immigration.

During the last 20 years the left in Latin America has been basically concerned about the validity of these two methods of social change. The truth is that from my point of view the radical differentiation made between these two methods is a mistake. It is a mistake in the sense that if one separates them in a radical way, one loses sight of links that bind the two methods together. One can say that the relationships between reforms and revolutions are established

relationships which take the revolution towards social change as a guide. I would say that there exists right now a relationship between these two methods in the sense that those reforms, as I have described them, allow changes within the existing society which imply an accumulation of power on the part of the revolutionary forces. Nevertheless, this does not change the situation of the dominant class in the capitalist society, and the working class, while it is becoming the dominant class, struggles continuously for reforms. Thus, this class may obtain reforms which improve their situation vis-a-vis society as a whole; however, they can go no further until a qualitative change is introduced, and this is the revolutionary struggle. This is what has permitted the working class to become the dominant class, which is to say, to displace the former dominant class, the bourgeoisie.

On the other hand, if we refer to relations after a revolution has been achieved, (you understand that when I say revolution, what I mean is the change in the dominant classes, of one class for another as the dominant one), the revolutionary class starts a series of reforms within society. It does not begin by simply destroying that society but rather it moulds and shapes, and adjusts according to its class interests. In this sense, the fact that it has become the new dominant class is what allows us to appreciate the value of reforms, which will serve the accumulation of the power necessary to consolidate the new society and the working class position in it.

The confusion between these two situations can result in tragic mistakes, as occurred with Allende in Chile. If we remember the situation during the Popular Unity in that country, at a moment when the achieving of power was not yet complete, the coalition of the left in the government posed as its principal and major task what they called the "transition to socialism", that is to say, the transformation of the society, changes in a socialist sense.

This relationship between reforms and revolution has to be situated in the historic sense. Capitalism is not exclusively a national system, and the bourgeoisie does not maintain its power exclusively within a national framework. This does not mean that revolutions cannot occur within a national context, but they are carried out against an enemy whose basis of power transcends national frontiers. So, as long as capitalism is the dominant system, on a world scale, it would seem to me that every national revolution must be violent. This is why we know of no single concrete case of a peaceful socialist revolution. Another element which makes necessary the use of violence is the fact that though we defeat the enemy internally and nationally, the enemy still has a superior force of power in an international sphere, and the reaction continues to be very strong. It will and can use a wide variety of tactics, whether it is military force, or destabilization, or infiltration, or a combination of them, etc.

When the revolutionary sector wins, it needs to maintain its ability to hold power not only politically but also militarily. Now, this situation includes strategies typical of this particular point at which capitalism represents the counter-revolution. The transition or the deterioration of capitalism to a subordinate or declining decadent system on the world level will present a quite different situation which will open up the possibility of peaceful revolutionary situations.

What I have described up to now could result in three consequences. In the first place, the role of the struggle for reforms in the present situation continues to be important but it takes a secondary position vis-a-vis the preparation for revolution, understood as the violent conquest of power. Secondly, whether this situation changes does not depend on the good will of one side or the other, nor on the tactical role of the nationalistic revolutionary forces; it only depends on changes in the historical situation. In the third place,

there is the adoption of a gradual approach on the part of the revolutionary movement to achieve power. It is not then a matter of principles but a question of realism which has to be lived as part of a historical reality within which this movement is developed.

PRESENT CONDITIONS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS

Now, I would like to pass from this introduction to a consideration of the conditions under which, in the present situation, the revolutionary movements are developing in Latin America right now.

The first aspect I would like to mention is the state of relationships of forces between capitalism and socialism on the international level. Let us begin by mentioning the strengthening of the socialist world which, on the one hand, has achieved a certain military equilibrium. This, up to a certain point, makes things difficult for imperialism to function in a unified and coordinated manner in order to confront the local challenges to this system. On the other hand, this strengthening of the socialist world is expressed in an expansion of the world's socialist system, for example, the Soviet Union, East Europe, China, Cuba in Latin America, Angola in Africa, etc.

A second characteristic of this correlation of forces is due to the ascendancy of the revolutionary movements on the periphery of the capitalist system. And what is interesting to examine is how the movements in these colonial and dependent nations have all followed a certain trajectory since the two World Wars. Thus, I would distinguish three types of development in these movements which constitute important stages in these processes of liberation. The first one, I think, is the process of decolonialization which began after World War II, with the liberation processes in India and Egypt during the 40s and 50s.

The second would be the case of national liberation movements, taking Algeria as the special example, that took place between the 50s and 60s. The third and last group is the international revolutionary liberation movements, which were socialist revolutions, as in the case of Viet-Nam, at the end of the 50s and the 60s.

A third element that we have to take into account when we talk about this correlation of forces on a world level is the world capitalist crisis. But, let us pause a moment on this particular aspect.

Let us note the degree, the extent to which Marxist theory has developed to understand the crisis. What was most helpful was the development of the theory of long cycles. Thus, keeping in mind that in addition to the normal cycles (business or commercial cycles of 5 or 10 years) capitalism is subject to long range cyclical movements. Their duration would be more than 50 years, in which we define a period of growth, of development, a period of crisis, and then, a period of conflict. Insofar as we are talking about a cyclical theory, these present formulations (which have been well developed by Ernest Mandel, Samir Amin and others) originate in the works of various economists. Nevertheless, from my point of view, they were not able to prove despite several empirical studies, the existence of these longer cycles. Remember that when we speak about cycles within Marxist theory, we are talking about movements of capitalism. That is, we are talking about forces which are intrinsic to the development of capitalism. Within this, an important role is played by the raising of organic composition of capital, the tendency of the rate of profit to fall and a group of variables which are immeasurable. In this sense the crisis should be foreseeable.

When we look at these movements at longer range we see that they are the result of a group of factors which are extrinsic to the reproduction itself of

capitalism. For example, they can be the result of the discovery of great quantities of basic resources, like oil, or they could be the result of the conquest of new areas, or certain new correlations within the class struggle or technological innovations. That is to say, events which are not described or intrinsically within the capitalist cycle. Nevertheless, beyond these long term movements they cannot be characterized as cycles, which no doubt exist, but exist as periods which imply quantitative changes in the capitalist system. And this is a profound objection to the theory of longer cycles. For example, right now it would be like living through the phase of a longer cycle; that is to say, a recessive phase of the longer cycle. What we expect and hope for is that capitalism will soon enter a new phase, that is to say, a descending or declining phase within a few years' time. That is to say, right now we would be as if history were repeating itself in a particular manner. But if we look at these cycles as periods which imply qualitative changes, this I believe will open up new possibilities for the future, and the question, what is changing within the context of the present crisis.

PERIOD OF CHANGES IN THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM

So, that if you consider the period in which capitalism is changing, which we are within right now, the changes from the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century represented a shift from competitive capitalism to imperialism, the displacement of England as the world capitalist power by the United States and Germany and the effect of two World Wars. Also, the period was characterized by the emergence of socialism, with the Russian Revolution. In the same way during the 40s and the 50s we notice another change, another important period, with the growth of North American capitalism, at the multinational level, and the beginning of the strengthening of the socialist

world, which I have already mentioned, plus the expansion of socialist revolutions. So, why should we not believe that the decades of the 70s and the 80s will also be marked by a period of change? Let us consider the characteristics that this periodic change might take.

My hypothesis is that we are going through a time of change in the correlation of forces between capitalism and socialism, which open up the possibility of a new phase in world development, in which capitalism will finish in an inferior or secondary position; and this represents an important qualitative change. Within this process, or change, there will be an important role to be played by the revolutionary movements in Latin America from the world point of view. And from this, we must draw certain conclusions.

If we enter a phase in which capitalism is put into a lower or inferior position, the importance of gradual methods, that is, reformist methods, will gain significance vis-a-vis revolutionary methods. That is to say, the environment which I already commented on as the key factor in the present situation. And why is this? Because in the present stage we cannot counter-propose the disappearance or elimination of imperialism. But there is nothing that prevents us from stating that imperialism can return to the same position, that is, it could return to the same position that it had in the 50s and the 60s. It is precisely because believing that this can happen that Reagan appears to be so profoundly reactionary, because he would like to turn back instead of moving forward.

A decadent imperialism, an imperialism which is no longer dominant would have to come to some agreement with, would have to find some way of assimilating the ascendancy of the revolutionary movements in the world. And so, I ask myself whether

the policies of international social democracy, and in general, the European policy is not a foretaste, an anticipation of what we would eventually see as the normal situation for imperialism as a whole within a few years' time? I am thinking of the European policy towards the Soviet Union and the socialist world and the existence of the policy of detente, plus the growing economic cooperation which can be illustrated in many commercial agreements. In addition, we should note the European attitude towards the Third World. These are the factors that demonstrate the difference between European policy and U.S. policy regarding the Central American question.

POSSIBILITIES FOR SOCIALISM TODAY

The above describes the world situation. Now I would like to pose certain problems and see how they are being resolved. In other words, I want to discuss socialism today.

When we think of socialist economies, the main factor we look at is the development of the productive forces. This is what distinguishes modern socialism from older collectivist ideologies, and theories; in other words, the development of the productive forces, that is to say, economic development in general. One of the fundamental bases for achieving the major goals of socialism is to meet the needs, the main needs, or basic necessities of the people, but another important element is to assure this change in the world correlation of forces, which I already mentioned.

Nevertheless this development of the productive forces takes place within the limits of the world market, in which capitalism is and will continue to be important, even though it is slipping into second place on the world scale. This means that the socialist process must be founded to a large extent upon the dynamic of capitalism, whether we are talking about trade or the

general movement of capitalism as such, of the achievements in technology, etc. To close one's eyes to this would mean to take some ultra left wing detours, which has proved to be very dangerous. We have the historic example, the failure of the Chinese cultural revolution, and worse than this, the Kampuchea of Pol Pot. On the other hand, to open oneself too much could lead to right wing detours of which the most tragic is Poland.

So we might draw several conclusions. Socialism has to pursue its development keeping in mind the capital and technological development of the capitalist countries. Lenin understood this perfectly in the 20s. He proposed the policy of concessions which meant making a concession to foreign capital for the development of internal activities within the Soviet Union, under certain norms established by the Soviet State. And this is the policy which continues to be applied in the socialist world, as in the case which provoked such scandal some years ago, but which should become quite normal for the socialist world, that is the investment of Fiat in the Soviet Union. I insist that insofar as the development of productive forces continues to be a central goal of socialism, this policy will continue to be valid. Thus, we should not be surprised if countries like Cuba open their doors to foreign capital.

Nevertheless, the above is not merely a question of obtaining capitalist technology but of achieving the goals of socialism which cannot overemphasize production of consumerism. This would be typical of a capitalist society, which was the case of Poland where these measures were imposed without any restriction, without any control. Thus, following this approach of cooperation with capitalism on the economic level obliges the socialist countries to place a greater value than they have had upon ethical values. In addition they must create a system based on the political and

ideological development of their own people, so they might be in the right condition to actually adapt, to put to their own use the capital and technology they receive.

This brings us to a second point. Although the economic aspect is of utmost importance in socialist development, the political problem is the harder one. Socialism proposes a development of a popular power of the masses, but it is also an attempt to replace this power many times by a central power.

The experience we are going through in Latin America shows us that more important than resolving certain economic problems and independently of whether these problems are solved, the aim of the revolution is to assure, to guarantee this development of the power of the masses. This power is expressed in the idea that popular power is more important than nationalizations and that popular power does not always come necessarily with nationalization. This results in various kinds of revolutions which have already triumphed and which are proposing not global collectivization, or the handing over to the State of all means of properties, but the coexistence of different kinds of property during the transition phase. This was a contribution of the Chilean process during the Popular Unity Government at the economic level. That is, the creation of three areas in the economy: the State area, the private area, and the mixed area. But, the same situation exists, for example in Nicaragua today. It is also present in the Salvadorean and Guatemalan plans. At the same time, if one is going to maintain different kinds of properties, that means also that certain classes are not being wiped out. In addition, at the political level it means the existence of regimes which are much more pluralistic than were the revolutionary regimes of the past, and with much more respect towards minorities, class minorities, but also, religious, sexual minorities, etc.

What would guarantee that the revolutionary characteristics of a revolutionary class continue? It would be a proposal of this sort, which is already part of the process in this enormous development, which is already part of the revolutionary plan and which is using within the revolutionary process elements such as gradual reforms. This has been assured or guaranteed by a revolutionary democracy of the masses. These are perhaps the main differences between Latin American revolutions and the European social models which always emphasize pluralism, whereas the Latin American revolutionaries emphasize this revolutionary democracy of the masses. This is what guarantees pluralism.

What are the results of this revolutionary democracy of the masses? I would say basically three elements of capitalism. In the first place, the fact that the revolutionary forces can keep the power of the State. In order to do this they control what is basic to the State apparatus, the capacity for power. To possess this power of the State, it is necessary that they control directly the coercive capacity of the State. So the Armed Forces and Security Forces must be revolutionaries. A second element is that assured by this State, this revolutionary State, that they fully develop the organs of popular power. This was another important contribution of the Chilean process, which was however never fully developed in Chile precisely because they were not guaranteed or protected by the material forces of the State. Therefore, they were not only checked and restrained within the Popular Unity but also destroyed when the Armed Forces attacked. Finally, a third element of this revolutionary democracy of the masses is that the different social political forces are integrated in a national political front in which the other classes, including the previous dominant class, participate. In this set-up of alliances the National Liberation Front is developed. Today, this is expressed overall, in the

participation of socialist democratic forces, that is to say, International Social Democracy within these broad fronts. Tomorrow, we might think of a broader range of participation in those countries.

POWER AND CLASS ALLIANCES

I would like to point out that some consequences and problems as well derive from this scheme. One clear consequence when one tries to directly assume the power of the State, there is no other way of doing it under the present historical circumstances than to conquer that State, and to conquer it precisely by force of arms. This means by revolution and armed struggle. Thus, the revolution becomes the central issue in the revolutionary struggle in Latin America.

On the other hand, the relationships between the revolutionary forces and the other forces have assumed a new structure in Latin America. For example, we should remember that during the Soviet Revolution the power remained concentrated exclusively in the Russian Communist Party. The attempts made to create an alliance with a part of the Revolutionary Socialist Party ended up in the absorption of that small group by the Communist Party. This is a characteristic of the Russian process. Later, this was presented by Stalinism as the general characteristic of revolutionary processes; therefore, imposing the thesis of a single party which was developed by neither Marx nor Engels but which nevertheless, was imposed historically for a long period of time.

The case of the Cuban Revolution was a different process. Here we had two great revolutionary forces; the two main forces of the left: the July 26 Movement and what was then the Communist Party, that is to say, the Popular Socialist Party. Both political parties were fused into a single party after the revolution, which was accepted by the revolutionary movement, but it did not

include the participation of other forces. Nevertheless, it is different from the Soviet process. A single party did not lead the revolution; the single party was the result of the fusion of the two parties who led. But, let us observe now other revolutionary situations.

In the case of Nicaragua, El Salvador and Guatemala we find two levels of social convergence. There is the unity of the revolutionaries, and there is the unity of the Democratic Front with other forces.

In the case of Nicaragua this revolutionary unity was proposed within the same movement, the Sandinista Front, which at that time was divided into three tendencies. This was what made it possible to reunite the Sandinista National Liberation Front later.

In the case of El Salvador and Guatemala, the process of unification of the left is the result of different organizations, organizations with quite different origins. Those organizations would come out of the so-called revolutionary line; some have a Marxist origin, others are basically Christian, and there is the Communist Party. These are only some of the broad organizations which compose the National Front. In other words these Fronts are much broader. Nevertheless when we talk about the broader front we must realize that it is similar to aspects of Stalinism, but, it was always applied in an unrealistic manner and always sought the hegemony of the Communist Party over all the other forces that participated in the Front. The popular democracies of Eastern Europe are in fact single party regimes, even though they present themselves as broad front regimes. The Polish case is a typical one. The Polish National Front brought together the Communist Party as such, the Socialist Party and the Peasant Party. However, the Communists became the hegemonic group within that Front.

Let us look at the only country in which there

has been a recent and complete revolutionary process which involves these new tendencies that I have mentioned: Nicaragua. Here we notice that the unity of the left was verified in the case of the Sandinista forces. At the same time, we have the fact that a Broad National Front was formed, and this evolved into a multi-party regime after the overthrowing of Somoza's dictatorship. This Broad National Front was not like the Popular Fronts of earlier times, that is to say, it was not just a way of imposing the hegemony of one group upon all that composed it. And as you know very well, the situation in El Salvador is evolving along the same lines, given the actual diversity that we find within the Democratic Revolutionary Front. The same can be found in the case of Guatemala.

So, I think that in Latin America we are going through a revolutionary process which while tending towards socialism, and while it is part of the world's socialist revolutions, has a series of peculiar characteristics which create something like a new alternative to the former forms of socialism. That is to say, a much more democratic alternative, in which the democratic sectors which make up society are guaranteed in a much fuller way their participation in this new society. The fact that these societies are called democratic brings them much closer to socialism -that is to say, the socialism for which the socialist forces have always struggled and what socialist regimes have achieved so far. This exercised successfully the one aspect of socialist revolution, that is, the development of productive forces and the attention to the basic needs of the masses. But, developing to a much lesser degree the other line, let us observe the other dimension of socialism, which is popular democracy.

The problem of popular democracies has already been posed by classic Marxists like Lenin; he understood that socialism was what made possible the

development of the productive capacities which depend basically on it. This was expressed by the Soviets; by the popular councils, the worker councils, the soldiers councils.

I would say that for the reasons I have mentioned the international situation has changed, regardless of the way in which the former socialist revolutions were done and the problems they experienced to achieve what they are today. New possibilities are opening up which will allow us, if they have not already done so, to develop in Latin America a far better socialism than we have ever known.

Question:

Considering the most recent advances in technology, that is to say, within the most developed capitalist countries, what effect would these have within these countries themselves, thinking for example in terms of big financial capital?

Answer:

I believe that the greatest potential for technological development which we find in the most advanced countries, especially in the United States and Japan, are within their societies. In these countries, there are situations which bring them into irrational situations from a historical point of view. The development of organizations, the large scale use of robots result in situations which they find quite difficult to resolve within the limits of temporary capitalism as it now exists. The reasons are twofold. On the one hand, it increases in an impressive manner the productive capacity vis-a-vis markets which to a certain extent we could call saturated, for example, the automobile industry. This is an example where there has been an unprecedented technological revolution in the United States and Japan. General Motors, which since 1980 has had something like 12 robots, will have

250 robots by the end of the decade, which is an impressive productive capacity.

Coming from Mexico, where there are more than 12 million cars circulating, we can see all kinds of machinery working. There are holes all over the streets and the rest are full of rows of cars. They are destroying the face of the city, trying to open roads for these cars at the expense of homes, houses, parks and gardens. And so, the city continues to be saturated.

What can be done with this market? It is possible to continue increasing the capacity of the industry, which has already proven its irrationality precisely because it is based upon the idea of personal or individual transportation. In the case of the 1.4 billion automobiles which are being used in Mexico today, 90% of the vehicles transport 20% of the population, which is completely irrational. And yet, it is along these lines that the automobile industry continues to plan its development. This is one aspect of the problem. The other aspect is that the investments are not made just because the industry wants to be competitive; it wants to be productive in order to make profits. So these investments are directed towards increasing in a significant way their productivity.

Another element can be added. In spite of the significant increase in productivity, for example, General Motors in 1990 will only employ 2/3 of its present labour force. Consequently, they will not only be getting rid of a large number of workers, they will be eliminating a considerable number of jobs. A logical question then is, what will happen to the many people who will have to start looking for jobs?

When we look at unemployment rates in capitalist developed countries since the end of the 60s, this is just as true of the advanced capitalist countries

as is of the dependent ones. We observe that traditional economists maintained that there was a certain structural unemployment, that is to say, a natural and desirable margin of unemployment of 4 percent within the economy. This figure has been completely superseded. U.S. unemployment has for two decades been well above 4 percent. Once we observe this, one finds it useful to analyze dependent countries.

Capitalist dependent countries present the same phenomenon observed in advanced countries, but in the former, this condition is exacerbated. The case of Chile is significant to illustrate this situation. After the coup d'état and after important changes made in the structure of the economy, Chile entered an important period of growth until the middle of 1981, when the international crisis affected it. During this growth process, which reached 8 or 9 percent a year, the official unemployment rate (which is always lower than real unemployment), oscillated between 12 and 15 percent. This figure was much higher than historical rates of unemployment and those before the military coup. The latter shows that even during a period of economic growth, in both advanced or dependent capitalist countries unemployment remained.

These are, I believe, some of the conditions which have to be considered when you think of the technological changes which are occurring in capitalist countries. I don't see the direct link with financial capital, except insofar as we talk about an increased productive capacity vis-a-vis relatively saturated markets which cannot but exacerbate the effects of competition.

Question:

I would like to ask Professor Marini the following question. You are saying that the future of Latin

American socialism is more human, or more democratic than that of the established socialist countries. But I would like you to comment on the fact that the present or new socialist countries and the emerging ones can count upon both economic and military assistance of those established socialist countries. However, when for instance the Soviet Union emerged as a socialist country, it certainly had to count on itself alone, and in fact it was surrounded by the whole world out to destroy it. Consequently, they had to concentrate their economic development, perhaps at the price of social democracy.

Answer:

I could not agree more with you. The fact that socialist revolutions occurred in those countries like the Soviet Union was a key factor in creating better conditions for socialism. This makes more sense if you notice the important factors which characterize the change in a historical period. I first pointed out that there was a strengthening in the socialist world. Thus, I keep in mind these historical moments and since then we notice, for example, that of the Soviet Union and of Eastern Europe, the country with the highest level of development is East Germany.

Why?

Because East Germany does not have to provide the cost of war because of the Soviet Union. This assures the stability of the economy of East Germany and those of the countries of Eastern Europe.

Today we would not have in Latin America a socialist revolution like the Cuban revolution solidly in place were it not for the enormous support of the Soviet Union.

Question:

You have given us an idea of the evolution of revolutionary strategy in Latin America in the last 20 years, that is, since the Cuban revolution. Now, do you think that the other side, mainly the United States, has also developed measures to counteract this revolutionary process on that continent?

Answer:

The United States have tested a variety of methods in Latin America. They have mounted a strategic development which is the counterinsurgency strategy, which basically provides for military aid to the existing regimes, counterrevolutionary regimes, changes of government, indeed, all the techniques to overthrow governments. There is no doubt that in the case of Chile there was a great development of these techniques with the so-called "de-stabilization" the CIA planned. In addition, this technique had been tested already in some other countries but it had not achieved the same results as it did in Chile. In other words, there is no doubt that the United States have been perfecting their capacity for force. The problem with the United States is that the question of revolution and counterrevolution is not solved merely on the technical level. In this sense, what would have been the most complete response to the revolutionary movement and one which was the ultimate in counterinsurgency and the implementation of repressive regimes in Latin America has worked on the side of the revolutionaries. That is, the result has been new developments with the creative capacity of the masses to lead and guide the popular revolution. In addition, the capacity to take greater advantages from national contradictions. Thus, the whole game of counterrevolution has changed today. It began early in the 60s with the triumph of the Cuban revolution and at the end of the 70s a new phase began with the ascendancy of the revolutionary movements in Latin America. Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, demonstrate this.