

JPRS 79862

15 January 1982

# USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 16, November 1981

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	1. REPORT NO. JPRS 79862	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle USSR REPORT: TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No. 16, November 1981		5. Report Date 15 January 1982	
7. Author(s)		6. Performing Organization Rept. No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201		10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.	
		11. Contract(G) or Grant(G) No. (C) (G)	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address  As above		13. Type of Report & Period Covered	
		14.	
15. Supplementary Notes Translations from KOMMUNIST, theoretical journal of the CPSU Central Committee, Moscow, published 18 times a year.			
16. Abstract (Limit: 200 words)  The report contains articles on political, economic, military and social developments and problems within the USSR and as they relate to communist and other countries.			
17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors  USSR Political Science Sociology Propaganda Economics  b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms  c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 5C ~			
18. Availability Statement: Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22161		19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 147
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price

15 January 1982

USSR REPORT  
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 16, November 1981

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

## CONTENTS

L. I. Brezhnev's Answer to Question by PRAVDA Correspondent.....	1
Lofty Calling and High Responsibility (M. A. Suslov).....	3
Trustworthiness, Exigency and Sense of Duty (G. Romanov).....	12
Solving Strategic Problems of the Five-Year Plan (I. Arkhipov).....	28
Mature Socialism and Social Sciences (P. Fedoseyev).....	43
Topical Problems in the Social Area (A. Zdravomyslov).....	57
Revolution of the Proletariat, Revolution of the People (A. Sovokin).....	66
Robbery Under the Guise of "Interdependence" (R. Ul'yanovskiy).....	79
Life Demands Reorganization of International Economic Relations (A. Chekhutov).....	91
Darkness From Overseas (V. Nikolayev).....	104
On the Basis of Equality, Voluntary Participation and Fraternal Cooperation (M. Kulichenko).....	108



Production Management--Object of Research (P. Bunich).....	120
Socialist Society and Scientific Progress (G. Shakhnazarov).....	124
Africa Today (V. Iordanskiy).....	131
United States: Politics and Political Consciousness (V. Petrovskiy).....	135

PUBLICATION DATA

English title	: TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 16 Nov 1981
Russian title	: KOMMUNIST
Author (s)	:
Editor (s)	: R. I. Kosolapov
Publishing House	: Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"
Place of Publication	: Moscow
Date of Publication	: Nov 1981
Signed to press	: 2 Nov 1981
Copies	: 894,000
COPYRIGHT	: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

L. I. BREZHNEV'S ANSWER TO QUESTION BY PRAVDA CORRESPONDENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 81 p 3

[Text] Question: Recently, U. S. President Reagan said that to judge from Soviet leaders' conversations "among themselves," the Soviet Union considers victory in a nuclear war possible. He used this argument to substantiate his policy of accelerated expansion of the U. S. nuclear arsenal.

Leonid Il'ich, what can you tell us about this statement by the American President?

Answer: I leave to Mr. Reagan's conscience the suggestion that he is familiar with what Soviet leaders say among themselves. As to the substance of the question, let me say the following:

The thoughts and efforts of the Soviet leadership, like those of the entire Soviet people, are aimed at preventing a nuclear war in general, at removing the very threat of its outbreak. What we say among ourselves is what I said publicly from the rostrum of the 26th CPSU Congress: to attempt to win the arms race or to hope for victory in a nuclear war is dangerous madness.

Let me add that only someone desiring to commit suicide could start a nuclear war in the hope of winning it. However great the might of the attacker and whatever means of unleashing a nuclear war he might have chosen, he would be unable to achieve his goals. Inevitable retribution would follow.

Such is our viewpoint, based on principle. It would be a good idea for the President of the United States to issue a clear and unequivocal statement rejecting the very idea of a nuclear attack as criminal.

Why, we ask, would the United States refuse to support the proposal submitted by the Soviet Union to the current UN General Assembly on not to be the first to use nuclear weapons?

If there is no first nuclear strike there could be no second or third. This would make speculation on the possibility or impossibility of victory in a nuclear war groundless, and the question of nuclear war as such would be dropped from the agenda.

This is precisely what all peace-loving people on earth are striving for, and it is the goal of the consistent efforts of the Soviet Union and its leadership. Therefore, the United States and its leadership have the last say.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003

CSO: 1802/4

## LOFTY CALLING AND HIGH RESPONSIBILITY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 81 pp 4-11

[Speech by M. A. Suslov at the All-Union Conference of Heads of Social Science Chairs, delivered on 14 October 1981]

[Text] Comrades! All-union conferences of heads of social science chairs are now taking place periodically. This is natural, for the dynamic processes of social development, the big tasks in the building of communism and the raising of new generations of Soviet people steadily present our social scientists with complex problems and demand steady progress in their scientific and teaching work.

This conference will deal with the problems facing the personnel of social science chairs in the light of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress. The congress defined the paths toward the further development of mature socialism and the increasingly complete determination and practical utilization of its constructive possibilities. It formulated clear guidelines for the new five-year plan and for the 1980s on the basis of a profound Marxist-Leninist analysis of contemporary social processes. The congress gave a new impetus to the struggle for peace and international security.

In this conference, it will be important to bring to light everything positive that has been acquired in recent years, to pay attention to major work shortcomings which are still extant, and jointly to earmark measures which will help to upgrade the role of the chairs in the development and diffusion of Marxist-Leninist theory and the ideological and political upbringing of new detachments of specialists.

It gives me great pleasure to present to you the warm greetings and very best wishes of Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev. Leonid Il'ich asked me to say that the party assigns great value to the work of the personnel of the chairs in higher educational institutions -- the largest unit of our social scientists. The party has entrusted to you one of the most responsible sectors, which largely determines the development of the spiritual potential of Soviet society. The success of your work will greatly influence the level of the ideological and political maturity of the cadres and consequently the pace of social progress.

Comrades! The stipulations of the 26th congress -- the highest party forum -- are being confidently implemented. Problems in converting the economy to an essentially intensive track of development, rational utilization of the country's production potential and conservation of resources of all kinds are being systematically



resolved. A wide struggle has been launched throughout the country and within each labor collectives for the implementation of the 11th Five-Year Plan, which is the main assignment issued by the congress to all party organizations.

The example of many leading collectives proves that the fusion of the scientific socioeconomic strategy of the party with the creative enthusiasm of millions of people is the guarantee for the successful implementation of daring and far-reaching plans for the development of the country and the steadfast implementation of the main task: ensuring the further well-being of the Soviet people. This precisely is the purpose of the many steps contemplated in the latest party and government decrees.

Naturally, the implementation of the congress' decisions is not free of difficulties. The party's intensification course is still frequently obstructed by inertia, rigid economic thinking, departmentalism, parochialism and bureaucratic distortions. This cannot be tolerated. One of the most important tasks set by the congress is the decisive elimination of obstacles which hinder our economic growth.

As a whole, there are reasons to believe that industry will have a good year. In agriculture objective reasons have created a complex situation. As we know, considerable parts of the country were affected by a lengthy drought. However, despite such difficult conditions the leading farms are harvesting substantial crops. The secret here is found in the high-level organization and dedicated work of field and livestock farm workers and the systematic use of scientific farming methods. It is precisely this that makes it possible to oppose the whims of nature successfully.

Comrades! The international situation has been aggravated in recent years. Aggressive imperialist circles, mainly in the United States, representing the interests of the military-industrial complex, are trying to turn the wheel of history back -- to undermine detente and to return to the cold war. They are increasing military budgets in an effort to disturb the existing military-strategic balance and to gain one-sided superiority. The decision to deploy American medium-range nuclear weapons in Western Europe and Reagan's decision to produce neutron and other weapons are intensifying the arms race even further. Imperialism is creating crisis situations in some parts of the globe and is grossly interfering in the internal affairs of other countries.

The firm and peace-loving foreign policy of the CPSU is countering these imperialist plans and actions, which are threatening the cause of peace. The initiatives aimed at improving the international situation formulated at the 26th congress received the powerful support of all people of good will.

Life has fully confirmed the assessments and conclusions of the the 26th CPSU Congress on the laws and the trends in contemporary global developments and the reasons for the current aggravation of the international situation. The falsity of demagogic speculations on the "Soviet military threat" is becoming increasingly apparent to the world public. The movement of the popular masses for the preservation of the peace and the development and consolidation of detente and against the arms race and the threat of war is becoming increasingly more powerful.

International developments and recently held talks with many leading Western political figures are further proof that the idea of the intensification of detente is alive and that this is precisely the means which such sober-thinking politicians believe offer a possibility of finding a realistic solution to international problems and to the preservation of peace.

The results of the Crimean meetings and talks between Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and the leaders of the socialist states triggered a broad response throughout the world. These encounters proved once again that the Soviet Union and all the members of the socialist comity remain the main bulwark of peace on earth and are consistently defending the cause of detente and the right of nations to free and independent development.

The imperialist circles are trying to weaken the socialist comity. For quite some time, imperialism has been making covert and overt efforts to weaken the foundations of socialism in the Polish People's Republic, to aggravate the crisis in that country and to nurture and inspire active efforts on the part of antisocialist and counterrevolutionary forces.

Let us remind them in this connection that socialist Poland, the Polish communists and the Polish people can firmly rely on the fraternal solidarity and support of the Soviet Union and the other members of the Warsaw Pact.

The might of the joint forces of the socialist comity and the prestige of the Leninist policy of peace and cooperation among nations give us the right to speak of the future with a feeling of confidence. Peace on earth can be defended, and we shall spare no effort to achieve this.

Comrades! The entire history of the building of socialism and communism confirms the need to secure and to strengthen the leading and guiding force of the communist party. The Marxist-Leninist party is playing a leading role in society because it is continuously strengthening its relations with the working people, improving the ways and means of the party's leadership of all aspects of socioeconomic life and structuring all its activities on the basis of a profound scientific analysis of social development trends.

Even after becoming the revolutionary vanguard of the entire Soviet people at the developed socialist stage, the CPSU has fully retained the class nature of its ideology and politics. The party approaches all problems in domestic and international life from strict class positions as it struggles adamantly for the triumph of communist ideals. Under contemporary conditions, the increased leading role of the CPSU is manifested through the objective law of the building of socialism and communism and the firm principle of truly democratic development of society.

During all the stages of its historical development, the party has always paid unabated attention to the development of Marxist-Leninist theory -- the only accurate teaching which makes it possible to illumine our future progress with the light of scientific prediction. The theoretical thinking of Marx, Engels and Lenin is distinguished by its continuing creative link with the historical experience of millions of people and tireless creative search. It is this that makes their theory

the most influential political and spiritual force of our time. This is also the basis for the way our party is developing its theoretical activities today.

This was clearly confirmed by the 26th CPSU Congress. The accountability report presented by L. I. Brezhnev and all congress materials convincingly proved the party's ability to note promptly and to give a theoretical interpretation to the new phenomena, trends and real processes occurring in social life and, on this basis, to find effective means for the solution of ripe problems.

The party justifiably gives priority to the theory of developed socialism among the new summations and conclusions which have been added to the CPSU theoretical arsenal in recent years. We see in this concept the biggest achievement of creative Marxism-Leninism and the necessary theoretical and methodological base for the solution of the basic problems posed by the present stage of social development.

The party's concept of developed socialism as a legitimate and lengthy historical stage and of extensive possibilities which still exist for progress in our society within the framework of the first phase of communism gives a powerful impetus to the further development of the social sciences.

V. I. Lenin pointed out that one cannot be a Marxist and a revolutionary without participating in the development and application of revolutionary theory to the full extent of one's forces. The processes taking place in the developed socialist society and the course of world events present social scientists with complex new problems and require the systematic development and enrichment of all the structural components of Marxist-Leninist theory, such as philosophy, political economy and scientific communism.

The further development of problems in dialectical materialism, which Lenin purposefully described as the living soul of Marxism, assumes particular importance under contemporary conditions. Dialectics has always been the only methodological tool of knowledge because it is irreplaceable in terms of its possibilities and power. A great deal remains to be accomplished in the study of the specifics of the effects of the general laws governing the development of socioeconomic systems at the present stage, the interaction between the base and the superstructure and other problems of historical materialism.

The solution of qualitatively new problems which arise in the conversion of our economy to primarily intensive development increases the role of socialist political economy as the theoretical base of the party's economic policy. In this area we have the right to expect fundamental studies of problems of expanded socialist reproduction, rational utilization of industrial and scientific and technical potential, improvements in the economic mechanism and advancement of distribution relations.

Many complex and sometimes grave problems arise in the field of scientific communism due, among other things, to the dynamics of our social development. It is a question of studying the laws governing the organization of a classless and subsequently of a socially homogenous society, the new levels which show the leading role of the working class in this process and the social consequences of the scientific and technical revolution. The study of the new features in the development of national relations and the further unification of the ideological,



social and international community -- the Soviet people -- and the study of the other social phenomena mentioned at the 26th party congress assume great importance.

We must thoroughly encourage the study of the extremely rich history of our party. A profound theoretical interpretation of its great historical experience enables us to reach a better understanding of the laws governing social development and constitutes a firm base for the communist convictions of the Soviet people. This is the reason for its tremendous educational importance.

Let us particularly emphasize the energizing of comprehensive research through the joint efforts of representatives of different social sciences. This is consistent with the requirements of Marxism-Leninism as a unified integral theory. This particularly applies to the comprehensive study of the effect of the main socialist principle "from each according to his capabilities and to each according to his work" at the developed socialist stage. The economic, social, political, juridical, organizational and other measures aimed at increasing control over the amount of labor and consumption and the stricter observance of the principle of unity among the interests of society, the collective and the individual must be developed on a comprehensive basis.

However, we must avoid going to extremes or pitting the moral incentive against the material incentive system. For example, we cannot accept the view of some scientific and even economic workers on reduction in the role of wages as a labor incentive as an alleged law of developed socialism. This is a far-fetched conclusion. In fact, life calls for an increase in the stimulating role of wages. This requires that a direct dependence between their amount and actual labor results be established always and in every respect. A considered approach to this problem will permit us to formulate scientific recommendations for the adoption of effective measures, which will exclude and prevent violations of this just socialist principle and close all loopholes allowing unearned income for parasites and all kinds of lovers of easy profits.

The fuller and more systematic implementation of the basic principle of socialism is of major national economic importance, for it enables us to increase interest in labor results not only on the part of individual workers but also labor collectives and entire production sectors. At the same time, this will help to develop a communist attitude toward labor in the people. It will promote their ideological and moral upbringing and will have a beneficial influence on the utilization of the advantages of mature socialism and the advancement of the socialist way of life.

The most important task of our social sciences is the extensive formulation of the scientific foundations for the molding of the new man. In this area, priority is given to the further enhancement of the effectiveness of the ideological-political, labor and moral upbringing of the Soviet people and the level of their Marxist-Leninist awareness. A more profound study must be made of the problems of the guided development of the needs of the individual and the laws governing the shaping of socialist conscientiousness and spiritual life in the developed socialist society. The interest shown by the working people, the student youth in particular, in problems of cultural and moral progress is growing tangibly. All of this offers broad scope for creative work and effective cooperation among philosophers, psychologists, historians, sociologists, jurists, educators and specialists in ethics, esthetics, literature and the arts.

The modern world is characterized by the increasing interaction and interweaving of internal and international factors. That is why we must always keep in sight the processes which are taking place in the world socialist system, the international revolutionary movement and the area dominated by monopoly capital. Social scientists must also pay attention to the so-called global problems -- ecological, food, energy and raw material -- which have become especially acute in recent years.

The fruitful development of all of these and many other problems is possible only on the basis of Leninist methodology and a profound study of life. The party and the state are sparing no effort to ensure the successful development of the entire set of social and natural sciences. At the end of the 1970s, the funds allocated for science in our country accounted for approximately 5 percent of the annual national income. This is one of the highest such indicators in the world.

The role of VUZ science is a very important part of the scientific potential of Soviet society. Suffice it to say that the higher schools employ almost one half of all doctors and candidates of sciences. In the social sciences VUZs have particularly great possibilities, for they account for almost 80 percent of all the social scientists in the country. Naturally, the party has the right to expect of VUZ scientists a substantial contribution to the development of the theoretical and practical problems formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress.

Science demands creative daring, an uncompromising search for the truth and the creation of an atmosphere of efficient cooperation, good intentions and party principle-mindedness in each scientific collective. This is the only way to obtain greater practical returns and the only way social theory can fulfill its full role as an instrument for the revolutionary transformation of the world. "...The more daringly and decisively science advances," Engels pointed out, "the more consistent it becomes with the interests and aspirations of the workers."

Our leading party scientific institutions -- the Institute of Marxism-Leninism and the Academy of Social Sciences of the CC CPSU -- must set the example of joint and truly creative work, exigency and a critical attitude in social science collectives.

As was emphasized at the 26th CPSU Congress, reality proves that one of the main obstacles to the development of the social sciences is the enduring inclination to engage in scholastic theorizing. In fact, fruitless and irking debates on concepts and definitions in political economy, philosophy, sociology, law and other fields have been ongoing for years and even decades. Meanwhile, discussions on topical problems are sometimes timid and sluggish and do not always turn into practical and comprehensive exchanges of views.

The fact that some social scientists put a distance between themselves and vital subjects considered "topical" makes itself felt in many areas. That is why no tangible help should be expected from such scientists. It is hardly necessary to prove that such a stand clashes with the basic stipulation on strengthening the ties between social sciences and life and conflicts with the concept of the duty of the communist scientist. The stipulation of the 26th party congress to the effect that science must be the "disturber of the calm" fully applies to our social sciences. Their task is to study the new processes in life, to encourage thinking, firmly to struggle against sluggishness in science and, metaphorically speaking, to be forward looking.



Within the scientific collective of the VUZ, social scientists must be able to rally and direct the efforts of the other chairs in giving comprehensive aid to the party committees of the city, oblast and republic in resolving topical problems of socioeconomic and spiritual development. In this case, it is important to ensure precisely the comprehensive development of the various intersectorial problems of the area.

Giving the party committees active assistance in their ideological and propaganda work is an important sphere of activity for the VUZ social scientists. The value of speeches made by social scientists to broad audiences such as those in labor collectives and places of residence and in guiding methodical councils and propagandist seminars is priceless. Today, the effective and creative participation of faculties of social science chairs in reorganizing the ideological activities of party committees, updating propaganda and helping Komsomol organizations in their work among students assumes particular importance.

Comrades! The primary duty of the entire faculty of the VUZs, the social science chairs above all, is to train specialists who have properly mastered Marxist-Leninist theory, who are able to put it to practical use, who are clearly aware of the objectives of our party and who are infinitely loyal to its great cause.

We must always remember that today's student is tomorrow's specialist and that he will soon be heading and leading collectives of people. That is why it is so important to combine the professional with the ideological and political training of the future specialists.

The introduction of a social science course for the entire duration of VUZ training has contributed to the more profound mastering of Marxist-Leninist theory by the students. Their social and labor activity has increased. However, life goes forward and a great deal remains to be done by party organizations and social science chairs before the VUZs can fully play their role as centers for the Marxist-Leninist education and communist upbringing of the future specialists under contemporary conditions.

In this respect, it is of prime importance to upgrade the ideological and theoretical level of teaching Marxist-Leninist theory. In order to ensure the profound and integral study of revolutionary theory, we must develop in the students the habit of studying the works of K. Marx, F. Engels and V. I. Lenin, CPSU documents and the works of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev systematically and thoroughly. This is incompatible with scholasticism and dogmatism, in which the real study of Marxist-Leninist theory is replaced by latching on to individual quotations and superficial commentaries. During their student years, our young people must develop the desire to increase their knowledge of the foundations of communist ideology steadily. Only then can we consider that the teacher-social scientist has fulfilled his obligations as an ideological tutor of the youth.

Nor should we tolerate the fact that in some chairs social sciences are taught with no relation to the specific political and socioeconomic problems which affect young people. Life has indicated again and again that the involvement of student youth in the profound mastery of Marxism-Leninism and the historical experience of the CPSU must be closely related to the practice of the building of communism and the development of the social activeness of the students. Participation in the projects

of our entire people turns the theoretical concepts and knowledge of socialism and communism drawn from books and lectures into the active life stance of the fighter for communism.

In this respect, our higher schools have gained extensive and fruitful experience. Student participation in scientific societies, theoretical conferences, social science competitions, mass agitation work with the population and summer labor semesters has proved its usefulness. These forms of work must be improved and enriched.

We must also give some thought to making the teaching of social sciences itself more lively, active and creative. The students must learn how to determine by themselves the interconnection between the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology and the political course followed by the CPSU. They must develop skill in writing reports and delivering public addresses and participating in debates to defend communist ideology.

Comrades! The serious aggravation of the ideological struggle in the international arena must be taken into consideration in educational work with students. Our class enemy and his propaganda and special services have mounted a real psychological war against the USSR and the other socialist countries. Many of their subversive actions are aimed at Soviet youth, including the students. We must not ignore the fact that bourgeois propaganda occasionally exerts some influence on a certain although small percentage among them.

We shall allow no one to blacken the historical accomplishments which the Soviet people have achieved under the leadership of our Leninist party. It is the duty of the social scientists and teachers of the social sciences to arm the young generation of builders of communism with a clear understanding of the universal-historical significance of what the Soviet people, who are paving the way for all mankind, have accomplished.

Greater attention must be paid to the ideological training of the students. We must steadily develop in them a resistance to hostile ideology and propaganda along with lofty moral and political standards. We must educate them in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism, political vigilance and readiness to defend the socialist fatherland.

In this area success largely depends on the extent to which this work has been conducted in a lively and informal fashion by the party committees of higher schools and by their first assistants in this matter -- the social science chairs. Truthfulness, sincerity, clear class assessment of all domestic and international events and the ability to answer even the most complex and pointed questions clearly, substantively and convincingly instead of avoiding them is the main strength of our communist propaganda in the struggle against the intrigues of our ideological opponents.

One of the main problems in upgrading the standard of teaching social science and in the communist education of the students is that of cadres. This is a problem which the party always keeps in sight. The steps taken by the Central Committee made improving the qualitative structure of social science teachers possible. The current VUZ training system essentially meets the country's need for social science

cadres. Although we give proper credit for such accomplishments, we must mention that some problems in this area remain unresolved.

Problems related to further improvements in the training and assignment of social science teachers have been highlighted, and that of the selection of young people to study basic social science subjects in the VUZs remains unresolved. The work of skill-upgrading institutes is not entirely satisfactory. The shortage of highly skilled social scientists -- professors and doctors of science -- is still sharply felt in many VUZs. More than half of all chairs lack any such personnel.

In the final account, the solution of all of these problems will contribute to the training of highly skilled specialists who will dedicate their knowledge, energy and strength to the building of communism.

Comrades! The duties of the social science teacher are honorable and responsible. To the student youth the social science teacher is the representative of contemporary Marxist-Leninist thinking. It is with his help that the future specialist can reach the full depth of the purpose and the force of the scientific ideology of the working class. This creates special requirements for the intellectual, ideological-political and moral features of the teacher and his personality. The social science teacher must impart not only knowledge but his convictions, party passion and moral experience to the students.

The social science teacher is a creative person. He is always in step with the latest achievements in science, art and social life. He tries steadily to enrich his knowledge, for as we know, a teacher remains a teacher only as long as he himself keeps learning. He is an intelligent person in the full meaning of the term, highly cultured, sensitive, attentive and responsive to others but uncompromising on ideological matters. He sets the example for the students in terms of ideological and moral principle-mindedness and loyalty to the party and communism.

These are high and strict requirements dictated by our very reality, the deeply revolutionary and creative nature of Marxist-Leninist science and its growing role in the spiritual life of our country and all mankind.

I wish your conference successful work, and good health and creative achievements to all its participants. I am confident that the results of this conference will contribute to the further improvement of the scientific and teaching activities of Soviet social scientists.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003

CSO: 1802/4

## TRUSTWORTHINESS, EXIGENCY AND SENSE OF DUTY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 51 pp 12-27

[Article by G. Romanov, CC CPSU Politburo member and Leningrad Oblast CPSU Committee first secretary, on practical experience in work with Leningrad party organization cadres]

[Text] The decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the stipulations and conclusions included in the Central Committee's accountability report submitted by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC general secretary, embody the lofty principles and creative spirit of Leninism, provide clear answers to the basic problems of our time and arm the party members and all working people with a scientific program for the further development of the Soviet state. Once again, the congress convincingly asserted the great role of the CPSU -- the collective leader of the Soviet people and their political vanguard, which is confidently leading the country down the constructive road.

The implementation of the broad and complex problems of the 11th Five-Year Plan -- mainly upgrading work effectiveness and quality, accelerating scientific and technical progress and completing the conversion to an essentially intensive track of development -- is the core of the activities of the party, soviet and economic organs, the trade unions and the Komsomol today. The attention of the cadres in all units in the party and state apparatus and all sectors of the economy, science and culture is focused on the solution of these problems.

The importance and content of cadre policy problems have always been influenced by the scale of the party's constructive objectives. It is well known that the new stage in this policy began with the October 1964 CC CPSU Plenum and became inseparably linked with the fruitful party and governmental activities of Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, who is a model manager in the Leninist style and an example of dedicated service to the people and to the ideals of communism.

The Leningrad party members welcomed with profound satisfaction the conclusion reached at the 26th congress to the effect that the work of Central Committee plenums and the Central Committee Secretariat and Politburo at all levels has been purposeful and highly organized in all aspects of the shaping of party policy, cadre selection, organization and control of execution and enhancement of the role and responsibilities of party organizations. This work is based on the firm foundations of Marxism-Leninism.



The Central Committee documents and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's works and speeches provide a profound theoretical and practical substantiation of topical problems in cadre selection, placement and upbringing. The democratic bases of work with people are being improved steadily, and trust in and respect for them are combined with principled exigency. In developing these norms, which have become firmly entrenched in our life, the 26th CPSU Congress assigned priority to the need for further all-round strengthening of discipline and personal responsibility to the party and the people, particularly on the part of economic, soviet and party leaders.

## I

Guided by Lenin's belief that after a political line has been formulated, the choice of people who can effectively struggle for its implementation becomes decisive, the oblast party committee considered the tasks of the Leningrad party organization regarding the further enhancement of cadre responsibility for assignments profoundly and thoroughly at its first plenum after the 26th CPSU Congress.

As in the rest of the country, much has been accomplished in our oblast in recent years in strengthening all sectors with politically mature, highly skilled and experienced comrades. Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev expressed his great appreciation of these comprehensive efforts at the 26th party congress. He noted that the Leningrad party organization had achieved good results in developing the creative activeness of production collectives and the communist education of the working people.

This success did not come about by itself. It has become the rule to analyze the status of the work with cadres in industry, agriculture, construction, transportation, public services, scientific establishments, schools, vocational-technical schools, secondary specialized and higher schools and creative unions and organizations at obkom, gorkom and raykom party plenums and bureau sessions. The party committees are promoting continuity in the management of various sectors, the proper combination of mature and young workers, the systematic renovation of cadres and the promotion of capable new organizers. Active use is being made of tested means and methods, such as control and supervision of execution, criticism and self-criticism, the setting of personal example, checking the people's practical work, persuasion and encouragement and, if necessary, punishment.

The submission of reports by managers and talks with them and the practical training and certification of specialists have become quite widespread. Cadre training and retraining and political and economic education have been given an important role. They are structural elements in the system which has been organized, is being made operational and is being perfected by the entire oblast party organization.

The increased leading role of the CPSU faces the party workers with stricter requirements and particular responsibility for the effective implementation of party policy, including personnel problems. This is why party committee cadres are a subject of prime concern to the CPSU obkom.

Currently, the city and rayon party committees, in which all the threads of economic and social management are interwoven, have been strengthened with party members with tested practical experience and with the necessary political and organizational



qualities. On the whole, they are implementing assignments successfully. All secretaries and the absolute majority of the personnel in the party gorkom and raykom apparatus have higher education and considerable experience in production work and in primary party cells. More than one half of all department heads and 85 percent of their deputies are under 40 years of age, and two thirds of the instructors are under 35.

The primary party organization secretaries' structure has improved. Whereas 10 years ago no more than 80 percent of this category in the aktiv had higher or secondary education, today the figure is 95 percent of the total. Secretaries are being replaced less frequently, and the number of workers, national economy specialists and women among them has increased.

The ability of party organs to fulfill their functions completely greatly depends on the qualitative structure of the elective party aktiv and the possibility of relying on it in daily work. A total of 3,500 party members have been elected to positions in the oblast, city and rayon party committees; almost 85,000 party members belong to party committees and primary and shop party organizations and more than 21,000 are party group organizers. The combat capability of the primary party organizations is greatly influenced by the fact that almost one out of every five party members is also a member of some elective party organ. This has a direct influence on the style, methods and manner of their work.

Positive changes have taken place within the soviet organs. The cadres of the executive committees of soviets of people's deputies have been strengthened. Among the chairmen of local soviets, the number of economic specialists and people properly familiar with the production process has increased by one half. Members of the young generation are being made people's deputies with increasing frequency.

Leningrad and its oblast have skilled economic cadres. In recent years, the management of the various sectors has been taken over by specialists with excellent political, business and moral qualities, economic management experience and a combination of competence, initiative and concern with national interests. The qualitative structure of the engineering-technical and scientific cadres is improving steadily. In the past 10 years alone, the number of graduate specialists increased by half while that of doctors and candidates of sciences increased by a factor of 1.7.

The shifting of agriculture to an industrial track necessitated substantial cadre changes in the sector. Today, nearly all managers and 80 percent of all chief specialists in agricultural enterprises and three quarters of all heads of crop growing and animal husbandry brigades are engineers, technicians, agronomists, zootechnicians or economists. A similar trend can be seen in construction and transportation organizations and other production areas. We can state quite confidently that most work sectors are headed by people who can resolve even the most complex problems.

We know that our party ascribes tremendous importance to the general educational and professional growth of the working class. During the past 5 years, more than 1.6 million Leningrad workers have improved their skills. One out of every two workers has a higher, incomplete higher, secondary specialized or general secondary education. In industry, the number of production workers engaged in mechanized or automated work has increased.

The CC CPSU has frequently noted the positive experience of the Leningrad party organization in training workers in mass skills. During the last 10 years alone, the vocational training schools have graduated 570,000 people, most of whom have a secondary education, and assigned them to various sectors. Today, vocational technical school graduates account for the majority of workers in many labor collectives, in agriculture as well.

The homeland has bestowed high awards upon thousands of workers, scientists, specialists and party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol workers for their efforts. Several have been awarded the title Hero of Socialist Labor; more than 300 were made laureates of the Lenin or state prize and many were presented with honor badges. This is one of the convincing proofs of the tremendous creative potential of our cadres.

## II

The "Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985 and the Period Through 1990," which was ratified by the 26th CPSU Congress, assigned the people of Leningrad the tasks of concentrating on the reconstruction and technical retooling of enterprises, increasing specialization in the production of high technical standard and quality goods, ensuring the fuller use of production capacities, increasing labor productivity faster than the volume of output and planning the further comprehensive development of the city's economy. The means for the implementation of these directives and for ensuring the maximal utilization of the production and scientific and technical potential and cadres were comprehensively analyzed at the meeting of the oblast party committee aktiv after the congress.

The main question facing our economy involves ensuring a more rapid increase in labor productivity. The experience of frontranking collectives, which were already able to increase the volume of output without additional workers during the 10th Five-Year Plan, proved that the goal was realistic. The party obkom bureau approved the initiative of the working people at the Shipyards imeni A. A. Zhdanov (V. A. Yemel'yanov, director, and V. D. Balabasov, party committee secretary) and the Central Boiler Turbine Institute imeni I. I. Polzunov Association (N. M. Markov, general director, and V. V. Afonin, party committee secretary) for ensuring the growth of output with the same installed capacities and volume of scientific research while actually reducing the number of workers.

The Znamya Oktyabrya, Plastpolimer and Petrodvortsovy Chasovoy Zavod Associations and other collectives are working in precisely the same way. The All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Hydroengineering imeni B. Ye. Vedeneyev, the All-Union Scientific Research and Design Insitute of the Aluminum, Magnesium and Electrode Industry and the Scientific Research and Engineering Institute of Chemical Machine Building are increasing their volume of scientific research and development without increasing their personnel.

The dissemination of this experience and the participation of hundreds of enterprises and organizations in the implementation of many target all-union, sectorial and territorial programs for the creation and application of the most effective scientific and technical achievements will enable us to reduce the personnel employed by 2-3 percent by the end of the 11th Five-Year Plan. This

means that it will become possible to reduce manpower requirements by tens of thousands of people as compared with ministerial manpower assessments.

The steady attention which the party's Central Committee has paid to strengthening the material and technical base and the social reorganization of the Nonchernozem zone in the Russian Federation have brought about major qualitative changes in the countryside as well. The efforts of the CPSU gorkoms and raykoms and soviet and agricultural organs to encourage specialization and concentration and the creation of sovkhoz production associations as a basis for faster scientific and technical progress and for increasing labor productivity have resulted in substantial growth in farm output. Compared with 1975, deliveries to the state have increased by 20 percent for milk, 28 percent for meat and 63 percent for eggs.

However, the high standards of the 11th Five-Year Plan, by the end of which production must reach 1,050,000 tons of milk, 260,000 tons of meat and almost 2 billion eggs, require first of all further concentration of the efforts to strengthen the fodder base.

This subject was especially discussed at a recent party obkom plenum. Its participants unanimously agreed that the availability indicator for locally produced rough and fresh fodder must be considered most important in summing up the competition results and awarding bonuses to farm workers, specialists and managers. The implementation of the comprehensive program for the development of a feed base and mixed feed industry in Leningrad Oblast will result in a considerable increase in feed production.

Today, when the scale of public production has increased and economic relations have become particularly complex and widespread, the strict observance of plan and contractual discipline assumes utmost importance. In his letter to delegates to the 26th party congress Heroes of Socialist Labor V. P. Vinogradov, a CPSU member since 1915, and V. S. Chicherov, a brigade leader at the Metallicheskiy Zavod Association, Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev emphasized that "To us, the plan is the main thing. It must be fulfilled strictly by all productive collectives." This requirement is always kept within sight by the party and soviet organs and economic managers, who are persistently working for the fuller utilization of capacities and capital investments and all available resources.

Unfortunately, we also have managers who work at below-capacity level and fail to ensure the implementation of plans. Some of them do not hesitate to cite "objective" reasons, including claims that assignments are unrealistic or unsupported by resources. The legitimate question, however, is why such people, who head big collectives, readily agree to such plans at the time of their formulation but subsequently fail to display the necessary insistence and principle-mindedness in fulfilling assignments, and fail to support them with the necessary organizational and economic work and engineering and economic computations for the mobilization of reserves.

Naturally, reactions to difficulties may vary. It would be ideal, of course, if there were no difficulties at all. But life is life and breakdowns in deliveries of raw and other materials and complementing items do occur. In such situations, one must act more energetically in order to correct the situation with the least possible damage to the state.



The changes which have taken place at the Fosforit Association are typical in this respect. At the start of the last five-year plan, the CPSU obkom bureau reviewed the report submitted by the leaders of that enterprise, which had been consistently failing its assignments. The simple conclusion was that the main reason for the chronic lag was poor performance discipline and the low level of work with cadres.

The association's party committee and economic management (Yu. A. Shadrin, general director, and N. S. Baulin, party committee secretary) and the Kingisepp city party committee (A. I. Myachin, secretary) drew proper conclusions from the criticism. Steps were taken to upgrade the responsibility of the party organizations and party groups for the state of affairs in the collective. The main services were strengthened and the necessary conditions for the further development of socialist competition, improving the certification of engineering and technical workers and the quality of specialist training and the solution of social problems were created.

Results were not slow in coming. Labor discipline violations declined by one half and cadre turnover diminished. The 5-year assignment was fulfilled ahead of time, output increased by a factor of 2.4, and more than 2 million tons of valuable chemical fertilizers were produced above the planned figure. Based on the results of the five-year plan, the Fosforit Association was awarded the Red Labor Banner Order, and Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev congratulated the collective on the installation of new production capacities.

The Fosforit example is hardly an isolated case. It teaches us a great deal, mainly about how to analyze the activities of lagging units extensively, to determine the main reasons for shortcomings, to determine the best ways of eliminating them, select the proper people and to direct their efforts toward ensuring high end results. Although not simple, such matters are extremely important.

In this connection, the CPSU obkom formulated recommendations on increasing control over the activities of lagging sectors. They call for a systematic analysis of the state of affairs, mandatory consideration of the reasons for each case of plan nonfulfillment and adoption of effective measures to eliminate the lag. As a result, the number of collectives which fail to fulfill their plans has been steadily declining in the rayons.

Party organizations, labor collectives, scientists and specialists are increasing their efforts to reduce the time needed for the creation and mastery of the use of new equipment, to improve production quality and to increase the conservation of raw and other materials, metal, fuel and other resources.

For example, a useful initiative was launched by the thousands-strong collective of the Elektrosila Association (B. I. Fomin, general director, and A. F. Yankov, party committee secretary). The plan here is to increase output without increasing rolled metal outlays by improving product technology and design and ensuring the more efficient utilization of raw and other materials. This initiative, which was approved by the oblast party committee bureau, is being emulated with increasing frequency.

Nevertheless, the party's most important stipulation to the effect that the economy must be economical is not always followed completely. Some enterprises and design

and engineering organizations still pay scant attention to making economical designs of machines and mechanisms. Little use is being made of wasteless technology. Substantial investments in some sovkhoses yield poor returns. Construction at some projects is suffering delays.

Although seemingly disparate, such cases are as a rule caused by only one reason: a lack of responsibility for assignments. Let us point out that effective definition of functions, rights and obligations, so that no one could justify errors by claiming a lack of knowledge of his prerogatives and lay the blame on someone else, is the very foundation of management science and practice.

The successes of the Svetlana Association are widely known. Here, as a result of steady improvements in the organization of labor and production management, all duplication by the different services has been eliminated. Every worker is clearly aware of his obligations and is rewarded according to the quality of their fulfillment. Naturally, the organization of such a management system is not a matter of days. However, the strictly party approach adopted by the association's management (O. V. Filatov, general director, and V. V. Shul'deshov, party committee secretary), the ability to select, place and lead cadres, bold thinking, anticipation of the consequences of decisions, initiative and attention to and exigency toward people make the excellent results inevitable.

However, some associations, scientific research institutes and design bureaus are still too timid in their efforts to centralize management and production specialization. Some enterprises and organizations set up services and departments without sufficient technical and economic grounds, in violation of standard regulations and personnel norms. Small subunits are created artificially and the efficient ratio of engineers to technicians is not observed. Despite the extensive application of automated control systems, the volume of administrative and managerial personnel in some organizations has not been reduced.

The current procedure for the payment of bonuses to specialists must be improved. Justifiable objections are being raised at worker meetings and in working people's letters regarding the so-called "deductions" [vyvodilovki] according to which equal bonuses are awarded to virtually every one, whether he does his job or not. The still poor organization of labor norming is one of the reasons for the continuation of this erroneous approach. Frequently even the installation of new equipment or the use of new technology is not followed by prompt revision of the obsolete norms. This hinders the growth of labor productivity. Such practices dampen enthusiasm and provide nutritive soil for manifestations of a consumerist mentality, money-grubbing and the tendency to give less to and receive more from society among unstable people.

Dishonest management practices and moonlighting as sources of easy additional income should be mentioned as well. Naturally, there are sectors such as medicine and science in which private specialists' services are admissible within reason. However, moonlighting is practiced by people who rarely do their best at either their main or their second jobs. This occurs most frequently where work and accountability are not efficiently organized, control is poor, there are production violations and work deficiencies are corrected carelessly.



The party organizations must put a firm end to such phenomena, particularly since there are today tested methods for improving labor effectiveness, such as combination of skills, expansion of service areas and the movement of multiple-machine handling. In particular, the practice according to which enterprises are given the right to control the bonus fund and the portion of the wage fund saved as a result of reductions in the number of workers (similar to the Shchekino method) is entirely justified. However, such experience is not becoming widespread because the central organs base the wage fund on the actual number of workers, thus considerably reducing the incentive for the collective to pursue this line.

Let us particularly single out the brigade method used by more than half of all city and oblast production workers in industry, construction, agriculture and transportation. It was precisely in the brigades that many useful labor initiatives were born, and it is precisely the brigades which provided an effective method of combining collective with personal responsibility for end results.

The organization of brigades is a complex and painstaking process. Practical experience has indicated that it involves not only organizational restructuring but frequently the disruption of customs and the surmounting of a kind of psychological barrier, not only on the part of the workers but of management also. Here everything is important: the creation of the necessary organizational and technical conditions, the brigade leader's prestige, and the cohesion of the labor cell. Of late, the party committees have begun to study the activities of the best brigades and brigade leader's councils more thoroughly, to show concern for developing an active reserve force and training leaders of primary collectives, to actively promote production innovators and party and Komsomol members to such positions, and wherever the necessary conditions exist, to create party groups or to appoint party organizers.

Currently, together with the people's control organs and the financial authorities, the councils for economic and social development of the city and rayon party committees have undertaken a thorough study of the structure of the management and the tables of organization of enterprises and organizations. The purpose is to make them consistent with the norms governing the number and category of their personnel, with a view to reducing the number of engineering and technical workers and above all the administrative personnel. The objective is for every working person to hold a proper job at wages consistent with the type of work performed. As we know, this was particularly strongly reemphasized at the 26th party congress.

Naturally, the work of cadre services at enterprises and organizations is not exempt from such reviews. We frequently hear that anyone could do their jobs. Naturally, if the function of such departments were merely to record the hiring and firing of personnel no particular talent would be necessary. Today, however, more is demanded of them: a profound knowledge of people and production needs, future developments and the need for specialists and workers in the mass professions.

The personnel services can and must become more actively involved in the development of the automated registration of workers' movements. They must improve the vocational guidance and selection system, display efficiency in personnel training and retraining and work for the elimination of the causes of labor discipline violations and cadre turnover. This responsible sector must be kept under close and permanent control by the party committees.

### III

The comprehensive assertion of the Leninist work style is the most important prerequisite for effective cadre policy. It is based on a scientific approach to the solution of the problems in economic and cultural construction, collective management, close ties with the masses, strict exigency based on a profound study and objective evaluation of the political and practical qualities of the workers and extensive development of criticism and self-criticism.

The CC CPSU has recently issued a number of documents on such matters. The Central Committee decrees "On Further Improving Control and Supervision of Execution in the Light of the Decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress" and "On the Work of the Primary Party Organizations in Industrial Enterprises in Voronezh in Controlling Administrative Activities" are of basic significance in upgrading cadre responsibility. The assessments and conclusions contained in these most important decisions are a good foundation for the further strengthening of party and state discipline.

We concentrate on having the party, soviet and economic organs combine control of execution more closely with live organizational work. The number of commissions in charge of controlling administrative activities has increased. The Leningrad Higher Party School held a special seminar for their managers.

Unfortunately, not all party committees are making effective use of this reliable tool for strengthening discipline. As we know, good decisions are frequently made. However, control of their execution is not always specific and efficient. Some party organizations do not engage in principled criticism of shortcomings, and avoid asking manager-party members for reports on their personal contributions to the implementation of party decisions. Arbitrary and subjective methods in cadre selection have not been eliminated, as a result of which poorly trained people with inadequate political, practical and moral qualities are promoted to responsible positions. In some cases, people who know the extent of their capabilities refuse one position or another, but submit to pressure applied to them, and subsequently have to be relieved from their duties because of inability to handle the work.

Practical experience shows that a real manpower reserve is necessary if we are to avoid errors in promotions. The party obkom, gorkoms and raykoms select comrades with the necessary experience, knowledge and organizational aptitudes carefully, taking the opinions of primary party organizations into consideration. Thus, the oblast party committee keeps party gorkom and raykom personnel with proper party and economic training in reserve. In turn, many obkom department personnel are recommended for leading positions in city and rayon committees and soviet and trade union organs.

We deem it expedient to recommend for membership in party committees experienced economic managers and specialists in various economic sectors who, after mastering the methods of party work, are frequently appointed as managers of big enterprises or scientific research and design establishments.

The integration of science with production, the establishment of big party organizations at associations and the creation of expanded party committees have provided

further opportunities for improving the work with management cadres. A considerable number of such party committees, of which there are currently 38, are also a source of reserve personnel for promotion. As a rule, active work in a party committee is a guarantee that, all other conditions being equal, the worker who has had such training will be able to resolve more difficult problems better than others can.

The procedure followed in most enterprises is to discuss the qualities of a worker who is being considered for future promotion comprehensively at party committee or bureau meetings. The position which he is scheduled to fill is clearly defined, and he may assume it only with the agreement of the party organs. This method has proved to be effective. In recent years, for example, at the Kirovskiy Zavod Association (B. A. Muranov, general director, and S. P. Chernov, party committee secretary), higher and middle management has come only from the ranks of association specialists who have proven their capabilities.

Very effective work is being done by the administration and the party committee of the Baltic Maritime Shipping Administration (B. P. Trunov, chief, and E. A. Skopintsev, secretary). During the past 5-year period, all vacancies for captain, first officer and senior mechanic which developed for a variety of reasons were filled by reserve personnel. The same procedure was followed at the Znamya Truda Association (S. I. Kosykh, general director, and B. S. Sokolov, party committee secretary).

Particular mention should be made of the reinforcement of the party and economic apparatus by Komsomol activists. We know that as a rule they are full of energy and ardor and daringly undertake the solution of complex problems. However, they are sometimes short of experience and broad knowledge. With this in mind, the party committees try to organize a system according to which Komsomol workers undergo mandatory tactical training in collectives where they are not ignored, are helped whenever necessary, and receive advice and moral support. This method has paid off. Many heads of big associations, enterprises, sovkhozes and other structures, who were Komsomol activists until recently have shown their mettle in their new positions.

The party organizations make wide use of private talks -- a tested method of upgrading cadre responsibility. Well prepared in advance, and conducted in a frank, principle-minded and well-wishing atmosphere, such talks are an effective means of control and education. They must make an impression on the party member, strengthen his positive qualities and help him to correct his shortcomings. Naturally, it is very important that the recommendations made at such meetings be followed up.

However, it would be wrong to claim that everything in our work with reserves is as it should be. Important positions frequently remain vacant for long periods of time. Here and there, a formalistic approach predominates, subjectivism gains the upper hand and no public and collective discussions are held to consider promotions. The responsibility for this lies mainly with the party committees and bureaus, which have apparently failed to realize fully that the right to control administrative activities, as stipulated in the CPSU Bylaws, entrusts them with this high obligation.



The party apparatus plays an important role in the practical solution of all problems handled by the elective party organs. It determines the effectiveness, activeness, prestige and influence of the party committees to a large extent.

In recent years, a great deal has been done to improve the qualitative structure, to eliminate duplication and lack of coordination in the work of the departments and to ensure the more efficient organization of record keeping. Some of those who, sparing no effort and time, work enthusiastically and creatively with the apparatus include first secretaries of party raykoms and gorkoms such as A. I. Kirsanov -- Kalininskiy; A. F. Dubov -- Kirovskiy; V. N. Krikhunov -- Moskovskiy; V. M. Grebnev -- Luzhskiy; and N. F. Fedorov -- Tosnenskiy.

Understandably, however, in the light of the requirements of the 26th party congress, a substantially new approach must be applied in the organization of the work of the apparatus today, and the most effective methods must be developed creatively. Unfortunately, the time of gorkom and raykom instructors is frequently taken up in short meetings and preparations for and implementation of a variety of tasks. A study of the utilization of the time of the personnel of some party raykoms has shown that a considerable part of it is spent at their work places, and their visits to primary organizations are frequently reduced to mere appearances.

Not all rayon party workers are able to make a thorough study of the state of affairs, to single out positive experience and to find the reasons for negative phenomena. Insufficient time is allocated for personal contacts with heads of small collectives and secondary-level cadres at their work places.

Shortcomings are to be found in the work style of the soviet organs as well. They do not always show the necessary persistence in resolving problems in economic construction and the coordination of the activities of all the enterprises and organizations in their assigned territories. Elements of formalism and red tape and instances of an inattentive attitude toward the letters, needs and demands of the working people can be found in city and rayon practices.

Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev emphasized at the 26th CPSU Congress that "The style and method of management is an important problem facing the entire party, the entire people. This must always be kept in mind. We must be guided by the Leninist norms in everything. This is the direct obligation of every party manager!" This thought expresses the requirement facing all leading cadres with extreme clarity. Its implementation is the duty of all party units.

#### IV

Every day, party committee workers face a variety of problems, large and small, which may be more or less difficult or urgent. To use Lenin's words, it is very important to remember that no amount of conscientiousness or reputation can replace the main thing: knowledge of the matter.

In raising the cadres in a spirit of high responsibility, the oblast party organization pays very close attention to arming the leading workers with the tools of the modern science of management, with the art of guiding social processes. In the interval between the 24th and 26th party congresses, more than 600 people in the

oblast were given higher party and political training. More than 11,000 party, soviet and ideological workers were retrained at oblast and interrepublic courses, and several people graduated from the CC CPSU Academy of Social Sciences and the Academy of the USSR National Economy.

Gorkom, raykom and primary party organizations are training managers of primary party units. The Leningrad Higher Party School, the city's leading VUZs, the Political Education Club and the University of Marxism-Leninism are fruitfully participating in this process.

Various methods are used in training economic managers and specialists. More than 80,000 people are enrolled in various skill improvement courses and in universities for economic knowledge and seminars. Never before have so many people been retrained on such a scale in our oblast.

Similar work is being organized thoughtfully in our agricultural sector. Every year, on the basis of a thorough and comprehensive evaluation and on the recommendation of city and rayon party committees, young specialists who have proven their abilities are assigned to a 6-month training course at the management school of Leningrad's Agricultural Institute. During the last five-year plan, virtually all of them were promoted to higher positions. Most of them returned to the collectives which had assigned them to the course. This is important where lagging production sectors or economically weak farms are involved.

However, seemingly good results frequently conceal gaps in the content of the training, from which a certain alienation from life and superficiality have not been eliminated. A differentiated approach to the training of each separate category of the aktiv has not been adopted everywhere. Seminars and practical science conferences on specific problems are not being used sufficiently.

As we know, the scientific and technical revolution accelerated the obsolescence of knowledge, and the theoretical and practical knowledge acquired in the past may eventually prove to be insufficient. We have seen that sometimes even specialists in metal-processing sectors and managers of technical services are insufficiently familiar with modern scientific and technical developments, such as powder metallurgy, plasma metal processing and group technology.

The shortcomings of the current skill-upgrading and cadre-training systems can be largely explained by departmental lack of coordination among individual units and the absence of a single coordinating center. There is no clear division of areas of action among sectorial skill-upgrading institutes, VUZ faculties for retraining executive personnel and departmental and territorial courses. Training methods and periods have not been standardized. There is no efficient long-term plan for upgrading skills and retraining cadres.

As a result, the current system still fails to exert the necessary influence on the training of cadre reserves, for improved skills or retraining are rarely considered as prerequisites in appointing a specialist to a higher position.

The increased complexity of the economic and social processes in all areas of sociopolitical life calls for upgrading the level of school education. In general, the city's VUZs have actively responded to the requirements of scientific and

technical progress. During the past 5-year period alone, more than 200,000 specialists with a higher education, graduated by Leningrad's VUZs, have started work in the national economy.

Greater attention is being paid to ensuring that the schools train the necessary number of engineers and technicians in the skills most consistent with the needs of the most important economic sectors in Leningrad and the northwestern part of the country. To this effect, training in 20 new fields has been initiated, among other things, and enrollment plans in more than 50 areas have been amended.

Training and educational work in the vocational-technical training system is being improved further. It has been joined by many creatively-minded educators, masters of vocational training and noted Leningrad worker-tutors, who share their professional and practical experience with the youngsters. Let us note the increasingly popular practice of assigning graduates to the labor collectives in which they took their practical training. Unquestionably, this helps to retain them in their jobs. The vocational-technical schools have become more responsive to modern economic requirements and to work with an eye to the future. Larger numbers of workers possessing broader training are being graduated.

However, we still face the problem of achieving a better balance between the enrollment plans of vocational-technical schools and the availability of local labor resources. Today, the vocational training system has everything it needs to undertake seriously the solution of the important problem of professionally selecting new students. We must think more not only about how to fulfill the enrollment plan but also how to help adolescents choose the type of skills most consistent with their inclinations.

## V

The fact that the implementation of all economic, social and political tasks is inseparable from the process of shaping the new man was emphasized at the 26th party congress. Today's builder of communism is a conscientious worker with a high political standard, a patriot and internationalist, the product of the party, the heroic history of the country and our entire system.

It is fully understandable that the selection, placement and upbringing of ideological cadres and the aspiration to have politically mature and initiative-minded people possessing high-level theoretical and specialized knowledge is a matter of ongoing concern to the party obkom, gorkoms and raykoms. More noticeable efforts have been made in this direction in the course of the implementation of the CC CPSU decree "On Further Improving Ideological and Political-Educational Work."

Currently, more than 200,000 propagandists, political informants, lecturers and speakers are working in the party and Komsomol training and economic education and mass training systems. A high percentage among them have higher political education. They are characterized by a great sense of responsibility for the content and results of their work and are persistently looking for new ways and means of influencing the people. The ideological and professional standards of journalists and workers in education, culture and the arts have risen and their participation in sociopolitical life has grown. The party committees pay greater



attention to the organization and planning of political education, training and upgrading the skill of all categories in the political aktiv.

Although much has already been done, we must admit that the reorganization of this most important area is still sluggish and that omissions are still being eliminated with less energy than is required. For example, the obkom bureau's discussion of the reports submitted by the Volkhov party gorkom and the party committee of the Baltiyskiy Shipyards showed that propagandists, lecturers and speakers were not always ready to answer pointed questions and that there was no unity between educational means and the strategic tasks of the individual collectives.

All of us know how very valuable the lively and intelligible words of a lecturer may be. However, frequently presentations are frankly boring and superficial. The opposite, when in an effort to gain cheap popularity, some lecturers try to amaze their audience with "sensations" and with their alleged special access to information, can also be found. The fact that these are not isolated cases is confirmed by the results of the certification conducted by the Knowledge Society, as a result of which some workers were denied the right to lecture.

The fame of our city, the cradle of the October Revolution, the city-hero, the symbol of the courage and firmness of the Soviet people, with its consummate architectural and historical monuments, is universal. Leningrad enjoys profound respect and love throughout our homeland and abroad. This makes the fact that the lofty ideological and moral qualities which are the common features of Leningraders are not the basis for the actions of every resident of the city all the more annoying. Whitewashing, padding state accounts, violations of trade and consumer service rules and thefts of socialist property still exist.

All of this proves the existence of serious flaws in the work with people and the lack of exigency and the necessary moral climate in some collectives. Recently B. P. Barinov, formerly director of a scientific research institute, was expelled from the party by the oblast party committee bureau for abuse of his official position and violation of party ethics. Serious breaches of state discipline, the squandering of incentive and state funds and the misuse of official trips were discovered at that institute. The former institute manager went so far as to resell privately owned cars for profit. All of this was done with the clear connivance of S. M. Ryzhov, institute party bureau secretary, and V. A. Kapustkin, trade union committee chairman. They too were given a severe party reprimand and were fired.

The party obkom persistently sees to it that any illegal act, regardless of who commits it, is properly assessed by the primary party organizations. To this effect, increasing use is being made of the influence of party control and public opinion. Naturally, the personnel of the administrative organs have the final say in the battle against such violations. The party and the state value their difficult but honorable work highly. They must always combine their professional knowledge with civic courage, incorruptibility and justice.

The role of the intelligentsia -- teachers, writers, scientists and artists -- in the upbringing of the new man, the youth in particular is particularly important and honorable. Adolescence is a time when a person is preparing for independent life and when a number of "whys" and "hows" demand convincing answers. Such answers must be supplied by the older generation, whose members, through word and deed, must pass

on to the young the best traditions of the party and the people and propagandize the Soviet way of life. Our joint efforts must be focused on ensuring continuity and consistency in the educational process -- from the family and the school to the labor collective and from the first book read to modern plays and motion pictures.

The party presents our art with special ideological requirements. Inaccurate ideological emphasis or a superficial or one-sided interpretation of life could harm the work of the artist and the educational process. As we know, much depends on the social climate among the artistic intelligentsia. Professional exigency and intolerance of dullness and facelessness in art must be increased. Literary criticism, the press and the literary-artistic periodicals, which have a great influence on the content and direction of the creative process and on shaping the tastes of viewers and readers, must take a more active stand in this matter.

The party directs cultural institutions and creative associations toward the development of a sensitive and respectful attitude toward talent. It also calls for intolerance of the absence of ideas, indiscriminate approaches and political near-sightedness. This is the basis on which the large and prestigious detachment of Leningrad's artistic intelligentsia and the party members working in the creative organizations is trying to organize its work and to judge its results.

At the 26th party congress, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev described the complex and tempestuous nature of world events and presented an expanded program for the further struggle for detente and peace. The ideological confrontation between the two systems has also intensified with the worsening of international circumstances. The imperialist reaction has mounted a real psychological war against the Soviet Union, using all available means, such as economic pressure, blackmail, false propaganda, malice and demagoguery. The indoctrination of Soviet youth and the artistic intelligentsia with a view to the ideological reorientation of some of them plays an important role in the subversive activities of the Western ideological diversionist services.

These fierce attacks are countered by the vitality of our social system, the historical truth and invincible power of Marxist-Leninist theory and the ideological convictions of the Soviet people. We must continue to display the greatest possible vigilance, to promote intolerance of hostile propaganda and firmly to rebuff ideological currents and provocations alien to socialism.

Profoundly mastering the wealth of ideas, thoughts and experience concentrated in the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th congress, our cadres are trying to reach the level of the party's requirements. This means that they must combine obedience and discipline with initiative, practicality with aspiration to lofty objectives, and a critical attitude toward shortcomings with the readiness and ability to correct them quickly.

Together with all working people in the country, the working people of Leningrad and its oblast are persistently working to implement the 11th Five-Year Plan. Tens of millions of rubles have been earned above the plan since the beginning of the year. Compared with the same period of last year, the production of gas turbines, light industry technological equipment, livestock breeding and feed production machinery, chemical fertilizers, cameras, television sets and other consumer goods has increased. The production of more than 1,230 new varieties of goods has been

mastered. Considerable work has been done to introduce progressive technological processes and mechanization and automation equipment.

In developing socialist competition under the slogan "From High Labor Effectiveness of the Individual to High Labor Effectiveness of the Collective!" Leningraders pay particular attention to the economical and rational utilization of labor, material and fuel and energy resources. This has enabled them to ensure faster labor productivity increases and to achieve the entire increase in industrial output with a reduced number of workers. Substantial quantities of electric power, thermal energy, fuels and metal have been saved.

The oblast's farmers are hard at work. Assignments on the sale of crop and live-stock products to the state are being met successfully. Currently the party, soviet and economic organs in the countryside are concentrating on organizing indoor care for cattle and increasing cattle productivity in the winter season.

The construction workers are ending the year with good results. The construction of the Leningrad Nuclear Power Station imeni V. I. Lenin was completed successfully. It reached its planned generating capacity of 4 million kilowatts ahead of schedule. This considerable contribution to the development of the country's fuel and energy potential was noted in the congratulations offered by Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev. Today, the construction workers are concentrating on the timely completion of all the key important state projects, mainly those with deadlines, and on meeting their assignments for housing and cultural construction.

The rate at which the collectives of the Leningrad transportation junction are handling shipments of national economic freight is being accelerated comprehensively. Seamen, railroad workers, river workers and truckers ascribe particular importance to the efficient utilization of transportation equipment and to reducing the above-norm idling of rolling stock.

All sectors of Leningrad's economy face major tasks. Their successful implementation will be yet another serious test of the political and professional maturity of the city and oblast working people. Currently, the labor collectives are actively preparing to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR. Hundreds of thousands of production frontrankers have pledged completion of their assignments for the first half of the five-year plan, delivery of equipment to the most important construction projects in the country ahead of time and mastery of the production of many new types of equipment and high-quality consumer goods by that noteworthy date.

Guided by the requirements of the party, the state and the national interests always and in everything, and constantly resolving the problems in improving the effectiveness, work quality and responsibility of cadres, the Leninist party organization is doing everything possible to increase its contribution to the implementation of the historical decisions of the 26th Leninist party congress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003

CSO: 1802/4



## SOLVING STRATEGIC PROBLEMS OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 81 pp 28-41

[Article by I. Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers]

[Text] Proceeding from the objective needs of society and the profound study of the economic situation, the 26th CPSU Congress formulated the main task of the 11th Five-Year Plan: to ensure the further growth of the well-being of the Soviet people on the basis of the stable progress of the national economy, the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, the conversion of the economy to an intensive development track, more efficient utilization of the country's production potential, comprehensive conservation of resources and improved work quality. The main content and continuity of the economic strategy of the CPSU, whose main objective is the good of the people, are defined in its main objective precisely and clearly.

As programmatic documents of tremendous mobilizing force, the CC CPSU accountability report to the party congress and the "Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985 and the Period Through 1990" became reliable guidelines for all economic activities in the 11th Five-Year Plan.

Extensive and purposeful work is under way on the implementation of the tasks stipulated in the "Basic Directions." In recent months, a number of resolutions have been passed by the CC CPSU, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers on many problems which arose in the course of completing the implementation of the 10th Five-Year Plan and the formulation and nationwide discussion of the draft CC CPSU plan for the 26th party congress. They are consistent with the stipulations of the congress and their implementation requires the continuing tireless attention of economic management organs.

Our objective is to implement the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the ideas and assignments formulated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary. Today, the thoughts and actions of the working people and all activities of party and public organizations and soviet and economic organs are focused on reaching this objective.

The 26th CPSU Congress substantiated the fact that today the most rational way to resolve economic problems is all-round production intensification. The need to accelerate it is related to a number of important factors. On the one hand, the balance of manpower resources will be less favorable than in the past and mineral



extraction costs will be higher, for resources located in hard-of-access eastern and northern parts of the country will have to be developed and environmental protection costs will increase in the 11th Five-Year Plan. On the other, quality requirements in the consumption area will become increasingly strict.

Under these circumstances, high end national economic results can be achieved mainly through the more effective utilization of material, financial and labor resources, active use of progressive equipment and technology, accelerated reconstruction and technical retooling of operating enterprises and improved economic management.

"Translated into practical terms, economic intensification and improved efficiency," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress, "mean mainly that production results grow faster than outlays, and that more can be achieved with smaller resources."

The tasks formulated by the congress are complex and important. Suffice it to say that in the 11th Five-Year Plan the growth of the national income must be achieved with smaller increases in capital investments compared with the 10th. However, these assignments are also realistic, for the country has a powerful scientific and production potential, rich natural resources, and the rich stock of skilled cadres needed for their implementation. Naturally, great efforts will have to be made. Above all, it will be necessary to make fuller use of the advantages of the socialist economic system. Existing reserves will have to be placed in the service of society and work shortcomings in all sectors will have to be decisively eliminated.

## I

One of the basic factors in production intensification, common to all economic sectors, is the improved utilization of available production potential. The CC CPSU accountability report stated that "Today...we can resolve any important and difficult problem. However, a seemingly simple and rather ordinary matter -- a thrifty attitude toward public property and the ability to make full and expedient use of everything we have -- is the linchpin of economic policy."

Thus formulated, the question becomes clear and understandable to any working person. It is approved by the Soviet people, for waste means scorn for labor, which is totally intolerable in a society which has at its disposal only that which labor has created. The task of improving all economic work must be looked upon exclusively from such truly party and state positions.

Our country has a rich mineral and raw material base. A significant share of the world's petroleum, natural gas, coal, iron ore and other minerals is concentrated in its territory. This is the base for the creation of one of the biggest extracting industries in the world in our country. However, the existence of such a rich raw material base does not in the least reduce the timeliness of the need for thrifty use of these resources. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized at the congress that "We are responsible for their proper and thrifty utilization not only to the present but to future generations. No one has the right to forget this."

Improving the degree of extraction of minerals from the ground, reducing extraction, transportation and storage losses, and comprehensive and intensive processing of

the raw materials are some of the major components of production effectiveness. Major possibilities exist in this area.

Reducing the material intensiveness of goods is of exceptional importance. We know that a 1 percent reduction in material outlays on a national scale ensures an increase in the national income of more than 6 billion rubles. This percentage is increasing steadily.

The party and the government pay steady attention to the development of the fuel and energy complex. The level of extraction (production) of the most important types of fuel and energy resources contemplated for the 11th Five-Year Plan will enable us to ensure further improvements in the country's fuel and energy balance. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's instructions on the need to reduce the share of petroleum used as fuel by replacing it with natural gas and coal and the faster development of the nuclear power industry, including the building of fast neutron reactors, are being implemented. Compared with 1980, in 1985 the share of natural gas, including well-head gas, in the fuel and energy resources of the country will increase from 24.8 to 31.5 percent; the share of petroleum, including gas condensate, will decline from 42.1 to 38.5 percent. Electric power generation by nuclear power plants will triple. Increased electric power production at thermoelectric power plants will be based essentially on the more extensive utilization of the inexpensive coal of the Ekibastuz and Kansk-Achinsk coal basins and the gas deposits in Tyumenskaya Oblast.

Compared with 1980, petroleum extraction in 1985 will increase by 27 million tons or 4.4 percent. Total petroleum extraction in Western Siberia, the Komi ASSR, Kazakh SSR, Udmurtskaya ASSR and other promising areas will exceed 93 million tons.

By 1985, 356 billion cubic meters of natural gas, or 57 percent of the all-union extraction, will come from the West Siberian petroleum and gas complex, compared with 156 billion in 1980. Also by 1985, almost 86 percent of the wellhead gas will be used, thus reducing its losses from 14 billion cubic meters in 1985 to 7 billion. A total of 43,000 km of main gas pipelines and branches will be built, compared with 30,000 km in 1976-1980.

The rapid development of the West Siberian petroleum and gas complex will require the reorganization of the pipe and gas machine-building industries. Corresponding assignments have been formulated for the 11th Five-Year Plan.

The coal industry will be developed further. In this connection, the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers recently passed a decree on additional measures for the accelerated development of coal strip mining in 1981-1990, measures for the accelerated technical retooling of the mines of the USSR Ministry of Coal Industry and raising miners' wages and improving their working and living conditions.

Intensive efforts must be made in the 11th Five-Year Plan for the timely and comprehensive solution of problems related to the accelerated development of the nuclear power industry, the liquefaction of Kansk-Achinsk coal, the search for new and effective sources of energy and the utilization of recoverable fuels.

The implementation of these projects will become the base for reliable fuel and energy supplies to the national economy. The steps aimed at increasing such supplies are being paralleled by strict conservation and more effective use

of fuel and energy resources. The use of energy-conserving technologies is of great importance in pig iron and electrosteel smelting in ferrous metallurgy, the production of aluminum, titanium, magnesium and nickel in nonferrous metallurgy, the production of cement clinker in the construction materials industry and the production of ammonia, synthetic rubber, chlorine and phosphorus in the chemical industry.

Substantial fuel savings may be obtained by using heat waste and reducing heat and electric power losses. The use of utilizer systems can be very effective.

The CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers approved the decree "On Basic Directions and Measures for Upgrading the Effective Utilization of Fuel and Energy Resources in the National Economy in 1981-1985 and the Period Through 1990," which calls for the adoption of a broad range of measures for the solution of this problem. The five-year plan assigns each ministry and union republic specific tasks on the conservation of fuel and energy, which must be considered as minimal.

Great attention is paid to meeting the growing needs of the national economy for ferrous and nonferrous metals. A factor such as the metal stock accumulated in the country, i.e., the metal in productive capital and consumer goods, which eventually becomes reusable, is exerting an increasingly strong influence on the solution of this problem.

The metal stock has practically doubled during the last 10 years to nearly 1.5 billion tons. This means that the needs of the national economy for metal goods can be met with a relatively small increase in the overall volume of newly smelted metal and the use of scrap and waste and by significantly upgrading the quality of the metal produced and ensuring its efficient use.

With a view to reducing the labor and metal intensiveness of machines and mechanisms, the 26th party congress called for tripling the volume of output of powder metal during the current five-year plan. This will increase the possibility of saving metal and will enable us to produce a greater quantity of more durable and corrosion-proof items. A special government decision defines the specific assignments on the development of powder metallurgy in 1981-1990.

Recently, the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers drafted and passed a decree which is also a program for making the production and utilization of metal goods more effective. Compared to 1980, the implementation of these measures will make the saving of 14-15 million tons of metal possible by 1985.

The respective ministries and departments and the councils of ministers of union republics were issued assignments on ensuring the increased production of economical types of rolled metal, reducing the use of iron and steel castings, increasing the use of steel sheets, plastics and other ferrous metal substitutes and conserving metal in construction and other sectors. A system of measures for the technical retooling of ferrous metallurgy enterprises was formulated. The speedy implementation of this program will make a substantial contribution to the development of this sector.

The government also issued a decree on improving the collection and utilization of ferrous metal waste and the construction of low-capacity plants and processing



centers in areas where ferrous scrap metal is generated. This will streamline the hauling of scrap metal and will reduce the volume of rail haulage by more than 1 billion ton/km.

The workers in nonferrous metallurgy face important and responsible tasks. Production increases will be based not only on the reconstruction, expansion and construction of new enterprises but on improvements in existing and application of new progressive technology. This will enable us to raise the level of nonferrous metal extraction and to lower extraction losses.

Improving the collection, procurement and processing of such metal scrap and waste provides a significant opportunity for increasing nonferrous metal resources. According to the July CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree, by the end of the current five-year plan, the volume of annual procurements (deliveries) and processing of nonferrous metal scrap and waste will reach almost 0.5 million tons. The production of metal alloys will be increased correspondingly.

However, the increasing needs of the national economy sometimes outstrip the production of certain types of nonferrous metals. This makes the question of their strict conservation in the manufacturing of end products even more timely. The measures drafted by the government will make the conservation of scarce nonferrous metals possible during the current five-year plan.

A great new step in the direction of the further chemization of the national economy will be taken during five-year plan. Today, chemistry means fertilizers, new materials, synthetic fibers, fuels, lubricants, etc. By 1985, the production of chemical fertilizers will reach 150-155 million tons in terms of conventional units (36-37 million tons in terms of 100 percent content of nutritive agents). The production of synthetic resins, plastics, chemical fibers, staples, polymers and other materials used in machine building, construction and the light and food industries as substitutes for metals, timber and cotton will be increased substantially. Particular attention will be paid to organizing the production of high-grade polymers with predetermined technical properties, mixed plastics, auxiliary textile substances, preservatives, catalysts, extra-pure chemicals, special particularly fine polymer fabrics and other chemical substances.

In recent years, the national economy has experienced severe timber shortages. Meanwhile, every year, millions of cubic meters of secondary raw materials from timber logging, processing and procurement remain underutilized in the country as a result of incomplete processing, even though 1 ton of timber waste is the equivalent of no less than 2 cubic meters of dressed lumber in the production of pressed wood tiles from wood fibers and shavings. Considerable losses occur in the course of the hauling, transportation, long-term storage and processing of the timber.

Measures for the implementation of the assignment stipulated in the "Basic Directions" on the organization of all-round enterprises for timber growing, procurement and processing, ensuring the more extensive processing of raw timber, creation and mastery of new technological processes and materials, improving the quality of paper goods significantly and ensuring the maximum use of waste paper must be formulated and implemented.



An extensive debate recently held among scientists and specialists in IZVESTIYA confirms that on the basis of the level reached in timber procurements and with the proper and rational utilization of procured raw materials, the needs of the national economy for timber and for all sorts of wood products through 1990 can be fully met.

The expanded scale of output, the development of specialization and cooperation and and the increased complexity of economic relations have made transportation, by rail in particular, more important than ever. The development of production forces in the eastern areas is having a great effect on the growth of freight haulage. The fastest possible upgrading of the railroads and the entire transportation system of the country to a level which meets the needs of the national economy for freight haulage and passenger transportation will be one of the main tasks of the five-year plan.

In accordance with the "Basic Directions," freight and passenger haulage by rail will be increased respectively by 14-15 and 9 percent during the current five-year plan. In order meet these assignments, increasing resources will be allocated for the development of the material and technical base of the railroad transportation system. The comprehensive mechanization of loading and unloading operations, use of containerized and packaged shipments and better scheduling will be developed. Thus, in accordance with the recent CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers Decree "On Measures for Accelerating the Development and Upgrading the Effectiveness of Containerized and Packaged Freight Hauling in 1981-1985," the volume of freight hauled by rail will be increased by a factor of 1.8-1.9 for all-purpose containers and 1.7 for packaged goods.

The "Basic Directions" and the five-year plan also stipulate the faster development of trucking, in which sector freight hauling must be increased by a 1.3-1.4 factor in 1981-1985. Maritime, riverine, air, pipeline and industrial transportation will be developed further.

The solution of the transportation problem is closely related to improving the organization and management of the transportation process. It requires the rapid introduction of the latest freight haulage technology and improved interaction among the different transportation systems and between them and the other sectors. Ministries and departments must pay greater attention to problems of transportation rationalization, to reducing idling and empty runs by freightcars, ships and other transportation facilities and to ensuring the fuller utilization of their freight capacity and space. They must show concern for the preservation of transportation equipment.

The 26th party congress discussed the situation in capital construction thoroughly. During the last five-year plan, major progress was made in capital construction and a great deal of valuable experience in its organization was gained. Every year, hundreds of new industrial projects and thousands of new residential, cultural, health and education building go up. However, this sector suffers from serious shortcomings. This is especially confirmed by the fact that the volume of capital investments stipulated in the 10th Five-Year Plan was used in its totality, while assignments on the commissioning of capacities remained underfulfilled.

One of the reasons for this is the continuing and harmful practice of dispersing capital investments. This increases the amount of unfinished construction, i.e., it freezes state funds and leads to excessive construction time at many projects and to the economically unjustified creation of numerous underpowered construction organizations, frequently operating on a parallel basis in the same area. A firm and consistent battle must be fought against manifestations of departmentalism and parochialism, which are intolerable in our socialist economy.

Let us point out that this year a more active concentration of capital investments took place in the formulation of the plan. As a result of a careful analysis, it was deemed necessary to limit the volume of construction and installation projects in 1982-1985, so that they can be balanced with material-technical, manpower and financial resources and construction organization capacities. In this connection, ministries in charge of such products and ministry-customers were called upon to ensure the strict implementation of the construction plans for 1982 and the subsequent years of the five-year plan, above all assignments related to the commissioning of production capacities and projects.

The recent CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree on improving cost estimating was aimed at the elimination of shortcomings in this area. Proposals are being drafted on improving the management of capital construction, organizing construction output, ensuring the growth of labor productivity and further upgrading construction technical standards.

The policy of technical retooling and reconstruction of existing enterprises rather than the building of new projects has proved to be fully justified. It enables us to increase investments in the active share of productive capital, to invest in equipment, to enable operating enterprises to convert faster to the production of new goods and to improve capital returns. We must steadily and strictly supervise the implementation of instructions according to which the question of new construction can be raised only when all internal production reserves, including reconstruction and technical retooling, have been exhausted or when it becomes a case of implementing essentially new scientific and technical solutions.

Obviously, the growth of the national income and therefore the well-being of every Soviet person greatly depends on the extent to which labor, material and energy resources are used sensibly and thriftily. It is important to lead the labor collectives and public organizations into the struggle for the economical and thrifty utilization of the people's property. They must become concerned with the use of each kilogram of grain, fuel, metal, raw material and material, each kilowatt/hour of electric power and the preservation of machines, equipment and tools. Considering the tremendous scale of output, this is not only an important reserve for saving on social labor and natural resources but a mandatory prerequisite for balancing production with resources.

Both the five-year and the 1982 plans contain specific assignments on the practical implementation of the measures stipulated in the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers Decree "On Intensifying Efforts for the Economical and Rational Utilization of Raw, Fuel-Energy and Other Material Resources." USSR ministries and departments and councils of ministers of union republics have been instructed to ensure the formulation of organizational and technical measures for the additional reduction of material outlays per unit of output by an average of 3-5 percent, compared with

the 1980 level, including 1-1.5 percent in 1982 in all enterprises and establishments under their jurisdiction. In 1982, 3-6 percent savings in boiler and furnace fuel and electric and thermal power, and no less than 8 percent in gasoline and diesel oil must be achieved in addition to the reduction in outlay norms stipulated in the plan. Permanent control over the implementation of these assignments must be organized.

In this connection, the initiative of a number of Moscow enterprises on the extensive use of the achievements of science and technology with a view to the conservation of manpower, material and energy resources, which was approved by the CC CPSU, assumes tremendous importance.

## II

A powerful scientific and technical potential was created in the USSR under the Soviet system. Today, thousands of scientific collectives are successfully working in our country and are able to resolve even the most difficult problems. The material and technical base of science has been considerably strengthened in recent years. The fruitful alliance between science and production has become a characteristic feature of the mature socialist society.

The technical retooling of the production process with the help of equipment and technology based on essentially new technical solutions will be carried out during the 11th Five-Year Plan. Measures have been earmarked by the USSR Council of Ministers for a substantial increase in output and increased use of automated manipulators (robots) in national economic sectors and industry. The formulation of comprehensive scientific and technical programs has been assigned an important role.

Under contemporary conditions, the intensification and improved effectiveness of social production require the fastest possible application of scientific discoveries and inventions. Because of the more rapid development of basic and the increased effectiveness of applied research, the 26th CPSU Congress stipulated that major scientific efforts must be focused on discoveries capable of making truly revolutionary changes in production, the technical level and quality of output and in the achievement of high end national economic results.

The USSR Academy of Sciences, the republic and sectorial academies, the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology and all ministries and departments have the task of ensuring the increased effectiveness of scientific research and the efficient utilization of funds allocated for the development of science and their concentration along priority directions.

Design-engineering and scientific research organizations frequently resolve the problems assigned to them successfully. However, the requirements regarding the development of science and technology are becoming steadily stricter.

In the "Basic Directions," the party set new levels to be reached in production renovation and technical retooling on the basis of the scientific and technical potential accumulated in the country.



500,000-800,000 kilowatt power turbines for thermoelectric power plants using low-grade coal, the manufacturing of the first nuclear reactors for supplying big cities with heat, the development of new designs of power blocks with fast neutron reactors generating 800,000-1,600,000 kilowatts and the creation of one-of-a-kind power transmission cables must be achieved.

New methods for the treatment of oil-bearing seams will be applied in the petroleum and gas industry with a view to ensuring the fuller extraction of the oil, along with progressive methods for the extraction of the natural gas from wells, high-productivity immersion pumps and advanced technologies for the extraction of high-viscosity and bituminous petroleum, and the series production of gas-pumping machines developing pressures of 100 or more atmospheres will be organized. A great deal will be accomplished in the technical retooling of ferrous and nonferrous metallurgical enterprises and in many other sectors.

Machine building, which will be developed at a faster pace during the 11th Five-Year Plan, plays a decisive role in the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the practical implementation of scientific, design and engineering achievements. The machine-building ministries must resolve complex problems related to the retooling of all economic sectors on the basis of the most advanced technology. They must quickly master the series production of redesigned machines, equipment, automation facilities and instruments with extended safe life, productivity and reliability, and resolve problems in designing and producing equipment consistent with the specific operational conditions in the various economic sectors and parts of the country. The production of programmed machine systems and equipment will be increased considerably. This will make it possible to eliminate manual and monotonous work, particularly under difficult and health-hazardous conditions, and to prevent environmental pollution.

While duly noting the achievements in scientific and technical progress, we cannot fail to notice major shortcomings in a number of them. There still is no suitable unity in production management and scientific and technical progress; serious omissions remain in planning and encouraging the development and installation of new equipment; the technical standards and quality of some technological processes, machines and equipment remain low.

The most advanced equipment requires a suitable level of operation and servicing. First-rate equipment is created through the efforts of designers and engineers, but because of very poor handling, its productivity and effectiveness are considerably reduced.

A characteristic example is the KamAZ truck, which is a heavy-duty high-maneuverability vehicle. It can be profitably used only by big trucking enterprises with adequate repair and high-quality service facilities. Moreover, the productivity of such vehicles, in comparison with common carriers, drops substantially, while their maintenance cost doubles, if they are used by small departmental trucking bases. This situation must be changed radically. By decision of the USSR Council of Ministers, 39 KamAZ motor vehicle centers and plants for repairing their systems and parts will be opened during this five-year plan in order to improve the efficiency of such trucks.



The effective utilization of the achievements of scientific and technical progress is firmly linked with the further improvement of the planned development of science and technology. The assignments included in the respective plans, aimed at end national economic results, must be fully reflected in capital investment plans, for the latter greatly determine the subsequent fate of discoveries and inventions.

The management of design-engineering and scientific research organizations must be improved and more particularly, consolidated. The development of scientific production associations remains one of the most important tasks. Today, the organizers of scientific and technical progress must firmly eliminate unjustified duplication in the work of scientific institutions, take practical steps to close down unproductive laboratories and institutes, ensure real and prompt directional changes in research and development in accordance with production requirements, increase the role of higher scientific establishments in this area considerably and strengthen the interaction between academic and sectorial institutes.

The slow practical utilization of the latest achievements of science and technology, the limited use of new technologies and shortcomings in the organization of the series production of new machines and equipment are the bottlenecks. Based on the instructions formulated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev to the effect that "The application of scientific discoveries and inventions is the most urgent and decisive sector today," we must decisively strengthen control over the practical application of scientific and technical achievements.

### III

Keeping in mind the demographically adverse situation of the 1980s, there are no alternatives to saving on labor outlays through a considerable increase in labor productivity if we are to preserve the necessary rates of economic growth and to provide manpower for the new enterprises.

The 11th Five-Year Plan includes very demanding assignments in this area. Social labor productivity will have to be increased by no less than 17-20 percent, which will account for no less than 85-90 percent of the increase in the national income; labor productivity in industry will be increased by 23-25 percent, which will account for more than 90 percent of the increase in industrial output.

Exacting assignments concerning the growth of labor productivity have been made, particularly if we bear in mind that the importance of every percentage point in the growth of labor productivity increases with every passing year. In order to ensure the strict implementation of these assignments, each enterprise and construction site will have to adopt thoroughly considered measures, which will provide the necessary conditions for highly productive work, improvements in the material incentive system and precise determination of the contribution of the individual collective and worker to results. The solution of this problem calls for focusing our efforts on upgrading the level of labor technology, the more efficient use of machines and equipment and the reduced use of manual labor, particularly in loading-unloading and auxiliary operations, which involve the labor of several million people. This will also be the purpose of the steps being taken to improve the labor rating and norming system, the use of progressive work organization methods and the introduction of incentives for upgrading skills and professional

mastery, while strictly observing the principle of increasing labor productivity more rapidly than the average wage.

Strengthening labor discipline is a major resource for improving the utilization of labor reserves. Every year, the country is deprived of several billion rubles' worth of industrial goods because of absenteeism, idling and absence from work with official permission. Strengthening discipline is a problem which requires the permanent attention of all management organs and executives on all levels.

Increasing the round-the-clock load per unit of installed equipment or, in other words, increasing its work shift coefficient, is an important method of improving labor productivity. Practical experience proves that wherever proper attention is paid to the utilization of this reserve, where multiple-machine handling is practiced, skills are combined, workers are released from auxiliary operations, worn-out and obsolete equipment is replaced with new and progressive tools, computers are used and continuing concern is shown for working conditions in the second shifts, capital returns and output increase and outlays for new equipment are recovered faster.

However, the capacity of many sectors is used extremely poorly. In machine building, the shift coefficient for metal-processing equipment is only 1.35. It is even lower in the various machine-building ministries (Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances, 1.32; Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building, 1.30; Ministry of Electrical Equipment Industry, 1.28; Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building, 1.27; and Ministry of Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, 1.26). The degree of utilization of installed capacities has declined considerably at the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy and at many others. Agricultural equipment is used inefficiently.

The utilization of such reserves and the declaration of real war on all losses which lower social labor productivity constitute a national task.

#### IV

At the present stage, the intensification of the comprehensive approach to the development of the national economy is a characteristic feature of the party's economic strategy.

In this connection, it is extremely important to make each comprehensive target program an integral unit and an organic part of the general state plan for economic and social development in the course of the fulfillment of the five-year plan. This is a new and complex matter, for which reason the USSR Gosplan and other state committees, ministries and departments should analyze the problems which arise here particularly closely and ensure their proper solution.

As was pointed out at the 26th CPSU Congress, many comprehensive programs are of particular importance to the state. This applies primarily to the energy and food programs, which are being drafted on Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's initiative, and the consumer goods production program.

During the last five-year plan, food production in the country increased. However, tangible difficulties remain in supplying the population with some products. The

food problem demands particular attention and must be resolved on the basis of the further upsurge of agriculture, the expansion of the entire agroindustrial complex and the proportional development of its sectors.

As we know, a number of CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decrees on strengthening the material and technical base of agriculture and improving the economic and financial condition of kolkhozes and sovkhozes were considered and approved at the July 1978 CC CPSU Plenum. As was noted at the 26th party congress, the main direction in the development of agriculture, as earmarked by the plenum, remains unchanged.

The volume of capital investments in the development of agriculture and related industrial sectors stipulated in the 11th Five-Year Plan will remain the same as in the 10th. Increasing funds for the further strengthening of the material and technical base in agriculture are being planned.

A set of measures for further improvements in the planning and economic incentive in agriculture is being implemented in accordance with the 14 November 1980 CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree. Their purpose is to increase the production and procurement of farm products and to strengthen the kolkhoz and sovkhoz economy.

Recently, the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers approved a series of new and important decrees on the further development of agriculture in the Nonchernozem Zone and the Tsentral'no-Chernozemnyy Rayon in the RSFSR, increased production and procurement of chemical fertilizers for agriculture, the adoption of a comprehensive land-reclamation program, additional steps to increase the effective utilization of reclaimed areas and the growing of corn and feed crops on them, and measures to improve the work of agricultural machine-building sectors, to improve the effectiveness of chemization, to ensure the maintenance of agricultural equipment, to improve the production, procurement, processing, storage and marketing of fruits, vegetables, grapes and potatoes, and to increase the output of private plots and to ensure the more economical utilization of grain. The prompt and efficient implementation of these decisions is an important factor in ensuring a comprehensive upsurge in the agrarian sector of the economy.

In the light of the congress' decisions, greater attention must be paid to improving the utilization of the tremendous resources allocated for the development of kolkhoz and sovkhoz production, to increasing returns on each ruble of capital investments, ton of fertilizer and hectare of land, and to the persistent elimination of the still considerable losses in agriculture. Population requirements could be satisfied far better even without increasing the current volumes of output of such commodities by eliminating the very tangible losses in grain, potatoes, vegetables and fruits during their transportation, storage and primary processing.

The search for reserves and frequently the simple elimination of obvious shortcomings are very topical problems. However, in this case simple thrift and economy are insufficient. New technological processes and a better solution for the problems which arise are necessary.

Improving the well-being of the working people requires increased production and improvements in the quality of consumer goods and the development of the service industry. During this five-year plan, light industry will be provided with modern



equipment, and supplies of raw and other materials to it and its management will be improved. Better technical facilities will be made available to consumer service enterprises and steps will be taken to ensure their more even distribution throughout the country. The influence of the trade system in determining the variety and quality of goods in demand will be strengthened. The heavy industry sectors will contribute to the increased production of consumer goods.

Recently, special party and government resolutions on increasing the production of prime necessity goods, ensuring the fuller satisfaction of population demand for them, increasing the production of goods in mass demand and improving their quality and variety were approved. They list the specific ministry and department duties for increasing the production and improving the quality of the respective goods.

Local soviet and economic organs play an important role in ensuring population supplies with goods and services. In no other area of the national economy are local possibilities and reserves as important as in the satisfaction of daily consumer requirements and in providing consumer services. Some local areas have already assumed obligations on above-plan good production. For example, the labor collectives in the Ukraine decided to produce consumer goods worth 450 million rubles above the 1981 plan; Uzbekistan pledged to produce similar goods worth 250 million rubles. Such initiatives must not only be given complete support but must also be provided with the requirements for their successful implementation.

Foreign economic relations, which make the extensive use of the advantages of the international division of labor in meeting our targets possible, play an active role in fulfilling economic programs and raising the people's living standards.

The Soviet Union is successfully developing trade and economic relations with foreign countries. During the 10th Five-Year Plan, foreign trade and economic cooperation assignments were fulfilled ahead of schedule.

As in the past, the task of all-round and more extensive development of cooperation with the socialist countries retains its priority in the 11th Five-Year Plan. Trade and economic, scientific and technical and other contacts between the Soviet Union and the developing countries are contemplated. Economic cooperation with the developed capitalist countries will continue.

The CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers are continuing to pay attention to improving foreign economic relations. Several decrees have been approved in recent years on increasing the effectiveness of foreign trade and economic and scientific and technical relations with foreign countries.

## V

Under the contemporary conditions of growing dynamism in social production and scientific and technical progress, economic management problems must become the focal point of attention for the party and the state. The rapid renovation of equipment and technology, the expanded scale of output, the appearance of new production sectors and changes in the nature of labor and in the features of the working man himself and in his professional training and standards demand steady improvement of the production apparatus, more accurate formulation of long-term



objectives of economic development and optimal proportions, more economical and efficient use of resources, a systematic approach to the solution of national economic problems, improved deployment of production forces and efficient coordination of the various economic sectors.

In July 1979, the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers made important decisions on planning and administration problems. They stipulate steps for improving planning, increasing the role of state plans, five-year plans above all, and improving the economic mechanism, so that planning, which is the core of management, can exert a more active influence on ensuring the balanced and proportional development of the economy and the use of a comprehensive approach to the solution of economic problems, and to enable economic levers and incentives (cost effectiveness, production costs, profits, etc.) to make a greater contribution to the reaching of high end results in each sector and enterprise.

Greater coordination in the organization of territorial-production complexes and industrial centers and in improving their management is being ascribed increasing importance. The comprehensive development of economic rayons must be combined with their optimal specialization and the organization of efficient economic relations within them. It is particularly important to improve the sectorial and territorial structure in the European part of the country (restricting the growth of energy-intensive production, petrochemical and ferrous metallurgy in particular, the creation of branches of big plants in small towns, etc.).

The government will set up a body of representatives of the USSR Gosplan for the Ural'skiy, Zapadno-Sibirskiy, Vostochno-Sibirskiy and Dal'nevostochnyy economic rayons. The joint formulation of suggestions on the organization and development of Siberian and Far Eastern TPK [Territorial-Production Complexes] with the local party, soviet and planning organs will be one of its main tasks.

The current stricter requirements and tasks in economic development have greatly enhanced the role of the USSR Gosplan within the state management organs, and a number of steps are being taken to upgrade the level of planning.

The January USSR Council of Ministers decree stipulates measures for the elimination of shortcomings in the work of planning organs, mainly in balancing, coordination, ensuring a comprehensive approach to economic development, upgrading the quality of development and formulation and scientific substantiation of long-term and current plans for economic and social development and the application of improved planning indicators.

A comprehensive increase in responsibility for the implementation of the plans is a prerequisite for success in economic activities. We must be strictly guided by the party's instructions to the effect that the plan is the law and that the organized work of the national economy is possible only based on observance of it. Stricter planning and contractual discipline and firm rejection of the groundless practice of plan reductions, which encourages cadre irresponsibility, constitute a policy which must be pursued systematically at all management levels.

The struggle for upgrading organization and discipline must be consistent and sustained. It requires developing a feeling of duty to the state and society in the workers, and strict order wherever state and public interests are neglected.

Stronger centralized management must be combined with the broadening of democratic rights in economic management. Lenin considered the involvement of the masses in management "a wonderful means" which increases the power of the state tenfold (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 34, p 313).

Comprehensive support of initiatives aimed at upgrading work effectiveness and quality and the development and improvement of socialist competition for the overfulfillment of the five-year plan are the means which must be used to their fullest extent in directing the energy of the masses toward the solution of current problems in the building of communism.

The labor collective plays a great role in the creation of an atmosphere of joint and organized work, comradely mutual aid and interest on the part of every worker in high end results. This precisely is what determines the results of the implementation of state plans. It calls for increasing the demands made of economic cadres and managers of labor collectives. Unfortunately, all too frequently they are incapable of organizing the work and creating order. The modern manager must be able to organize the work perfectly -- to position people, concentrate resources where needed, exercise prompt control and see to the elimination of shortcomings.

Our economy needs managers with a work style which, as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has pointed out, "organically combines obedience and discipline with daring initiative and enterprise, practicality and efficiency with aspiration toward great objectives, and a critical attitude toward shortcomings with inflexible belief in the historical advantages of our chosen path."

The soviets of people's deputies play a great role in improving the management of economic construction. The exercise of their control and coordination functions and the broad rights and powers they have been granted by the USSR Constitution will ensure comprehensive economic and social development and to resolve problems in improving the population's working and living conditions more successfully.

The 26th CPSU Congress convincingly proved yet once again that our party is systematically implementing the great Lenin's behests and is creatively developing the ideas of scientific communism. The undivided loyalty of the Soviet people to the ideas of communism is clearly manifested in the unity between the party and the people and the tremendous political and labor upsurge created by the congress' decisions. They see in the party and in its steadily increasing leading role the most important prerequisite for and reliable guarantee of further successes in the building of communism.

"...We are optimists," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the congress, "because we have faith in the power of labor and because we believe in our country and people. We are optimists because the path it is showing us is the only true path!"

Unquestionably, under the party's leadership, the Soviet people will implement the great plans earmarked at its 26th congress.

COPYRIGHT: izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003

CSO: 1802/4

## MATURE SOCIALISM AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 81 pp 42-54

[Article by P. Fedoseyev, USSR Academy of Sciences vice president]

[Text] The developed socialist society which has been built in the USSR is a high achievement of contemporary civilization, and the first obligation of Soviet social scientists is to identify clearly all aspects of its economic, social and spiritual progress. The theoretical interpretation of the ideological wealth contained in the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th party congress and in its resolutions is the most important prerequisite for their successful work.

On the basis of the concept of mature socialism, the party refined and concretized the means and deadlines for implementing our programmatic objectives and formulated its strategy and tactic for a long future period.

A great deal remains to be accomplished to ensure the scientific interpretation of the party's strategic formulations, which were extensively and precisely reflected in the materials of the 26th congress and in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's works. First of all, it is necessary to substantiate in greater detail the understanding of the limits of the first phase of the communist system in economics, sociopolitical relations and other areas which jointly characterize the maturity, the completion, so to say, of socialism.

Studies made in this area make us aware of the scale of the present tasks in the building of communism and the connection between today's actions and future plans. They allow a realistic assessment of our possibilities and reserves, let us see existing difficulties and help us to find a way to eliminate them. It is precisely by following the leading directions in formulating the theory of the building of communism that the social sciences produce precise scientific forecasts, penetrate deep into the core of new problems and issue significant practical recommendations.

When V. I. Lenin described the mature socialist society as a developed integral organism, he had in mind the comprehensiveness, determined proportionality and balanced nature of all of its aspects and, to a certain extent, its completeness. It is a question of harmony between production forces and production relations, base and superstructure, politics and economics, centralism and democracy, private and social interests and ideology and material living conditions.

That is why mature socialism, as it advances, presumes the elimination of previously developed disproportions and disparities and, naturally, the elimination of newly arising contradictions. This is one of the basic features of the dialectics of progress in socialist society today. Unfortunately, social scientists, philosophers above all, are still doing very little work on the theoretical definition of the laws of social dialectics.

Today, it is very important to study the main lines of improvement in mature socialism as earmarked at the 26th CPSU Congress, with a view to ensuring the intercoordination of the various sides of social life. The new principles and planning methods, the extension of the time limits of the basic directions in the country's economic and social development to 10 years and the formulation of a comprehensive program for scientific and technical progress and the most important national economic programs make it possible to ensure the harmonious progress of society toward the higher stages of the communist system.

Obviously, the assessment of the extent to which production forces correspond to production relations, as required by the materialistic view on social processes, must be the starting point for such an analysis.

We know that as a result of the radical revolutionary changes which occurred in our country at the start of the Soviet system, progressive socialist production relations and unique forms of management were developed in our country, while the production forces remained largely underdeveloped and fell substantially below the necessary level. However, during the following decade the situation changed radically: highly developed production forces and extremely rich production assets were created. Socialist production relations provided a powerful impetus for economic upsurge. The coordination between the production forces and the new and revolutionary nature of production relations made the solution of a number of tremendous economic problems, as well as the rapid reorganization of the production apparatus and the entire material base of the country, possible within a historically short period.

While remaining an effective method for and a powerful factor in the development of production forces throughout the first phase of communism, socialist production relations improved steadily with practice. Their various aspects changed in accordance with the requirements of the production process. The two basic forms of socialist ownership -- national and kolkhoz-cooperative -- reached a new level of socialization. Ownership by the whole people was strengthened with the creation of production associations and territorial-industrial complexes. The organization and strengthening of various interfarm associations in the countryside and the intensification of agroindustrial cooperation has brought kolkhoz-cooperative ownership closer to national ownership. All of this has created new opportunities for the further upsurge of socialist production forces.

Let us bear in mind that production relations cannot be reduced to mere forms of ownership. As economic relations among people, they extend to the exchange of activities and their results (products) and to the area of distribution. The interrelationship among the individual, the labor collective and society, represented by the socialist state, plays an important role in socialist economic relations. State management of the economy and relations with enterprises and



direct producers take place through economic-financial organs and economic factors such as wages, prices, profits, credits, taxes, etc. That is why the proper correlation and optimal combination of individual, collective and state plans is of prime importance in production, exchange and distribution. The economic mechanism and all management units play a tremendous role in resolving new problems.

Today's production relations in our society are generally consistent with the increased production forces. However, we can already sense that some of their aspects are failing to match the level of the development of production forces -- some aspects of distribution relations, specifically planning and management methods in particular. Although partial, this contradiction is noticeable and is the source of some difficulties and problems which must be resolved. It is no accident that the party made it incumbent on state and planning-financial organs and scientific institutions to draft measures for the substantial improvement of production relations, the economic mechanism, management, planning and control above all, without delay, and to earmark measures which will allow them to reach a level consistent with the production forces of developed socialism, thus providing every opportunity for speeding up scientific and technical and socioeconomic progress. At the same time, we must eliminate the lag in some production force areas and the shortcoming in the utilization of their main elements: productive capital and manpower.

Here the guiding principle is provided by the party's fundamental stipulation -- increasing the effectiveness and quality of all work and production intensification. This presumes the fullest possible utilization of productive capital, economical use of material resources and high-level organization of labor and production. Economists must consider most seriously the creation of new economic factors and incentives in the production relations system which could influence these processes radically.

Some economists have engaged in protracted arguments on the nature of commodity-monetary relations under socialism: do they have a specific economic content or are they merely a form inherited from capitalism, and should they be developed or abandoned? Merely stating that they are an objective reality is insufficient. Real problems exist in the area of improving commodity-monetary relations within socialist economic ties and relations, the most important being of a direct social nature, for wages, assessment of commodity values, settling accounts among enterprises and economic organs and many other economic operations have a monetary expression and can stimulate or hinder the growth of labor productivity and production quality.

Under present conditions, production intensification and its increased effectiveness are the main paths leading to the solution of basic problems in economic development and acceleration of lagging aspects of production relations and the economic mechanism. That is why work on unresolved problems in socialist political economy, so clearly described by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 26th CPSU Congress, is so topical. I shall discuss some of them.

The need to adapt the economic mechanism to the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution presents socialist political economy with important problems. There must, first of all, be a study of those related to economic incentives

and to limits and restrictions on the use of obsolete equipment and technology. In our country general criticism, which is sometimes sharp and quite well substantiated, of the severe lag in the utilization of the latest scientific and technical achievements, delays in experimental design development because of bureaucratic interdepartmental barriers and the lack of initiative on the part of some economic managers has become generalized. However, this is similar to the case of some scientists who forget that in the final account all criticism must be positive and that when we expose shortcomings, we must also think about how to eliminate them. It is high time to create an integral system of economic incentive measures for technical innovation and to draft effective financial-organizational principles which can block the use of outdated equipment and obsolete technology. Naturally, such developments must rest on basic research on theoretical problems of socialist political economy.

The theory of socialist reproduction must be developed further in accordance with the new conditions which govern the building of communism. In particular, it is important to establish an efficient correlation between the two social production subdivisions which will secure the course of economic intensification and improve the well-being of the working people.

Soviet economists are properly defending and intensifying ideas on the leading role and priority development of the production of capital goods. However, neither theory nor practice have been able to avoid dogmatic and one-sided views about and applications of these concepts. There is a view according to which the production of capital goods must outstrip that of consumer goods at all times and throughout all stages of the communist system. This has frequently resulted in unjustified enthusiasm for the building of new enterprises, excessive delays in mastering production capacities, dissipation of material and financial resources, the wasteful use of metal, energy and fuel and the related extensive expansion of extracting sectors. On the other hand, a certain underestimation of the sectors producing consumer goods became widespread. Over a long period of time, a disproportion developed with regard to agriculture, which was considered essentially as part of the second production subdivision. All of this clearly contradicted the Marxist-Leninist theory of expanded socialist reproduction, according to which the leading role of capital goods production cannot be performed by systematically curtailing the production of consumer goods. No expanded reproduction in general, including that of productive capital, is possible without increasing consumer goods production.

The accumulation of a powerful economic potential created the objective prerequisites for the reorganization of the reproduction structure. While taking steps to develop heavy industry and its basic branches, machine building and the fuel and energy complex in particular, the party is also conscious of the urgent need to ensure the faster growth of sectors producing consumer goods. However, many theoretical and practical economists are trapped by traditional concepts and inertial thinking and are unable to understand the changed circumstances. They consider the reproduction ratios which were typical at the country's industrialization stage to be inviolable. They fail to realize that the general laws of expanded reproduction operate differently at the initial stages of machine production and under the conditions of the contemporary scientific and technical revolution. This view was held even after the publication of the familiar Leninist reproduction plans, which proved that under socialism, it becomes possible to equalize the

growth rates of both production subdivisions and considerably to increase the share of the national income and the gross social product used by the working people for individual consumption.

However, we must not ignore or underestimate the law of priority growth of the major types of productive capital, for observance of it is required for the improvement of production forces, which are the basis for the advancement of society. Technical progress, higher labor productivity and limiting and mechanizing manual labor with the help of modern technology would be impossible without increasing the production of machines and energy. Whereas a dogmatic interpretation of the law of priority growth of productive capital could and still can be used to conceal the careless use of such capital, attempts to reject or question the effect of this law under socialism could, in turn, hinder technical progress and economic development.

In developing and applying the reproduction theory, we must remember that the national economic proportions must be optimal and rationally substantiated at each stage in the building of communism. We must proceed not from stereotyped or dogmatic concepts but from the need for and possibilities of economic and social progress and on the basis of objective social laws.

In ensuring the further development of the fuel and energy base, metallurgy and the other industrial sectors, our party firmly relies on the accelerated technical retooling and intensification of production and the strictest possible conservation of metals, fuel, energy and all types of raw materials, with a view to increasing the production of finished goods. Economic wisdom and management skill require not the development of some economic sectors at the expense of others, but the development of all of them at a faster pace and on the required scale, mainly through production intensification. This applies to heavy and light industry, agriculture and the entire agroindustrial complex, which is an integral part of the material and technical base of communism. The economy must be economical in all national economic sectors.

Economic development planning requires thorough computations, substantiated forecasts, flexible reactions to scientific and technical progress and dynamic balancing of the expanded reproduction elements. This is a vast but neglected field for the application of economic-mathematical methods and models. Despite some efforts in this direction, the results so far have been unsatisfactory.

One of the basic problems in the theory and practice of scientific communism is the elimination of class disparities and the establishment of a socially homogenous society. On the basis of the summarized experience in the area of social relations gained over the past decades, the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th congress has pointed out the real possibility of resolving this problem essentially within the historical framework of mature socialism. This possibility requires the substantially new formulation and study of an entire set of problems related to the development of the socioclass structure as socialism grows into communism. In particular, in the light of the ideas and conclusions of the congress and as a result of the practice of class relations, we must refine our concepts on the stages in the dynamics of social homogeneity, singling out as a relatively separate stage the elimination of the main and essential aspects of interclass disparities, as distinct from the stage of the definitive elimination of their vestiges, in the



course of which not only the division into classes but the old divisions in labor will disappear.

We must admit that the problems in the social structure of Soviet society have not yet been studied with proper thoroughness. The works of philosophers and sociologists generally have an essentially abstract nature. They are not based on firm factual data which would enable us to depict specific changes in the status of individual social groups and the means leading to their systematic rapprochement. There is no close interaction with economists in the study of these processes.

In our study of the establishment of social homogeneity, we proceed from the fact that strengthening the leading position of the working class in all areas of social life is the most important law of mature socialism. This applies not only to its numerical growth but to its increased political consciousness, activeness and organization. The disparity between the working class and the intelligentsia is increasingly vanishing in terms of general culture and professional training. At the same time, the kolkhoz peasantry is nearing the level of the working class in terms of production socialization, technical work facilities, means of distribution and amount of income per capita.

It is true that substantial social disparities remain between town and country. Their elimination is a programmatic problem which is being resolved in the stage of developed socialism. The movement toward a classless society means the gradual lifting of the countryside to the urban level in terms of production and social relations. Under the influence of intensified agroindustrial integration and agricultural industrialization, major steps have been taken in that direction. Unfortunately, however, their interpretation by the social scientists has been very scant. The trends in and immediate prospects for the evolution of the nature and content of labor in agricultural production and structural changes among the various detachments of rural workers are not being studied with the necessary energy either.

Socialism abolished the social privileges of intellectual work. In turn, the steady growth of the production forces of the socialist society and the combination of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of socialism lay an objective foundation for the intellectualization of the work process in all of its manifestations and for the elimination of distinctions between mental and physical work. This most important prerequisite for the elimination of class disparities has become a real factor in shaping a classless society. However, even under developed socialism this involves difficulties and contradictions. Economists, sociologists and jurists must take an active part in the formulation and implementation of the extensive program planned by the party for the elimination of manual labor in the national economy, improving the public education system and upgrading the skill and standards of the workers engaged in public production.

Under present conditions, the building of communism calls for paying great attention to the study of intraclass and interclass differences, whether professional, property or social. Naturally, this does not reduce the need for full understanding of the changes which are taking place in the social structure of mature socialism in the least. Regardless of the great variety of this process, the working class remains the basic, the binding force in Soviet society. It is precisely its



revolutionary ideology and morality, collectivistic mentality, interests and ideals which have become accessible to all the working people in the country.

The period of revolutionary change and the building of the new system in the USSR have practically confirmed the accuracy of the Marxist-Leninist stipulation on the leading role of the working class in the struggle for communism.

The working class performs this historical mission essentially through the communist party -- the leading and guiding force in Soviet society. While remaining the party of the working class, following the complete victory of socialism and the strengthening of the sociopolitical and ideological unity of our society, the party has become the vanguard, the party of the whole people. Today, the leading role of the party is increasing in all areas of social life. This is predetermined by the internal laws of the rise of the land of the soviets to the higher stage in the communist system and the entire course of the struggle between the two systems in the international arena. The party fulfills its leading role by relying on its unbreakable links with the masses and on their deep faith in the party, earned through its systematic Leninist domestic and foreign policy and consistent concern with the interests of the working people. It is the noble duty of the social scientists to summarize the great and varied experience of the CPSU and to show the vital sources of its growing influence on society and its role in the historical destiny of the Soviet people.

With the establishment of the social homogeneity of Soviet society, national relations are an important area of scientific research. The CC CPSU reemphasized that at the developed socialist stage the dialectics of such relations involves progress toward complete unity among nations and nationalities, not by ignoring their national and sociocultural originality but on the basis of gradual rapprochement and the creation of maximally favorable conditions for the blossoming of each separate one of them.

The main feature in the study of national relations today is the solution of problems related to the activities of the new historical community -- the Soviet people -- and the prospects for the development of nations and nationalities within the framework of this social and international community. Friendship and fraternal cooperation among them become even stronger in the mature socialist society. The growth of the working class and its national cadres contributes to the equalization of the population's structure in all union and autonomous republics and to the international unification of the Soviet people. Yes, today the peoples of the USSR are more united than ever. However, this is not to say that all problems in the area of national relations have already been resolved. The dynamism of the country's life, with its more than 100 nations and nationalities, creates many problems which demand constant attention. As was noted at the congress, the number of citizens of non-native nationality who, naturally, have the right to proper representation in party and state organs and who have their specific requirements concerning language, culture and way of life, is increasing substantially. Closer attention must be paid to the need to improve the forms of international contact. In a word, a thoughtful and comprehensive approach is always necessary when studying the functioning of the complex multinational social organism.

The 26th party congress demands of social scientists a creative interpretation of the development of the political system of our society with a view to making further progress toward full social homogeneity. This means forecasting the changes in the functions of the socialist state and a study of its further strengthening and gradual growth into communist social self-administration. Special studies must be made of the correlation and interaction among the various units in the political system -- representative and direct democracy, forms of participation by the masses in the administration of the state, the activities of soviets, public organizations and labor collectives, and means of upgrading the political and legal knowledge of the population. More work on the legal foundations of governmental and social life and socialist law and order is of great importance.

The CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th congress gave a high rating to the work on updating Soviet legislation on the basis of the new USSR Constitution. This is being continued. In this connection, it is important promptly to identify all social relations which will require legal regulation in the future and to coordinate and concentrate the forces of legislative and law-and-order organs and Soviet legal science in order to make an effective contribution to the solution of the basic economic and social problems which the country faces at the beginning of the decade. The congress also called for the strict and precise observance of the laws by one and all. This will require effective regulation of relations among state organs and the establishment of their areas of competence and procedure in the implementation of their functions.

The greater integrity and comprehensiveness of social development under mature socialist conditions require a more profound study of the trends and factors involved in strengthening the material and spiritual foundations of the socialist way of life and the shaping of the new man.

The overwhelming majority of Soviet citizens rate their position in society on the basis of participation in socially useful work, labor and sociopolitical activeness, observance of moral norms and loyalty to the ideals of communism. However, we still come across many cases of wide disparities between the normative models of such awareness and the actual behavior of the people in ordinary daily situations (absenteeism and lateness for work, drunkenness, money grubbing, bribery, black marketeering, etc). Because of this, the task of ensuring the molding of an integral structure of individual activities which would combine beliefs and actions is a topical theoretical and practical task.

Recent works describe the nature of the socialist way of life, its characteristic features and the laws governing its consolidation. However, the fact that an efficient system of indicators depicting all aspects of development of Soviet society and which could be applied to social planning and management has not been formulated considerably reduces their practical value. We need a theoretical interpretation of the interconnection between the material well-being and the spiritual-moral wealth of the people, the growth of their culture and political awareness, and the development of sensible individual needs and interests, the active and purposeful shaping of which, as was emphasized at the 26th congress, is considered by our party to be one of the important tasks in social policy.

The party expects of social scientists a more effective contribution to the advancement of ideological, political and educational work, which must be aimed at

achieving maximal consistency with the requirements of the Soviet people, taking their higher educational and cultural standards into consideration. We must study the processes which shape public opinion and mass awareness more profoundly, in accordance with Lenin's instruction on the need "soberly to observe the real condition of conscientiousness and preparedness of the entire class specifically (rather than its communist vanguard only) and specifically all working classes (rather than their frontrankers only)" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 41, p 42).

As the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th congress indicates, success in educational and ideological work comes only when it is based on the solid foundation of socioeconomic policy. The profound philosophical significance of this conclusion means that it requires surmounting essentially idealistic concepts according to which problems in education can be resolved only through educational and ideological means. This conclusion, which has a basic conceptual and practical-political value, proves that a qualitative upsurge in the level of educational and, as a whole, ideological work, can be achieved only if it is most closely related to the implementation of the vital task of improving developed socialism, without ignoring the full complexity and dialectical contradictoriness of the movement toward communism. This applies equally to the shaping of positive value orientations in the members of society and to the elaboration of a system of effective measures for surmounting the negative trends in the behavior and thoughts of one segment of the population. As was quite clearly stated at the congress, such trends have quite specific social and economic grounds. The successful scientific formulation of a social policy aimed at surmounting antisocial phenomena is impossible without a clear understanding of the reasons for their appearance and continued existence.

The study of the dialectical processes of interaction among socialist public life, the socialist way of life and the people's consciousness is the most topical task for philosophers and all social scientists.

The importance of the study of the development of the many-faceted socialist culture was emphasized at the 26th party congress. It was pointed out that this requires the combined efforts of scientists in different fields.

The contemporary stage in the spiritual growth of Soviet society is characterized by the immeasurable growth and enrichment of the social content of culture and the energizing of its social role. Spiritual culture is a powerful factor in improving our way of life and in the shaping of a communist personality. However, the road from the inner need for culture felt by the people and its manifestation through a variety of spiritual activities in socially significant forms is complex and hard. Progress along this road depends on several factors, the level, nature and quality of social spiritual values above all.

Today, the approach to public production as an integral phenomenon which closely combines material with spiritual creativity and which converts all areas of socially useful practice into the comprehensive development of its subject assumes particular significance. This makes it very important to provide every person with equal access to spiritual values, whether in a big city or a settlement, in a cultural center or in the Extreme North. Hence the topicality of work on problems such as



the expedient and scientific expansion of the network of cultural institutions, their sensible and rational location and effective functioning, and the proper combination of ideological and financial factors in the activities of this network. The social scientists working on cultural problems must encourage systematic cultural construction and to contribute to the spiritual enhancement of the Soviet people and to the growth of the intellectual and creative potential of society.

The decisions of the 26th party congress create new horizons for philology as well. In accordance with the congress' stipulations, its main task is to undertake the systematic and extensive creation of an entire cycle of closely interrelated and comprehensive studies of the laws governing literary and linguistic processes in the mature socialist society on the basis of already achieved results.

Further progress in the study of literature is based on the depth of study of topical problems in the theory of socialist realism, the scientific summation of new phenomena in contemporary Soviet literature and the literatures of the members of the socialist comity and the interpretation of the entire wealth of our multinational literature, its high idea- and party-mindedness, national character and consistent historicism.

The Russian language, which is a means of international communication and a factor in strengthening the fraternal friendship among the peoples of the USSR, must be assigned a special place in the comprehensive study of linguistic processes. This means responsible assignments for the scientific institutions in the field of linguistics. As in the past, the existing equal national-Russian bilingualism remains the most important prerequisite for the successful use of the Russian language in union and autonomous republics. This is a leading principle in linguistic development, which ensures the most favorable situation possible for enriching national languages and increases the need to master the language of communication among nations.

The 26th CPSU Congress and the recently held congresses of other fraternal ruling parties profoundly analyzed the situation in the contemporary socialist world and the positive international experience gained in building the new society. The task of the social scientists is to study this experience with a view to summarizing, mutually enriching and practically utilizing the achievements in the organization and rationalization of the production process, the improvement of the economic and management mechanisms, the execution of an energy- and material-conservation policy, the implementation of major economic and social programs and the shaping of a communist awareness.

The question of the comprehensive rapprochement among socialist countries, which is continuing to intensify without minimizing their own historical features, was creatively developed at the 26th CPSU Congress. The social scientists must continue their extensive studies of the future development of this process in close connection with political and economic trends.

The law on the equalization of the economic, political and cultural standards of the members of the world socialist system is of great practical and scientific interest. It is worth noting that the European CEMA members have come substantially closer to each other in terms of their average per capita production and consumption levels.



At the same time, the expanded membership of CEMA, which was joined by less developed countries in the 1970s, has made this problem even more topical.

The CPSU and the other fraternal parties are charting a course toward making the next 10 years a period of active production and scientific and technical cooperation among socialist countries. This will require not only methodological work on the social effectiveness of such cooperation but the study of the various ways and means by which socialist economic integration is influencing the further intensification of public production. The optimizing of the reproduction model is one of the main features which can help this progressive process.

The new stage in the development of production forces needs a qualitatively new type of proportionality, production intensification and reproduction structure. It is the view of many economists that the national economies of CEMA-member countries are already sufficiently mature for the drafting of an international reproduction model. The making of such a model can become the starting point for resolving problems in the international division of labor and production cooperation within the framework of economic integration among these countries. A general reproduction model could be used as a prototype for a coordinated intergovernmental economic complex.

Naturally, the study of the problems of the socialist comity is not limited to economics but includes all aspects of social life -- politics, ideology and culture.

As we know, some parts of the social organism may fall behind in their development. This must be noticed and considered promptly and such sectors must be helped to catch up, for excessive violations of national economic proportions, for example, or serious omissions in the areas of social management or ideological and educational work are fraught with major difficulties and even threats to socialist gains, as the current events in Poland remind us.

We must never forget that scientific research in Marxist social science must contain a powerful aggressive, ideological and propagandist charge. Under the conditions of the aggravated struggle in the international arena, criticism of anticommunism, bourgeois and revisionist concepts, the exposure of the falsifiers of Marxism-Leninism and the hegemonistic ideology and policy of Maoism and all kinds of anti-Soviet fabrications of enemy propaganda constitute a task of prime importance.

We are fully justified in concluding that there is no area in social science which is not experiencing the beneficial and determining influence of the historical decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress today. We must enhance the level of organization in the whole of our scientific activity and make it more effective in order to be equal to the new tasks set by the congress, to eliminate the shortcomings it noted and to implement its stipulations successfully.

The ideas of the 26th CPSU Congress are a powerful incentive for improving the quality of work in the country's scientific institutions. Bearing in mind the tasks set by the congress, the republic academies have decided to intensify their study of the basic trends governing changes in the social structure of Soviet society and improvements in the political system and spiritual life of developed socialism. They have taken steps to draft long-term programs for scientific and technical progress for the period through the years 2005-2010. The study of the problems related to the socialist way of life, the communist education of the youth and

family organization rank high in the plans of republic establishments. The initiative on studying the principles and ways and means of exercising the constitutional rights and obligations of citizens and labor collectives and the legal problems in the organization of production and labor is worthy of our approval. The problems of the scientific and technical revolution and its social consequences will be studied more thoroughly. The counteracting of various bourgeois ideological concepts and the criticism of nationalistic, religious and other vestiges in the minds of the people will be increased and considerable attention will be paid to the internationalist education of the working people.

The implementation of scientific research programs largely depends on the level of organization in the work of the social scientists and the state of coordination of scientific research.

The Soviet social sciences have a large detachment of skilled science organizers. There are about 40 scientific councils and commissions on the most important problems in the social sciences. However, it is still not possible to say that everything is satisfactory in the areas of research coordination and concentration of the efforts of social scientists on the creative elaboration of the most vital problems. Duplication, work on petty projects and totally unjustified work on strictly local problems of no serious theoretical or practical value remain.

The practical application of research projects remains the weak link in the social sciences. Relations with customers, if one may call them that, are unsteady. Commissions are frequently insufficiently substantiated. In planning work on a given project, clear information must be available as to who needs it and why. In other words, we must plan a system for the organization of scientific work based not on the sectorial or regional principle, and one which would enable us to approach a complex problem concretely and specifically. The implementation of the long-range plan for the joint participation of the Moscow City CPSU Committee and the USSR Academy of Sciences humanities departments in resolving problems related to Moscow's socioeconomic and cultural development is noteworthy. The institutes involved in this project do not simply pass on the respective developments and recommendations to their customers and the practicing organizations but have established permanent business relations with them and hold joint and systematic discussions about the level of the effectiveness of the application of the results of their studies.

A similar situation must be achieved in all areas of scientific work. We have developed the practice of having scientific works written by collectives of authors. Obviously, it would be expedient to create, when necessary, comprehensive creative collectives for work on specific topics, which would include members of the respective party and state organs. The system whereby some natural science and technological institutes sign contracts with ministries and various organizations is yielding tangible results in the effective application of the latest scientific achievements and research effectiveness. Experience proves that one must struggle consistently for the application of scientific recommendations, providing, naturally, that they are worthwhile.

The academic institutions related to the humanities in the union republics are dedicating much effort to the study of regional and republic problems. However, without belittling the importance of such work, we must emphasize that many of them are still doing insufficient work on basic all-union problems. The specialization

of republic institutes must be pursued and their creative cooperation systematically developed. In this respect, the head institutes and the USSR Academy of Sciences social science councils bear great responsibility.

Scientific progress is the result of joint collective effort. Regular creative exchange of views among scientists is an urgent requirement. A successful all-union conference on problems in the contemporary natural sciences was held last April. The results of its work were approved by the broad scientific public and will be of great importance to the intensified integration of scientific knowledge and the increased interaction among natural, technical and social sciences. We must heed the suggestion on the holding of another all-union conference of historians (the last was held more than 20 years ago). In considering the topical problems in the social sciences we must emphasize the important role which historical research plays in scientific and practical work, the ideological arming of cadres and the patriotic and international education of the masses. This calls for an attentive and exigent attitude toward the work of historians, the elimination of empiricism, a descriptive style and elements of idealization concerning some periods in history, events and personalities, and the modernizing of the social thinking and culture of past centuries. A representative and prestigious conference of historians could result in a thorough discussion of topical problems in the science of history.

The work of methodological seminars, which are an important form of Marxist-Leninist education, scientific contact and creative exchange of views, must be improved in order to energize the scientific public and ideological and political life in the humanities institutes.

Science cannot become the "disturber of tranquility," as the 26th party congress, demanded, without making the scientific public more active. This is fully applicable to the academic journals in the social sciences. In addition to covering the achievements of science, providing scientific information services and playing a coordinating role, they must act as pioneers in sponsoring creative discussions and round-table meetings, the number of which has diminished considerably. As a rule, many reviews published in our journals resemble superficial annotations. Thorough book reviews are extremely rare, not to mention the fact that reviews of poor works which, unfortunately, are still being published, have totally disappeared.

In order to surmount the complacency noted in some scientific collectives, the necessary steps must be taken so that a creative atmosphere, reciprocal comradely exigency and inquisitiveness will exist in every academic subdivision. In remembering the critical remarks expressed in the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th party congress on manifestations of scholastic theorizing, we realize that this makes it incumbent upon us to strengthen our ties with reality and practical work and creatively to develop the topical problems in the building of communism.

We proceed from the fact that the socialist society is the most dynamic of all. A study of the dialectics of its development requires an understanding of its prospects. The importance of this is further enhanced by the fact that we face extensive work in summing up the experience gained in the building of socialism and communism in connection with the decision of the 26th congress on making the necessary additions and amendments in the current CPSU Program.

The party has provided Soviet social scientists with all the necessary conditions for fruitful work. It is their duty to justify the party's great confidence and to make their worthy contribution to the solution of the historical problems in building communism and consolidating peace on earth.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003

CSO: 1802/4



## TOPICAL PROBLEMS IN THE SOCIAL AREA

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 81 pp 55-63

[Article by Prof A. Zdravomyslov, doctor of philosophical sciences]

[Text] The reorganization of all social relations on the basis of the social principles inherent in the new system is completed during the period of mature socialism. The material and spiritual activities of the Soviet people, their entire way of life, changes. The fundamental features of the socialist way of life take shape and strengthen with the solution of the economic, political and cultural problems of building the new society, and the shoots of a communist way of life appear: labor becomes ever more meaningful, interesting and creative; the sociopolitical activeness of the working people increases and their participation in management broadens; meaningful forms of rest and recreation become ever more common, the inner world of man becomes richer, and human contacts become truly humanistic.

However, the consolidation of the socialist way of life is an exceptionally complex process. To begin with, a great variety of means must be used to surmount obsolete habits and behavioral norms in daily human contacts and vestiges of the past in the human minds. In this case we must also take into consideration the efforts which bourgeois ideology, acting from the outside, is making to revive these vestiges and to hinder the assertion of the norms of the socialist way of life. Secondly, some of the positive processes which are taking place in socialist society have consequences which are not always entirely predictable and for which not all members of society have been prepared. Some difficulties arise on the basis of socialist relations themselves. Thus, the fast improvement in the prosperity of the Soviet people as a whole has a favorable influence on the development of their spiritual needs, the more so since it is accompanied by higher educational standards, scientific and technical production facilities and expanded activities of cultural institutions and public organizations. However, it would be erroneous to assume that the development of spiritual and cultural needs is the automatic consequence of the improved material possibilities of the working people. On the contrary, whereas with the growth of material well being, less attention is paid to purposeful and systematic ideological-educational and cultural work, the resulting social effects could be positive as well as negative: the danger that consumerist feelings and of a parasitical attitude toward society may arise.

In accordance with the stipulations of the 26th CPSU Congress, in order to gain a better understanding of the laws governing the development of the material and spiritual foundations of the socialist way of life, we must adopt a differentiated

approach to the study of the characteristics and interests of each social group and stratum within socialist society.

At the present time, from the viewpoint of strengthening the material foundations of the socialist way of life, the most essential tasks are the following: First, further improving the living conditions of families with a relatively low income per family member and poor housing conditions; second, giving priority to the development of the production of consumer goods and services compared with the increase in population income; third, the formulation and implementation of the food program, whose basic principles were formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress; and fourth, control of the population's monetary income by blocking all sources of nonearned revenue and systematically implementing the principle of distribution in accordance with the quantity and quality of labor.

The 26th congress paid great attention to the problem of improving distribution relations in the socialist society. Distribution is an area in social life in which the economic and social interests of the working people directly meet and where the requirements of the production process, the enterprise and the worker's family come together. The new tasks of the party's economic policy, related to the conversion to intensive economic development methods, require improvements in the organization of labor and wages and the use of social consumption funds which would establish a closer interrelationship between the labor contributions of the worker and his material living conditions.

Any improvement in distribution relations, based on the strengthening of the socialist way of life, presumes more than merely taking individual steps in this area. The area of distribution itself must be considered within the framework of the sum total of social relations. Thus, distribution problems are closely related to production problems, for one can ideally distribute only that which has been produced, which has been created. Furthermore, the system of distribution of spiritual and material goods in the developed socialist society goes far beyond the framework of production problems. It affects many other sociopolitical factors. Control of distribution relations means not only wage and bonus control. Here it is a question also of a rational policy in the area of the utilization of social consumption funds and the problems of accessibility of vitally important goods and conditions such as housing, facilities for education and enhancement of cultural standards, health care and many other material and spiritual values.

Various ratios may be applied in regulating wage and incentive funds and social consumption funds. One of the suggestions in the area of improving distribution relations is to enhance the role of monetary regulators in wages. However, in the final account the real living standard of the family is determined not only by the amount of the wage but by the products and the various goods which meet one or another requirement which can be purchased with this wage. This means that if services and the production of prime necessity goods fall behind in their development, a certain gap arises between distribution and consumption, which could be used and is in fact used by the nonworking elements--the black marketeers or bribers (the latter may collect bribes merely for providing the information that a specific item is available in the stores). Therefore, it is clear that the task of improving distribution relations may move in two directions: production and consumption. This presumes the need for purposeful efforts to improve the system of trading in material goods. Since

consumption items include not only food products but housing, medical services, recreation and, to a certain extent, education, this is a question of improving virtually all aspects of the nonproduction sphere and of making it entirely consistent with the principles of the mature socialist society.

In this connection, particular attention must be paid to making incentives available to the various categories of working people in the nonproduction sphere, such as teachers and workers in health care, administration, mass information media, cultural institutions, etc. Here as well the level of wages must be rationally correlated with the level of wages in basic production sectors, so that the social significance of such professional activities may be more visible to the society.

Attention should be paid to the two approaches to the problem of improving distribution relations. In the first case, the principle of equal and free access to material and spiritual goods, based on the cash available to the consumer, regardless of its source, is asserted. According to the supporters of this viewpoint, this will increase the stimulating role of wages. In our view, however, this would only widen the gap between distribution and consumption and increase the opportunity for gaining unearned income by obliging "middlemen."

The second viewpoint legitimately proceeds from the fact that equal accessibility to material and spiritual goods is no more than an anarchic-utopian phrase as long as society must heed differences in individual labor, based on quantity, quality and skill. Socialism rejects rather than asserts equal accessibility to material and spiritual goods to the working person and the loafer, the conscientious worker and the slacker, and the frontrunner and the laggard, considering this a manifestation of social justice. Naturally, a preferred treatment in consumption, which the socialist society gives to individuals whose labor productivity is higher, means a relative inequality. However, it is the kind of inequality which does not turn such individuals into some kind of caste or estate; furthermore, it is of a kind which encourages everyone to rise to his level. Socialism does not promise the satisfaction of needs outside the real contribution to the production of material and spiritual goods which alone create the actual consumption fund.

Therefore, we see that a complex dialectics of equality and inequality in the distribution of material and spiritual goods is a characteristic of the developed socialist society. Essentially, the socialist way of life is based on a similar contradiction. On the one hand, there is a trend toward increasing social equality and rapprochement among the main classes and strata in socialist society. This trend is quite clear today. "In assessing the experience in the development of our society during recent decades," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 26th CPSU Congress, "I believe that we could assume that the establishment of a classless social structure, in its essential and basic features, will take place within the historical framework of mature socialism." However, a classless society does not mean a society without any social structure, for we note, on the other hand, a further differentiation among the labor contributions of the workers as a result of the increased role of professional skill differences and scientific knowledge in the organization of material and spiritual production. Differences in the degree of responsibility for overall labor results remain as well. These two trends interpenetrate and become interwoven and occasionally clash, triggering a number of collisions in the areas of distribution and labor



relations. The essence of the social policy of the socialist state in the area of improvements in the socialist way of life consists precisely of finding at any given moment the necessary measure for influencing either trend, in order to formulate the type of system of steps which would intensify integration processes within society without leading to the equalization of individual and professional characteristics and interests of the working people, underestimating the value of highly skilled labor and leading to petit bourgeois equalization.

This problem can be resolved radically by going beyond the framework of the area of distribution relations. Naturally, further improvements in distribution relations are intrinsically necessary. Nevertheless, it would be erroneous to assume that all problems of social development can be resolved exclusively on their basis. However broad the range of goods and values it may involve, and however we combine within it elements of incentive and equalization, distribution by itself cannot resolve problems caused by the insufficient development of the material and technical production base or the functional aspect of the labor content. That is why the 26th CPSU Congress draws attention to "making human labor not only more productive but more meaningful, more interesting and creative. The most important role here belongs to the elimination of manual, unskilled and heavy physical labor which is still practiced by millions of people in our country. This is not only an economic but a major social problem. To resolve it means to eliminate the major obstacles on the way to converting labor into a prime vital need of every person."

Unskilled, boring and physically hard work does not stimulate the development of the personality of the worker and restricts his desire for spiritual growth. Such work is frequently paralleled by negative forms of behavior. Conversely, meaningful and creative work extends to the area of varied and skillfully organized recreation and cultural contacts. It is precisely such work that becomes the basis of the development of labor as a prime, vital need. Under socialist conditions, meaningful labor becomes one of the most important objective factors which significantly affects the attitude toward other aspects of social life and toward all cultural and spiritual values. This means that various institutional changes, i.e., improvement in the systems of distribution of material goods, education, development of democracy, and so on, are refracted in the socialist society above all through the lens of the attitude toward labor, the attitude of the worker toward his production and social activity.

The socialist way of life is a working way of life. This elementary truth has been mastered by every conscientious citizen of our country, by every person interested in social problems.

However, the question of the attitude toward labor assumes a specific content at each separate stage of our social life, for each new generation has its own way of accepting the old truths and mastering the principles and norms of the socialist way of life in a new way consistent with its own experience.

In the 1980s, the most important factors which influence the shaping of an attitude toward labor are the increased well-being of the working people, which provides greater opportunities for free self-determination and choice of a profession by the young person; the enhanced general level of the population's education and culture, particularly that of young people, which raises the level of aspirations and leads to



fast fluctuations in the area of professional prestige. Today, the question of the attitude toward labor is considered by most young people not only as one of a source of existence, but as the choice of a career, professional self-realization, manifestation of possibilities of creative growth and ensuring leisure time which can be meaningfully used outside work according to the individual's choice.

During the past decade there have been both positive and negative trends in the development of the attitude toward labor. On the one hand, the level of conscious labor discipline and organization rises; unity between material and moral labor incentives strengthens; and the influence of the collective on the development of efficiency, responsibility and initiative in every worker becomes more effective. The party decisions aimed at strengthening the ties between school and production, the creation of a system of vocational-technical schools and the training of the new reinforcements of the working class with the help of this system had a tremendous positive impact on molding a new attitude toward labor. Let us point out that, starting with 1975, every year more than 2 million graduates of vocational-technical schools have joined the ranks of the working class; in the 10th Five-Year Plan they accounted for two thirds of all newly hired production workers. On the other hand, the fact that technology in many production sectors remains backward, as a result of which unskilled and physically heavy manual labor is still quite widespread in the national economy, hinders the development of labor into a prime vital need. Although they help to retain the workers, the higher wages paid for difficult labor conditions do not essentially change the attitude toward labor itself. The application of the norms of the socialist way of life in the labor area is also hindered by violations in the distribution system based on the quantity and quality of labor, shortcomings in family upbringing, and a remaining low standard of management of the labor collective. The result of all of this put together is that some workers violate production discipline and carry out their assignments formally while trying to obtain as much as possible from society and the collective. Generally speaking, the number of such people is small. However, they exert a noticeable influence on the labor atmosphere, on the sociopsychological climate in the collective. Unless blocked by strong and organized counteraction, an unconscientious attitude toward the work creates indifference, a passive attitude and unwillingness to struggle against the group mentality and formalism on which unconscientious workers frequently rely.

Speakers at the congress sharply criticized economic managers who consider problems of improving working and living conditions secondary. "This," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said, "is a radically wrong and harmful position. The Central Committee Politburo has frequently taken such managers, including ministers, strictly to task. Firm control must be provided over using the funds for the social development of enterprises, cities and villages precisely according to their purpose, to the fullest extent and within stipulated deadlines. Usually, local reports on the completion of new industrial projects do not indicate what has been done for those who will work there, and the amount of housing, kindergartens, libraries and prophylactic institutions built. Let us agree that such reports will be considered adequate only if they stipulate that the program for housing and cultural construction at the site has been fulfilled as well."

The 26th CPSU Congress emphasized the importance of socialist competition in developing feelings of social duty, conscious discipline, heroism and dedication in the work. By its very nature the competition must encourage initiative and a feeling of

responsibility. It helps to find and use production reserves and upgrades work effectiveness and quality. However, the congress also noted that occasionally socialist publications are not formulated from below but are "dropped" from above, by the superior organizations. "This damages the very spirit of the labor competition which must be based on counterplans and other similar initiatives running 'from the bottom to the top': worker, brigade, enterprise and sector. Only then should such initiatives be 'coupled' with state plans. This is consistent both with the nature of the socialist competition and the planned nature of our economy" (L. I. Brezhnev).

The picture created by Kuybyshev sociologists from the study of competitors in several enterprises, which reveals the extent of the conscientious attitude of the workers involved in the labor competition, confirms the need for a creative approach to the organization of the socialist competition. We learned that 16 percent of the workers participate not only in the competition but in its organization; another 22.5 percent are directly involved in the competition. They know and remember their obligations and are familiar with the course of the competition without participating in it as organizers; 38.5 percent consider themselves involved in the competition but, because of a number of important indicators, cannot be characterized as fully conscious participants. They either have no specific obligations, are not informed of the competition conditions, or are not interested in the summarizing of its results. Finally, 23 percent of those studied, although listed as competitors in the official summation of results, in fact are not involved in the competition and do not consider themselves involved. They show no interest in it. They are unfamiliar with their obligations, competition conditions and results (see SOTSIOLOGICHESKIYE ISSLEDOVANIYA No 1, 1981, p 157).

The development of initiative from below is an important means in developing a new attitude toward labor. It helps to surmount the element of formalism in the organization of the socialist competition and to make every worker voluntarily and conscientiously accept his obligations, weigh his possibilities soberly, make a close study of the rules for determining the winners and the losers and be interested in the summarizing of results.

Strengthening the spiritual foundations of the socialist competition, developing socialist culture and ensuring the purposeful enhancement of the needs and habits of the working people are the most important directions in improving the socialist way of life. As we know, the spiritual life of society develops in far more complex ways than material well-being and production. The spiritual life of the people is not simply a "consumption of spiritual values." It means above all their hopes, joys, expectations and doubts. It is a system of their thoughts, feelings, plans, intentions, motivations and disappointments and comprehensive assessments of people and events around them; it is a world of intimate emotions, adoption of spiritual values and development of moral principles. Any human step or socially significant action is the result of man's own spiritual activity, the result of the processing of a specific set of social relations in the mind of the individual. The spiritual world of man is materialized through his actions. However, before it is materialized it must exist as man's internal condition. Man's spiritual world is a reflection of the actual social relations which develop throughout life. As they accumulate and pile up, impressions remain in the human mind as though leading their independent life, converting into memories, dreams and aspirations and, subsequently, into actions. The human mind, however, is

not merely an accumulation of impressions, for it engages in activities such as the processing of emotions, accumulation of knowledge, formulation of moral principles and self-education. This internal work on oneself, imperceptible from the outside, is the basic, the determining content of man's spiritual life. It is precisely a rich spiritual life which distinguishes the true bearer of the socialist way of life and the personality of the builder of communism with its active life stance.

Boredom, monotony, sluggishness of feelings and thoughts, and bad manners are, therefore, the opposites of spirituality. As a rule, they are the result of a kind of life and contacts which do not demand of a person the stressing of his spiritual forces. They do not presume the existence of an internal active and creative attitude toward existing circumstances. Such a person could seem to be very active. However, his actions seem to correspond to his first impressions and motivations instead of being reworked by his moral consciousness. However, here again it is a question precisely of spiritual life, for it involves human emotions and feelings. Taking into consideration the fact that feelings and emotions could be uneducated and culturally raw, we are forced to acknowledge that with such a spiritual life asocial and even antisocial behavior could develop. This level of development of spiritual life is not typical of the socialist society. Furthermore, it clashes with the norms of the socialist way of life. However, the forms of spiritual life are relatively stable and could be reproduced for a while despite overall adverse sociopolitical conditions.

Faced with undeveloped spiritual needs and forms of spiritual life, improved well-being cannot change them by itself. Greater well-being creates prerequisites and material opportunities for the enhancement of the needs of the individual. However, these possibilities become reality only after an intensive inner work of the spirit, when a person applies conscious efforts to enrich his spiritual life.

The features of the socialist way of life embody the gains and advantages of socialism as a new socioeconomic and political system. Instead of individualism and rivalry, socialism promotes collectivism, true unity and harmony between public and private interests; instead of the constant reproduction of poverty and wealth on the opposite sides of social life, instead of material and spiritual poverty and unrestrained luxury, it offers social equality and the systematic enhancement of the material well-being and spiritual culture of all working people; instead of philistine consumer feelings, envy and enmity it promotes respect for the dignity of the individual and a spirit of creativity and cooperation among people. The mastering of the values of the socialist way of life converts them into norms of daily behavior and into basic criteria for the reciprocal assessment of the members of the socialist society.

The features of the socialist way of life are strengthened also in the course of surmounting the vestiges of private ownership mentality, which were instilled in the masses during the many centuries of existence of the exploiting system. As a result of the increased well-being, which increases the amount of private property, under the conditions of the socialist society such vestiges may be given new incentives. Naturally, personal property cannot become a means for the exploitation of hired labor. However, it could become the object of aspirations and create envy and a feeling of false pride and prestige, thus in fact lowering the importance of the individual and converting him into an appendix of material goods. Inheritance, as a result of which the labor income of the first generation could become the source of nonworking income of subsequent generations, could play a certain role in the preservation of such a mentality.



Money-grubbing and consumerism are also emotions which can sometimes create great stress of feelings and passions. The thirst for money develops in individuals who violate the law in this respect a great deal of inventiveness. It requires organizational talent and sometimes a strong character. However, such individual qualities and emotions violently clash with the norms of the socialist way of life, as a result of which such a person alienates himself from society and is forced to lead a double life and practice a double morality.

In addition to such forms of spiritual interests and corresponding behavior, we must take into consideration deviations from the values and norms of the socialist way of life, in which the interest of the individual is limited to his family. No, it is not a question of a truly moral attitude toward one's family situation and consequent obligations such as strong feelings of attachment, love, deep awareness of duty to one's relatives, and feelings and concerns which could be and indeed are the content of the spiritual life of many people in the socialist society and which bring a person profound satisfaction. We wish to emphasize that the general social civic content of such spiritual factors may vary greatly. Along with the close combination of family with production and civic interests, we may also see cases of pitting some against others and the aspiration of making the family a limited, a closed small world. In such cases, family life becomes a self-seeking aim, a means for avoiding social life and a field of consumer and philistine mentality. This may lead to consumption for the sake of prestige and arrogance, the purpose of which is not to satisfy normal social and cultural needs but to demonstrate the advantages of one's position.

Unfortunately, something similar could take place even when the basic life orientations of the individual are directly influenced by meaningful, varied or at least many-sided labor activity. It may seem that in this case all the necessary conditions exist for accepting the norms of socialist morality and the principles of collectivism and harmonious combination of production and nonproduction interests. Nevertheless, certain disproportions may develop here as well in the development of needs. This occurs when for the sake of his business and production interests, the person ignores his civic and family obligations, shifting them to others, to his relatives. Occasionally, the way of life of a family in which the functions are clearly divided and in which the husband has an interesting job and a noted social position while his wife does the housework and serves the head of the family, may be fraught with serious conflicts and internal instability. Therefore, from the viewpoint of the further assertion of the socialist way of life, the most preferable is the type of organization of production and family life which is based on the harmonious combination of production, social and family interests of the individual and in which there is true equality among members of the family, high standards in mutual relations and contacts, and a just and democratic division of obligations. Interesting work and participation in sociopolitical life are the most important sources for positive motivation and respective actions. They contribute to the enrichment and development of the spiritual interests of the individual, the broadening of his outlook, the profound mastery of scientific views on society and the understanding of the meaning of his own life. Social activity makes it possible to master the nature of social relations and the mechanism for the formulation of collective decisions and actions.

Such deviations from the norms of the socialist way of life are not rigidly related to any specific social stratum or class. This watershed has no clear demarcation signs.



It frequently goes through a single person and even more frequently through a family. For this reason, it can be surmounted through improved social upbringing and encouragement of a moral, communist minded spirit of self-education by the Soviet people. This is the most important sector in the ideological struggle from the viewpoint of the prospects of the building of communism. Such deviations can be eliminated only on the basis of the assertion of socially positive forms of spiritual life and on the basis of the development of conscientiousness, civic-mindedness and socialist morality and consolidation of the principles of socialist humanism.

The positive program of action for the strengthening and further development of the socialist way of life is closely related to the development of a new attitude toward labor, the sociopolitical activeness of the working people and the general enhancement of culture. All of them are included in the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003

CSO: 1802/4

## REVOLUTION OF THE PROLETARIAT, REVOLUTION OF THE PEOPLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 81 pp 64-75

[Article by A. Sovokin, doctor of historical sciences]

[Text] The assessment of the Great October Socialist Revolution as the turning point in Russian and world history and as the main event of the 20th century plays an important role in the contemporary ideological struggle. The bourgeois ideologues spare no efforts to refute its historical legitimacy and to belittle its international significance. The falsifiers of history make particular efforts to misrepresent the role of the Bolshevik Party and the motive forces of the revolution by claiming that the Russian working class and its allies did not follow a course leading to a socialist revolution but acted "spontaneously," "autonomously" and "independently" from each other, and that the movements of the peasants, soldiers and oppressed nationalities were anarchic. To this day, the S. R.-menshevik thesis of the "conspiratorial" nature of the October Revolution and the claim that it was a "coup d'etat from above," carried out by a "handful of decisively acting bolshevik extremists while the masses remained politically passive and apathetic," that it was a "coup d'etat by a minority," a "revolution by professionals" and so on remain popular in the West.

As was justifiably emphasized at the 26th CPSU Congress, our class enemies are learning from their defeats and are acting in an increasingly refined and insidious manner against the socialist countries. However, all of their attempts to "remake" history break down in the face of actual historical facts.

The nature of one or another revolution is determined by its class nature, motive forces, and extent of participation of the people's masses in it. That is precisely why, in characterizing bourgeois-democratic and socialist revolutions, the founders of scientific communism made wide use of the term "popular" revolution, along with the terms "bourgeois" and "proletarian." For example, V. I. Lenin gave a high rating to the work of P. A. Kropotkin on the French revolution, the main idea of which was to prove its popular nature. On the basis of his study of the French revolution, P. A. Kropotkin believed that the power of a people's revolution lies in "the destruction of the old organization and the introduction of a new one," for which reason the revolution "must encompass social life far more extensively than the bourgeoisie would wish it to be." He believed that the courage of the bourgeoisie "increased with every new victory that the people won over the old order" and that the victories of a bourgeois revolution occur only if the people's masses exceed the limits set by their leaders.

Indeed, a people's revolution begins by winning over the tremendous majority of the people and uniting them with a revolutionary\*political party in the struggle against the government (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 35, pp 318-319). The breakdown of the old governmental machinery and the creation of revolutionary and truly democratic power organs are important prerequisites in the making of such a revolution. Such features of a true revolution made on behalf and in the interests of the people's masses, as Marx wrote, were inherent in the first proletarian revolution--the Paris Commune (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 17, pp 561, 586). Addressing himself to Marx's assessments, in his work "The State and Revolution" Lenin wrote that the Russian Plekhanovites and mensheviks, Struve's followers, who wanted to label themselves Marxists, proclaimed the concept of a "people's" revolution to be Marx's "slip of the tongue." They have reduced Marxism to such a narrow liberal distorted level that they think only of pitting the bourgeois against the proletarian revolution," Lenin pointed out, "and even to this contraposition they give a ghastly meaning" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 33, p 39). On the eve of the October Revolution, expanding Marx's ideas, Lenin pointed out that a truly people's revolution is a revolution in which the popular mass, the majority of the people, the lowest social "bottoms," strangled by oppression and exploitation, rise by themselves, leaving on the entire course of the revolution the mark of their own requirements, their own attempts at building a new society to replace the old society they are destroying, in their own fashion. In his view, a revolution cannot be considered popular if the popular mass, the tremendous majority of the active population does not play a substantial role with its own economic and political demands (Ibid). Lenin's views on the future proletarian revolution in Russia, which state that "no power of the capitalists and the kulaks, and no power of global financial capitalism, which is stealing money in the hundreds of billions, can defeat a popular revolution. On the contrary, that revolution will conquer the entire world, for a socialist coup d'etat is ripening in all countries" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 34, p 330).

In Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution, the concept of a people's revolution is organically combined with the theory of the growth of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution. Lenin never separated a democratic from a socialist revolution, considering the second the extension, the new stage of the first. Using the Great October Revolution as proof of the correlation between a democratic and a socialist revolution, he wrote: "The first develops into the second. The second, in passing, resolves the problems of the first. The second consolidates the work of the first. Struggle and only struggle determines the extents to which the second can outgrow the first" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 44, p 147). This brief Leninist concept shows the dialectics of the conversion of the people's revolution in the democratic stage to a people's socialist revolution. Socialist revolutions are truly popular not only because of their motive forces and objectives but also their results, for it is only socialism that leads the nation to the path of real progress and to a new civilization. Therefore, a socialist revolution is a people's revolution of a higher type than a bourgeois-democratic revolution. This is determined by the degree of preparation of the proletariat and the extent to which it is united with the rural poor. This is achieved as the result of the experience acquired in the revolutionary struggle of the masses, guided and led by the Marxist-Leninist party.

# I

During sharp historical turns and revolutionary periods the people are the direct subject of the revolution and of progressive political movements. "By using the word 'people,' Marx did not eliminate class differences," Lenin wrote, "but brought together certain elements which could bring the revolution to its completion" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 11, p 124). The people can make a socialist revolution and consolidate its victory only under the leadership of its hegemon--the proletariat. It is precisely the working class and its party who organize the political army of the revolution and wield the power on behalf of the revolutionary people. This scientific truth, the class nature of the concept of "people," and the popular nature of a revolution were emphasized exclusively by the Bolshevik Party and its leader, V. I. Lenin, in the course of the preparations for and victory of the October Revolution.

The problem of winning over the majority of the people on the side of the revolution and the proletariat is complex and difficult both practically and scientifically. It is only Marxist-Leninist, proletarian parties, which stand on strictly scientific positions, that can resolve this problem in the interests of human progress, in the interests of the entire people, of all the oppressed and exploited. The first such party was the Bolshevik Party, created by Lenin, which led the Russian proletariat and its allies to a socialist, to a truly people's revolution.

The concept of winning over the majority of the people on the side of the proletariat which has risen to the struggle, was the basis of Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution. In summing up the lessons of the Great October Revolution, Lenin pointed out that "the proletariat cannot succeed without winning the majority of the population over to its side," and that "victory and the preservation of the power require not only the majority of the working class . . . but the majority of the exploited toiling rural population" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 40, p 14; vol 44, p 32). He developed the same idea in his work "Greetings to the Italian, French and German Communists," written in October 1919. The victory of the proletariat over a powerful class enemy such as the bourgeoisie and the success of the revolution "absolutely required the sympathy of the majority of the working people (consequently, the majority of the population)" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 39, p 219).

In order for the majority of the people to become the real majority in the administration of the state, Lenin pointed out, it is necessary to establish the type of state government "which would make it possible to make decisions on a majority basis and which would ensure the conversion of this possibility into reality." "On the other hand, in terms of its class content and ratio among one or another class within this majority (or outside of it) it is necessary for this majority to be able to conduct the affairs of state jointly and successfully" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 34, p 38). The bourgeois and petit bourgeois parties tried to present their selfish interests as those of the entire nation. They denied the people the right to decisive participation in socioeconomic changes. In their theoretical and ideological formulations, the concept of "people" lost its direct revolutionary meaning entirely. It was replaced by meaningless phrases and speculative abstractions. Thus, in the course of the preparations for the October Revolution, the Cadets--the main bourgeois party--claimed that it is precisely they that "do not represent a narrow-class party but are a party of the whole people"



(RECH', 2 June 1917). Whereas the Cadets, followed by the mensheviks and the S. R. were trying to protect the interests of the bourgeoisie under the guise of the "whole people" or "whole nation" concepts of their platforms, the bolsheviks believed that the class policy of the proletariat was the only guarantee for the victory of a people's, a socialist revolution.

The proletariat accounted for a minority in the country's population (about 15 out of 160 million). However, allied to the rural poor (more than 65 percent of the rural population, accounting for more than two-thirds of the country's entire population), became the unquestionable majority. Let us add to this that in the course of resolving the problems of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the intermediate non-proletarian, so-called middle classes of town and country, either directly joined the proletariat or maintained a sympathetic neutrality toward it. Therefore, the Leninist course of socialist revolution called for involving in it all the oppressed and exploited and the establishment of a system of soviets, which were the result of the creativity of the people themselves, something which determined the popular nature of the October Revolution.

The enhanced level of proletarian consciousness and organization and the liberation of the proletariat from the influence of petit bourgeois parties and its involvement on the side of the broadest possible toiling and exploited masses, the poorest peasant strata above all, was a prerequisite for the success of the revolution. During the preparations for the revolution, the main weapon of the working class was its political organization--the Bolshevik Party. It was precisely that party that taught organization and consciousness to the proletariat, raising it to the role of hegemon of the revolution, rallying under its leadership the tremendous majority of the population with a view to overthrowing the power of capitalism and building new social relations, and against the attempts of petty and big owners to revive capitalism. When Lenin raised the question of the shift from a democratic revolution to a socialist revolution and of the struggle for giving the power to the proletariat and the poorest peasant strata in his April theses, it was a question of a revolution by the overwhelming majority of the people, of a truly people's revolution.

The political and economic platform of the socialist revolution, adopted by the Bolshevik Party, reflected the basic demands of the broadest possible toiling strata, of the entire toiling people. It organically combined the socialist demands of the working class with general democratic demands. This included the demands for peace, elimination of landed estates, transfer of the land to the peasants, and emancipation of oppressed nations. No political party in Russia other than that of the bolsheviks had or could have such a program for meeting the expectations of the people's masses.

The Bolshevik Party proceeded from Lenin's stipulation that millions of people will never listen to the party's advice if it does not coincide with its own experience (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 32, p 178). The people's masses had to be convinced on the basis of their own experience of the rightness, justice and real possibility of the implementation of the bolshevik program. Only the experience acquired in the class struggle and the practical test of the platforms of the various political parties could convince the masses of the accuracy of the solutions suggested by these parties, and only thus was it possible to determine the behavior of classes and parties and to draw a conclusion as to which one would be followed by the majority of the people.

After the overthrow of the autocracy, in the atmosphere of a general "revolutionary intoxication," the bourgeoisie tried, as it had in the past, to pursue the imperialist war and to protect its scandalously high profits and landed estates. Meanwhile, the proletariat and the peasantry were calling for an end to the imperialist slaughter of the peoples, which was taking place to serve the interests of the capitalists. They called for an end to their thievery and to distributing the landed estates among the peasants. The sharp antagonistic contradictions between labor and capital and between the working people and the bourgeoisie could be resolved only by giving the entire power to the soviets. However, the mensheviks and the S. R., who were heading the soviets, were trying to preserve the power of the bourgeoisie. With their connivance and open support, the counterrevolution organized its forces, hindered the transfer of the land to the peasants, sabotaged the struggle against the arising economic catastrophe and was preparing a conspiracy.

The discontent of the popular masses with the high cost of living, the dislocation and the protracted nature of the war was increasing with every passing month. Under the circumstances of the aggravated class struggle, the mensheviks and the S. R., who had made an agreement with the bourgeoisie, unavoidably slid toward the support of the counterrevolution. The political crises (April, June, July) indicated with increasing clarity that they had remained deaf to the aspirations of the masses. While the toiling masses called for giving the power to the soviets, putting an end to the imperialist war, introducing control by the workers, transfer of the land to the peasants, and decisive struggle against the dislocation, the mensheviks and the S. R. continued to support the power of the bourgeoisie. They approved the offensive mounted by the Russian forces on the front, took the side of the counterrevolution in July and actually reduced to naught the role of the soviets. They supported the Kerenskiy Bonapartist government, which was a government of the counterrevolutionary bourgeoisie.

Under such historical circumstances, the success of the revolution depended mainly on the speed with which the majority of the people would reject mensheviks and S. R., who expressed the desire of a segment of the petite bourgeoisie to reach an agreement with the capitalists. However, the Bolshevik Party had to abstain from provocations and to refuse to join the battle demanded by the bourgeoisie but premature in the case of the proletariat as long as the majority of the people had not taken the side of the working class and as long as the bourgeoisie, resorting to trickery, and with the help of mensheviks and S. R., retained a decisive influence in controlling governmental policy. The resolution of the Sixth Congress of the RSDWP(b) stipulated that whenever favorable conditions appear and whenever the proletariat gains the majority of the people over to its side "the stressing of all efforts for the seizure of the power of the government and for directing it, allied to the revolutionary proletariat of the progressive countries," the task of the revolutionary classes will be "peace and the socialist reorganization of society" ("Shestoy S'yezd RSDRP (Bol'shevikov). Protokoly [Sixth Congress of the RSDWP (Bolsheviks). Minutes]. Moscow, 1958, p 257).

The resolutions of the April conference, approved by the Sixth Congress of the RSDWP (b) clearly formulated the party's task in winning the majority of the people over to the side of the revolution with a view to establishing the power of workers and peasants and taking a number of practical steps towards socialism, which were unquestionably possible on the technical level and which, on the political level,

could be supported by the overwhelming majority of the population of town and country.

The sympathy and support of the majority of the working people particularly increased after the Pyrrhic victory of the bourgeoisie in July, when it used weapons against the people demonstrating peacefully. The detention and persecution of bolshevik soviet deputies and members of soldiers' and peasants' committees, followed by the counterrevolutionary Kornilov mutiny and the military conspiracy against the revolution definitively opened the eyes of the people who no longer believed in reaching an agreement with the capitalists as preached by mensheviks and S. R. since February. The nationwide crisis, which was aggravated as a result of the defeat of the Kornilov movement, accelerated the turning of the toiling masses to the side of the working class. The struggle of the proletariat for Soviet power, peace, land and national liberation was supported by the people's masses--workers, soldiers, peasants and oppressed nationalities--in the autumn of 1917, as Lenin noted (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 34, pp 239, 244, 300, 401, and others).

Since the working class was resolving problems of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, as it was advancing towards a socialist revolution, it was supported by the entire peasantry, by all working people. It was precisely this historical fact that Lenin had in mind when he repeatedly said and wrote that the peasantry "as a whole was following us," and that "all peasants could not fail to rise and in fact did rise to the struggle against the mensheviks" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 37, pp 313, 353, 326; vol 38, pp 143, 178-179 and others), and that "this was the crux of the nationwide nature of the revolution" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 34, p 244).

The popular nature of the growing socialist revolution was manifested particularly clearly when the nationwide crisis became aggravated, and when the "upper" classes lost the support of the "bottoms." Lenin, who established this fact accurately, reached the conclusion that the party could unquestionably win, "for the people are very close to a state of despair and we are offering a proper solution to the people" (Ibid). In calling the party to a socialist revolution and to an armed uprising, having analyzed the domestic and international situation, Lenin convincingly proved that the Bolshevik Party was enjoying the active support and sympathy of the majority of the people.

The sympathy of the majority of the working people is confirmed most frequently by "the growth of one of the parties or the growth of its membership in the soviets, or else by the success of a separate but for some reason tremendously important strike or success in civil war, and so on and so forth" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 39, pp 219-220).

Unquestionably, the quantitative growth of the Bolshevik Party proved that its influence among the workers, soldiers and peasants was increasing steadily. Whereas, compared with the clandestine party membership, by the time of the April conference party membership had quadrupled, despite the persecutions by the Sixth RSDWP(b) Congress, it had increased tenfold and on the eve of the October Revolution, it had increased by a factor of 15. This proved the increased level of proletarian consciousness, party prestige and trust in the party shown by the broadest possible masses of working people.



In this struggle for winning the masses over, Lenin ascribed a prime role to the soviets, which "naturally reflected and expressed the feelings and changes in the views of these masses immeasurably faster, more completely and more accurately than any other institution" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 37, p 281). By rallying and involving the masses of workers and peasants in politics, the soviets were "the closest instruments to the 'people' (in the sense applied by Marx in 1871 regarding a truly popular revolution) and the most sensitive barometer reflecting the development and the growth of the political and class maturity of the masses" (Ibid, p 312). On the eve of the October Revolution, the mensheviks and the S. R. were forced to acknowledge that the Bolshevik Party had become the majority party in the soviets of workers' and soldiers' deputies. The Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets, held immediately after the victory of the October armed uprising, proved that the masses had turned away from the mensheviks and the S. R. and switched to the side of the bolsheviks. The bolshevizing of the soviets on the eve of the October Revolution was a clear indication that the masses would follow the bolsheviks.

The workers' deputies, who represented the proletariat and were the most militant, politically mature and well organized class in Russian society and who expressed most accurately and fully the growth of the new socialist revolution, were the binding and guiding force in the soviets.

After the Kornilov conspiracy, which revealed the antipeople's and counterrevolutionary nature of the bourgeois system once and for all, the party returned to the slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" which it had temporarily abandoned after the July events, but which was now expressing the clear prospects for the struggle and had become a close demand understood by the broadest toiling masses. The fact that in the autumn of 1917 the majority of the soviets had assumed revolutionary positions was one of the most important proofs that the people's masses had switched to the bolshevik side. The position of the peasants in the soviets was a major argument in support of this conclusion. The majority of peasant soviets were against a coalition with the bourgeoisie. However, "to be against a coalition means in fact to be with the bolsheviks," Lenin concluded ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 34, p 400).

All of this convincingly proved that the peasants had switched to the side of the proletariat, and that the peasant uprising was "an objective conversion of the people to the side of the bolsheviks not in words but in actions" (Ibid). The peasant uprising was of national political significance. In a country in which the peasants, who had dreamed of land for centuries, were in the overwhelming majority, the agrarian problem was the major problem of the revolution. The inability of the Russian bourgeoisie radically to resolve the problem of the land created grounds for drawing to the side of the proletariat over the sympathy of all hesitating rural strata, turning them into a potential reserve of the political army of the revolution.

Objectively, the struggle of the peasantry was a powerful revolutionary democratic movement, which helped the proletariat to win. Although at that period the S. R. were still enjoying considerable influence in the countryside, the majority of peasants who supported them were following the left-wing S. R., who were at that time opposed to a coalition with the bourgeoisie and favored a Soviet system. That



is precisely why on the eve of the October Revolution an informal yet exceptionally important alliance developed between the bolsheviks and the left-wing S. R. This proved the tremendous success which the Leninist party had achieved in winning over the sympathy of the determining mass of the working people.

The second most basic problem in Russia's democratic development at that time was the national problem. Gaining the support of the working people of oppressed nationalities meant a considerable increase in the revolutionary-democratic proletarian reserves, for more than 50 percent of the country's population consisted of nations and nationalities deprived of full rights. Bolshevism, which had stood firmly on principled positions on the national problem ever since its appearance, expressed on the eve of the October Revolution the just demands of the "toiling masses and the aspirations of ignored and oppressed nationalities" (IZVESTIYA TsIK 17 September 1917), something which even its political opponents acknowledged. The bourgeois policy of annexations and coercion toward nations deprived of full rights led to the fact that even at the democratic conference, which the leaders of the mensheviks and the S. R. had contrived to hold, the majority of the representatives of the oppressed nations spoke out against a coalition with the bourgeoisie. This proved that the oppressed nations had rejected the bourgeoisie, given their trust to the Russian proletariat and, together with it, were opposing the capitalist power.

"The national and the agrarian problems are the basic problems of the petit bourgeois population masses in Russia today." Lenin wrote in the pamphlet "Will the Bolsheviks Retain the State Power?" "This is unquestionable. On both subjects the proletariat does not stand alone. It has the majority of the people on its side. It alone can pursue a decisive and truly 'revolutionary-democratic' policy on both matters, which would immediately grant to the proletarian state system not only the support of the majority of the population but a real explosion of revolutionary enthusiasm among the masses. . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 34, p 299).

Lenin considered the support which the broadest possible masses had expressed of the demand of putting an end to the imperialist war and of making peace on a democratic basis the most important sign that the majority of the people had taken the side of the Bolshevik Party. The general indignation at the predatory war, which became apparent by the end of 1917, became the prerequisite for a mass support of the appeals for peace. A democratic peace was enthusiastically approved. In 1917, pulling out of the war, something which the entire nation demanded, became the crux of political events. Revolutionary Russia, which implemented the bolshevik, the Leninist slogans, extracted itself from the clutches of war.

A thorough study of the class struggle and the positions held by the different classes and parties led Lenin to the firm conclusion that the proletariat had earned the sympathy of the majority of the people and that the ruling parties had exposed their antipeople's nature. It was precisely this conclusion that became the basis of the decision made by the CC RSDWP(b) to launch an armed uprising, in which the growth of the people's trust in the Bolshevik Party, the majority achieved by the bolsheviks in the soviets and the successes of the peasant uprising were considered as objective factors for its future victory.

In the course of the preparations for an armed uprising, the party took into consideration that the expression of the will of the majority of the popular masses

was not sufficient to ensure the victory of the revolution. Such a victory needed an active revolutionary majority and an armed force superior to the forces of the enemy and able to defeat them. The Red Guard and the soldiers and sailors who took the side of the revolution, i.e., the revolutionary army which ensured the triumphant victory of the Soviet system, became that force in the October Revolution. In October 1917, "the resolve and readiness to overthrow the bourgeoisie and the physical organized power which this required" had fully ripened "in the huge masses of working people" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 38, p 133).

The uncommonly bloodless and successful armed uprising in Petrograd, the triumphal spreading of the Soviet system throughout the country and the painless and peaceful seizure of the power by the soviets in the overwhelming majority of Russian cities entirely confirmed Lenin's conclusion to the effect that the Bolshevik program for a socialist revolution was unquestionably consistent with the interests and demands of the overwhelming majority of the country's population.

## II

The Soviet system became not only a manifestation of the true will of the people but a powerful weapon for winning from the bourgeoisie over strata which hesitated between it and the proletariat. The revolutionary active majority, which could mount an uncompromising struggle against the bourgeoisie, continued to consolidate even after the victory of the October Revolution. The process of winning the sympathy and support of the majority of the working people by the working class continued. It assumed a variety of forms, changing in accordance with the specific circumstances which prevailed at the different stages of the establishment and development of the Soviet state. ". . . this sympathy and support," Lenin concluded, "does not come immediately. It is not decided by vote but is earned as the result of a lengthy, difficult and hard class struggle" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 39, p 220). The experience of the October Revolution proved that the unification of the working people around the proletariat, under a private ownership system, developed into a practical struggle for the overthrow of the exploiters--the capitalists and the landlords. The proletariat, particularly its detachments in the capital, was the decisive force in this struggle. It is such detachments that decide the destinies of a nation at turning points in history, providing that the center is supported by sufficient local forces. This was fully confirmed in the course of the October Revolution. The overwhelming forces of the people, moral as well as material, were on its side.

As the socialist revolution developed, the alliance between the proletariat and the poorest peasants became increasingly stronger. The front of firm supporters of the Bolshevik Party and the proletarian state expanded. The number of conscious and active builders of the Soviet state and of the new social system, without exploiters and against exploiters, increased among the toiling masses.

The Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the decrees on peace and land it passed and the establishment of a Soviet government proved that a radical change had taken place in the deployment of class and party forces. Whereas before the October Revolution the country was ruled by the upper classes, the Soviet system had now offered all working and exploited people tremendous possibilities.

Winning the masses of the peasantry over in supporting the government created as a result of the socialist revolution, the Bolshevik Party provided them with the opportunity to participate in the administration of the state and to fulfill their expectations. This was one of the most complex and important tasks which arose in the course of the socialist changes. What distinguished the October Revolution from all previous revolutions was the fact that it "led through the Soviet system to active participation in state construction tens of millions of people who had previously been uninterested in such construction" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol. 42, p 140).

The decrees on peace, land and the system, promulgated by the Second Congress of Soviets, had a most determining influence on the positions of the toiling peasantry. These decrees were lethal blows dealt at the parties of the S. R. and the mensheviks (on the eve of the October Revolution the Menshevik Party broke down while the S. R. Party split). The decree on land granted the peasants 150 million desyatins of crown, estate and church land. It freed the peasants from slavery to the land-owners, huge indebtedness and cruel exploitation. With the decree on land, which was the expression of the firm will of the tremendous majority of peasants throughout Russia, the Soviet system proved that the party of the S. R. had to be "defeated and expelled from the government so that everything in its program which was revolutionary and useful to the working people could be implemented" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 40, p 14). Within a very short time the Russian proletariat won the peasantry over from the S. R. The decree on land laid the beginning of such an extensive agrarian reorganization of the countryside that the party of the left-wing S. R., which claimed to be the only representative of the peasantry, was forced to ally itself with the Bolshevik Party in order not to lose its followers once and for all. Subsequently, the bolsheviks firmly pursued the line of strengthening the alliance between workers and peasants and the alliance among working people of all nationalities. It called for an honest coalition of forces supporting the platform of the Soviet system. It was only the flexible tactic of the Bolshevik Party that helped the left-wing S. R. to make a bloc with the communists. Subsequently, however, particularly in the period of the conclusion of the Brest Peace Treaty and the beginning of the socialist reorganization in the countryside, the left-wing S. R. broke with the Soviet system and mutinied against it, which resulted in their defeat.

The extraordinary and the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Peasant Deputies, which were held soon after the October Revolution, were proofs of the true feelings of the toiling peasant masses. The full executive committee, which was elected first at the extraordinary and then at the All-Russian Congress, was made part of the Soviet All-Russian Central Executive Committee. In assessing this historical act, Lenin said: "We have established close contact with the soviet of peasant deputies, second convocation. Together with it we organized the Soviet system of workers, soldiers and peasants" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 35, p 167). In January 1918, the delegates to the Third Congress of Soviets of Peasant Deputies joined the delegates to the Third Congress of Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, thus completing the merger between the two representative organs of the soviets. This represented the consolidation of the alliance between workers and peasants.

The elections for a constituent assembly were held during the period of unification between the soviets of workers' and soldiers' deputies and the soviets of peasant deputies. The results of these elections are being used to this day by various falsifiers who are accusing the bolsheviks of violating the will of the people.



Like the Russian mensheviks and S. R. in their time and like Kautskiy, who agreed with their insinuations, they are trying to prove that general elections are always the only determining manifestation of the will of the people, that the rejection of this principle is an antidemocratic action, etc., etc. Actually, the results of the elections for a constituent assembly are only one of the many proofs of the way the bourgeoisie can falsify the real will of the people with the help of general elections and the manner in which, under certain circumstances, such elections can be used not in the interests of the masses but for counterrevolutionary purposes, and that "statements about democracy and 'constituency' are merely a screen concealing the dictatorship of landowners and capitalists" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch., vol 40, p 17).

The elections for a constituent assembly were based on lists drawn up as early as September 1917, i.e., before the split within the S. R. Party. The joint list gave the right-wing S. R. overwhelming superiority compared with the left-wing splinter group, although the left-wing S. R. enjoyed, as we pointed out, far greater support among the peasant masses.

In the local areas, the technical preparations for the elections were made by the bourgeois zemstvos and city dumas, which used dirty forgeries. In a number of guberniyas, the bolshevik lists were not shown to the voters and "undesirable" ballots were destroyed. It is also important to note that only about one-half of the electorate voted.

Another factor which influenced the results of the elections for a constituent assembly was the fact that a considerable share of the peasantry was still unfamiliar with the platform of the Soviet system and the meaning of its initial decrees. These peasants had been tricked by the demagogic slogans of the S. R. (slogans which they neither could nor wanted to follow while the power was in their hands) and who followed them. All this explains why the majority of the votes went to the petit bourgeois parties. As the actual development of the revolution indicates, this was not consistent with the true deployment of class forces. The bolsheviks, who received about one-quarter of the votes, in fact enjoyed the sympathy of the majority. Noting this fact, Lenin subsequently pointed out that at the end of October and in November 1917 the bolsheviks were followed in fact, rather than with their ballots, by the majority of the working and conscious peasants, by the majority of the most active and conscious segment of the people (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 45, p 175).

Naturally, the elections for a constituent assembly made the general background in the class struggle for power, the hesitations of the petit bourgeois peasant masses, and their deception by the conciliationist parties quite obvious. This was thoroughly proved by Lenin in his article "Constituent Assembly Elections and Proletarian Dictatorship." Lenin wrote that "the results of the elections for a constituent assembly, if one knows how to use and interpret them, prove to us again and again the basic truths of the Marxist theory of the class struggle" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 40, p 19).

A basically new alliance of class forces developed in the course of the establishment and consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is confirmed by the decisions of the congresses held by the soviets--the most widespread and representative organization of the working people. The Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets,



which was held on the eve of the elections for a constituent assembly, and the third congress, which was held soon after the assembly was dissolved, proved most clearly that the masses had turned to the bolshevik side and no longer trusted mensheviks and S. R. According to Lenin, any mention of the fact that the Soviet system was not being recognized by the majority of the Russian population was received by the country with laughter (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 37, p 282).

The participation of the Bolshevik Party in the constituent assembly elections enabled the revolutionary proletariat to prove to the masses the true meaning of this "representative" institution, which was radically at odds with the interests of the people, for which reason it was dissolved by the Soviet system. The toiling peasantry, which had received land from the Soviet government, supported the dissolution of the counterrevolutionary constituent assembly. The country's petit bourgeois population spoke out in favor of "the bolsheviks," when they distributed the land and when the demobilized soldiers brought the news of the peace," Lenin wrote ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 40, p 16).

In the tradition of the Paris Commune, the Great October Revolution resolved the main problem of the socialist revolution, the main problem of the entire proletarian class struggle--the problem of the power. An end was put to the rule by landowners and capitalists. Proletarian dictatorship and a state of a new type were established and strengthened. ". . . This dictatorship," Lenin said, "would have been entirely impossible and internally meaningless without its main motive force--the unification of the working people, a unification which could draw the tremendous majority of the toiling population over" ("Leninskiy Sbornik XXXIX" [Leninist Collection XXXIX], p 220). With the help of the soviets, the people's masses themselves were building a live and creative socialism and organizing new social and economic relations. During the very first months of its activities, the soviet state initiated and consistently implemented most important socialist changes: workers control and nationalization of monopoly associations and individual enterprises, followed by entire industrial and transportation sectors, and nationalization of the banks. Organs for the administration of economic life were established. An anticapitalist, antiexploiting social trend could be noted in all most important measures taken by the Soviet system.

A characteristic feature of the policy of the Soviet system was that, in the course of the implementation of its main socialist tasks, it was also resolving the problems which the February bourgeois-democratic revolution had left unresolved. We know that the February revolution, which rejected the hated autocracy in one fell swoop, had not undertaken the real solution of the agrarian or the national problem. It had left the imperialist policy and the rule by capitalists and landowners untouched. The October socialist revolution resolved all of these problems more thoroughly than any other revolution in the world. In terms of its direct participants, the importance of the problems resolved and the scope and depth of action of the masses, the Great October Revolution had a far more profound, comprehensive and clearly manifested popular nature than any other previous revolution.

The socialist revolution in Russia, which freed from the chains of imperialism one of the great countries in the world and which created the first state of workers and peasants in history, radically changed the appearance of the world. It is continuing to exert its progressive influence on the destinies of nations. Decades afterwards,

as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasizes, the October Revolution is triggering "the interest not only of historians but of anyone who is involved in today's political struggle."

The building of developed socialism, the creation of a state of the whole people, and the shaping of a new historical community--the Soviet people--the worthy heir of the revolutionary passion, energy and traditions of the heroes of the October Revolution, are the greatest accomplishments of the new age.

The people's democratic, antiimperialist, national liberation and socialist revolutions, which radically changed the ratio of forces in the world, were the most important indicator of the changed aspect of the world as a result of the influence of the ideas of the October Revolution. The ways, means and methods of these revolutions were not an automatic duplication of foreign experience. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out at the 26th CPSU Congress, "All the socialist countries made their revolutions in their own way, in manners dictated by the ratio of class forces within each one of them, and on the basis of their domestic situation and external conditions." However, all of them were truly national, led by the working class headed by its party. This is one of the most important laws discovered by Marx, Engels and Lenin, tested in the course of the revolutionary historical creativity of the people's masses--the true makers of history.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5033

CPSC: 1802/4

## ROBBERY UNDER THE GUISE OF 'INTERDEPENDENCE'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 81 pp 76-87

[Article by Prof R. Ul'yanovskiy, doctor of economic sciences]

[Text] "The fact that the liberated countries are strengthening their independence does not suit the imperialists. By thousands of ways and means they are trying to tie to themselves these countries in order freely to dispose of their natural resources and to use their territory for their strategic plans." (L. I. Brezhnev, "CC CPSU Accountability Report to the 26th CPSU Congress and the Forthcoming Party Tasks in Domestic and Foreign Policy)

### I

With the breakdown of the capitalist colonial system, which took centuries to develop, imperialism lost the political monopoly of power in Asian and African countries. It also lost the full and exclusive monopoly it enjoyed in economic relations with the liberated countries; supplying such countries with machinery and equipment, selling them scientific and technological knowledge and training their national cadres stopped being its exclusive privilege. Many liberated countries dealt tangible blows at its property, i.e., at its basic positions in their economy. A number of liberated countries opted for a socialist domestic and foreign policy course. All this represents tremendous progress for the revolutionary process in Asia and Africa, as foretold by the great Lenin.

Meanwhile, imperialism is not only continuing but is even trying to increase its exploitation of the liberated countries with the help of elements of colonial structures still remaining in their economy. While doing everything possible to prevent the breakdown of these elements, imperialism is trying to increase its domination of the capitalist global economy and to create new levers for retaining economic and political control over the liberated countries and for preventing them from abandoning the capitalist way of development. This is the strategic task of contemporary imperialism.

The colonial vestiges supported by imperialism, the new forms of economic exploitation of former colonial peoples and the overt and covert political pressure exerted on liberated countries represent a comprehensive system of dependencies, justifiably described as neocolonialism, which is supported and implanted by imperialism by all possible means, including military pressure and intervention which, at the present time, are particularly dangerous. American imperialism's declaration that many areas,

which include dozens of Asian, African and Latin American countries, are its sphere of "vital interests," as well as the creation of "rapid deployment forces," which are used to suppress the national liberation movement described as "international terrorism" as a justification of such an aggressive policy, are nothing but an open revanchist challenge to the independence of the liberated countries.

One of the main distinguishing features of contemporary colonialism is that, starting with the 1960s, its economic ways and means have been decisively influenced by the growing expansion of multinational corporations which enjoy the comprehensive support of their home countries. It is precisely this aspect of economic neocolonialism which has become today most significant and which marks the conversion of imperialist countries to a very active policy of economic subordination of the liberated countries.

At the beginning of the 1970s, the multinational monopolies, which were the result of the process of exceptionally increased concentration and centralization of capital, against the background of the scientific and technical revolution, were already controlling one third of the gross national products of the countries in the capitalist world and more than one half of their foreign trade. They accounted for most private capital investments abroad and about four fifths of all technological exchanges. The multinational monopolies (MNM), based in the United States, hold a dominating position among them.

The most important among the variety of means for establishing economic neocolonialism and intensifying the exploitation of raw material and labor resources in the liberated countries is quite naturally the export of private MNM capital to these countries. In the 1970s, the rates of increase of such capital exports exceeded exports of government capital within the framework of so-called foreign "aid."

The breakdown of the colonial system and the expansion of the struggle for the economic liberation of the developing countries, which rapidly undertook the creation of a state sector on the basis of nationalization, initially substantially restricted their role as areas of application of private capital and resulted in the concentration of capital investments in the developed capitalist countries themselves. Between 1950 and 1976, less than one fifth of private capital exports of Western countries went to the developing countries; as a whole, only \$76 billion, or 26.5 percent, of the \$287 billion of direct private investments abroad in 1976 went to the developing countries.

Another indicative fact is that MNM investments are concentrated in a relatively small number of developing countries. In 1975, about 76 percent of their overall volume went to 29 countries, including one fifth to six countries known as "tax havens" (Panama, the Bahamas, Bermuda, the Dutch Antilles, the Cayman Islands and Barbados); more than one half went to only 11 of the biggest developing countries (such as Brazil, Mexico, India, Iran and others). This concentration was not the result merely of the particular economic interest in these countries by the MNM. It was also influenced by U.S. military and political interests, the strategic importance of some countries, and opposition to the socialist global economic system and to the struggle waged by the young countries to regain national sovereignty over their natural resources and economic activities.



Since the mid-1970s, MNM have opened more than 50,000 of their branches in the various economic sectors in the developing countries. Between 1951 and 1975, 180 of the biggest U. S. multinational corporations opened (or acquired) 4,523 branches in these countries, including more than 2,200 industrial enterprises, while 211 monopolies of other imperialist countries gained control over 9,170 industrial enterprises (between 1951 and 1970). This was an unparalleled powerful and lengthy economic offensive mounted by monopoly capital against the agrarian-raw material peripheral part of the world.

At the same time, between 1960 and 1975, 71 developing countries nationalized 1,447 MNM branches, including 628 in African countries south of the Sahara, 319 in Western Asia and North Africa, 300 in South and East Asia and 200 in Latin America. Although the number of nationalized branches was relatively small, these were strong blows dealt at the multinational monopolies, for nationalization affected big enterprises in the petroleum and ore-mining industry (about 300), banks and insurance companies (349), agricultural plantations (272), processing industry enterprises (221), public utility and transportation enterprises (58) and trading companies (48). Furthermore, the nationalization of MNM property took place at an ascending pace (from 468 cases in 1960-1979 to 979 cases in 1970-1976). Characteristically, whereas at the beginning of that period, the most frequent targets of nationalization were enterprises related to the former colonial mother countries (Great Britain, France), subsequently it was extended to the branches of American MNM. A total of 521 branches of British, 342 American, 146 French and 438 other monopoly branches were nationalized. In addition to nationalizations, many of the liberated countries amended to their own benefit the conditions under which MNM branches could operate. This was another unparalleled retaliatory blow at the monopolies on the part of the countries freed from colonial dependence. Consequently, in the last 15-20 years relations between imperialist countries and countries struggling for their economic liberation characterized the nature of two powerful and conflicting processes--monopoly economic expansion and anti-imperialist nationalism.

An active policy of developing the state economic sector and the taking of steps to limit foreign capital investments and activities and subject them to government regulation play an important role in limiting the expansion of an MNM in many liberated countries such as India. Such policy (although inconsistent in many countries) and the general domestic political circumstances which do not offer a "favorable climate" for MNM activities, limit their expansion even in countries in which their investments are most heavily concentrated presently.

This does not relieve in the least the tremendous threat of MNM expansion to the economic and political independence of the liberated countries. Such expansion has already reached a big and unparalleled scale. It was given further impetus by the deep upheavals in the global capitalist economic system in the 1970s and the drastic aggravation of the competition and struggle for markets and raw material and fuel sources. Private direct investments in the developing countries increased from \$43.3 billion by the end of 1971 to \$107.2 billion by the end of 1980, or by a factor of 2.5 in 9 years (although the real amount of such investments was less because of the inflationary growth of prices and the depreciation of capitalist currencies).

The multinational banks of imperialist countries also increased their expansion in the developing countries. Between 1971 and 1976, the 50 biggest such banks increased their

assets in the developing countries from \$603 billion to \$1,448 billion and the number of their branches from 968 to 1,573. To most developing countries, loans and credits granted by multinational banks at so-called market interest rates, which reached as high as 15-20 percent, became the principal means for financing their steadily worsening balance of payment deficits and one of the main items in their growing foreign indebtedness. Overall indebtedness of the developing countries to foreign banks, which increased from \$45.5 billion in 1970 to \$180 billion in 1977, i.e., by a factor of 4, accounted for about four fifths of their total foreign debt.

MNM managers have recently formulated the concept of so-called interdependence among countries within the capitalist system. By the end of October 1975, this thesis was formulated by D. Rockefeller, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank. He immediately proceeded to make clear the way this interdependence was interpreted by the monopolies, which were unwilling to acknowledge such "fatal" measures, in his words, as the increases in petroleum prices by petroleum-extracting countries. D. Rockefeller noted that the developing countries are trying to increase their say in global economic affairs and that they are dissatisfied with the existing international economic system which, they believe, is hostile to them.

What were his conclusions? According to him, foreign capital investments remain the key to increasing the prosperity of all developing countries. In his view, the multinational corporation is the best means for achieving this objective. Therefore, the reassessment of import policy should be answered by the developing countries with a similar reassessment of the limitation of exports. Attempts to follow the example set by OPEC could only undermine the new spirit of friendly rapprochement.

Therefore, the main prescription suggested by D. Rockefeller for surmounting the economic backwardness of the developing countries is cooperation with imperialist countries on the basis of a "close interdependence," in which the multinational monopolies would play a leading role. The purpose of this concept is to rally around the United States all industrially developed capitalist countries in order to weaken the pressure applied to them by the developing countries and to achieve a solution to economic difficulties suitable to the multinational monopolies. The thesis of the "interdependence between developing and developed capitalist countries" is a manifestation of the desire to restrict the participation of the Soviet Union and the world socialist system in resolving contemporary global economic problems. In the final account, its purpose is to counter the active efforts directed by the liberated countries themselves against the multinational monopolies.

The multinational corporations are trying to resolve in their favor not only the economic but the political problems of the contemporary capitalist world. The purpose of the monopoly thesis of economic "interdependence," which threatens the sovereignty of developing countries, is to convince them of the need to coordinate their foreign policy with that of the United States. The national bourgeoisie of the developing countries is presented with the idea that its fate is the same as that of U.S., Western European and Japanese monopolies. It is claimed that without their help the liberated countries would be unable to resolve their economic problems. Consequently, regardless of the tremendous disparities among them, more than 100 liberated countries should essentially constitute a single system together with Western state monopoly capitalism. D. Rockefeller and other monopoly capital leaders acknowledge that the industrially developed capitalist countries depend on supplies of raw materials, minerals and fuel

from the developing countries, for this is undeniable. However, they emphasize far more urgently that the developing countries as well depend on the United States, its financial aid and American technology and food. Therefore, the concept of "interdependence" has been formulated for the sake of concealing the exploiting nature of the contemporary social division of labor in the capitalist economy and for the sake of perpetuating its one-sided nature, which is detrimental to the liberated peoples, and to prevent the developing countries from attaining economic equality. The purpose of this concept is to elevate to the rank of state policy of the imperialist countries a new type of political and economic dependence of the developing countries on state-monopoly capitalism and on U.S., Western European and Japanese multinational monopolies.

## II

The concentration of a tremendous financial and technical potential in MNM hands and the global scale of their operations, on the one hand, and the particular dependence of developing countries on foreign markets and on funds and technology for their economic development, on the other, predetermine relations of inequality and exploitation between MNM and liberated countries. In the 1960s-1970s, the one-sided and exploitative economic dependence of the majority of developing countries on industrially developed capitalist countries increased substantially. In order to conceal this unquestionable fact, the bourgeois politicians and economists formulated the concept of "asymmetric interdependence," which allegedly exists between developed and developing countries. This thoroughly hypocritical concept was adopted by neocolonialist politicians in the liberated countries following the capitalist way, and is used with a view to weakening the struggle for a new global economic order. To listen to them, all that is needed is a simple correction of the "asymmetry" and the exploiting dependence would vanish....

Reality, however, indicates otherwise. The MNM decide on the nature, target and place of their investments on the basis of interests which have little to do with the need to develop the independent national economy of the liberated countries. As always, capital investments are determined by the use of inexpensive manpower in the liberated countries and the seizure of raw materials and markets for industrial commodities yielding maximum profits. The intention of correcting the "asymmetric interdependence" is totally absent. According to studies made by the United Nations Commission on Multinational Corporations, the purposes of their capital investments in the developing countries are the following:

to strengthen their control over raw material supply sources (for which reason even consortiums, i.e., superassociations of different MNM, are being created of late); to "replace imports" by a given country with goods produced by MNM branches, i.e., to seize and monopolize the biggest (and most extensive and profitable) national markets in the developing countries for the marketing of their own goods); and finally, to create a so-called "export base," i.e., to import in the developing countries some commodities or goods which are subsequently exported to third countries (including the MNM country of origin).

With the help of such a differentiated specialization in the production of parts, the MNM "exports" to the developing countries mainly the most labor-intensive (frequently manual) production processes, which essentially involve assembling operations. The enterprises set up in different countries on this basis are merely one of the limited units in the production of a given commodity. They are totally dependent on the



semi-finished goods and components they receive, on foreign markets and on decisions made at MNM headquarters.<sup>1</sup>

These objectives also determine the changes which are made in the sectorial structure of MNM capital investments in the developing countries. By the end of 1972, 44.8 percent of their direct investments in these countries were in the petroleum extracting (35 percent) and mining industries; 30.3 percent were in the processing industries and the remaining 24.9 percent, in other sectors. The full or partial nationalization of the petroleum and many other enterprises in the ore-mining industry in the developing countries (which mainly affected U.S. monopolies) reduced the share of these sectors to under 20 percent by the end of 1976. This was paralleled by both a relative and absolute growth of investments in the processing industry, but mainly in trade, banking, services and others. The sectorial breakdown of direct U.S. investments in the developing countries (which accounted for almost 54 percent of all direct foreign investments in such countries in 1970 and for more than 46 percent in 1976) was as follows (in billion dollars):

Sector	1970		1976	
	Amount	%	Amount	%
Total	21.5	100	35.1	100
Petroleum	8.4	39.1	5.2	14.8
Ore mining	2.5	11.6		
Processing	5.5	25.6	11.4	32.5
Trade, banking, insurance, services, etc.	5.1	23.7	18.5	52.7

These data show that within the stipulated period, direct U.S. investments, which had increased during the stipulated period by a factor of 1.6, sharply declined (by more than one half) in the petroleum and extracting industries, and that they increased in the nonproduction sectors by a factor of 3.6.

Characteristically, within the same period of time, direct FRG investments in the developing countries almost tripled (from \$2.2 billion in 1971 to \$6.5 billion by the end of 1976).

Japan's share of foreign investments in the developing countries is the highest among all developed capitalist states. In April 1977, of a total of \$19.4 billion invested abroad, 10.8 billion or 55.7 percent were invested in the developing countries.

There is no doubt that MNM economic policy and practice in involving the liberated countries in their multinational economic "empires" are actively encouraging in the liberated countries an exceptionally distorted industrial and overall economic development and a closed production cycle deprived of national bases. This increases their dependence on the developed capitalist countries. Such relations can be described as "growth without development," leading to new forms of subordination and exploitation of liberated countries.



### III

The growing dependence of the liberated countries on imported modern technology is a factor which has become particularly important in the exploiting strategy of the MNM today. Imperialism continues to do everything necessary to isolate the developing countries from the scientific and technical revolution. Suffice it to say that so far 97 percent of all scientific research and design work in the capitalist world economy is taking place in industrially developed countries and has been monopolized by the multinational corporations. The latter, as we pointed out, account for more than four fifths of the entire amount of capitalist trade in technology (or, more accurately, the right to obtain and use technology, involving payments for patents, licenses, consultations, technical assistance, etc.), the overall volume of which increased from \$2.7 to more than \$11 billion, i.e., by a factor of more than 4, during the 1965-1975 decade.

The significance of this indicator becomes obvious if we take into consideration that it has considerably exceeded the growth rates of all direct private foreign investments in the entire capitalist world. The isolation of the developing countries from scientific and technical progress in the capitalist world is manifested in the fact that such "trade" in technology and science is taking place almost exclusively among developed capitalist countries (and within them, among MNM). According to available data, in 1975 the developing countries paid for such items less than 10 percent of the indicated amount, i.e., about \$1.1 billion, of which \$845 million went to U.S. MNM. According to some forecasts, providing that the same growth rates are maintained, by 1985 the developing countries will be paying in excess of \$6 billion. Furthermore, according to United Nations experts, MNM policy in this area is such that given the existing situation it will take the developing countries almost 100 years to reach the 1975 technical level of the developed capitalist countries.

The volume of official payments made by the developing countries for science and technology hardly reflects the real situation. By using this currently most important lever of pressure on the developing countries, the MNM are trying to impose upon them the type of conditions for the transfer of technological and scientific knowledge which would lead not only to directions and capital investment structures they find suitable but to specific conditions in which their branches could function in the specific countries, control all newly created enterprises, and so on. This is actively boosted by the fact that most operations related to "technological transfers" to the developing countries are within the MNM themselves. The increasing number of agreements and contracts concluded between the MNM and the developing countries unrelated to direct investments involve mainly operations related to "technological transfers" and consultations.

Consequently, the countries liberated from colonialism, which have taken the capitalist way of development, may bear in mind that they will be able to reach the scientific and technical level of the developed capitalist countries today only on the eve of the 22nd century. What liberated country could accept this prospect for "asymmetric interdependence" which would last for centuries? Is it not clear that the imperialist political experts are hiding the exploiting nature of the monopolies behind this specious pretext?

Trade with the industrially developed capitalist countries which, in the final account, remains nonequivalent and which is the legacy of the colonial past, remains the foundation of the neocolonialist exploitation of the liberated countries. It is the consequence not only of the still-remaining strong colonial structures in their economy and a significantly lower labor productivity by a factor of 8-10, but also by price disparities which are the direct consequence of the monopoly price-setting practice on the capitalist market. The trend of the one-sided increase in the prices of finished industrial goods dominated the dynamics of export prices between 1951 and 1970. During that period, prices of finished goods increased by an average of 47 percent, including 75 percent for machines and equipment. Raw material prices increased by an average of no more than 5 percent, including 23 percent for mineral raw materials; prices of agricultural industrial raw materials dropped by 14 percent. As a result, compared with the beginning of the 1950s, the trade of developing countries in terms of value, i.e., the ratio between export and import prices, was 13 percent lower by 1970, which correspondingly increased their losses due to price differentials.

The correlation between the prices of industrial and raw material commodities which had developed in the 1950s and 1960s was substantially destroyed in the 1970s as a result of actions taken by petroleum exporters in the developing countries to raise the price of petroleum, inflation, the breakdown of the Bretton Woods monetary system and the energy and raw material crises. Whereas export prices of finished industrial commodities tripled between 1970 and 1980, the average price of all raw material and food commodities increased by a 6.9 factor, including 3.4 for foodstuffs, more than 3 for agricultural industrial raw materials and 17 for fuels. The index of the overall ratio of prices of raw materials and of finished industrial commodities increased by a factor of 1.6.

Nevertheless, such averaged indicators do not reflect the real situation in the developing countries. Excluding the prices of petroleum and petroleum products, which profit a few developing countries, the indicator of the ratio between raw material and industrial prices remained virtually unchanged between 1970 and 1979 (it increased by 2 percent).

In reality, however, the growth of export prices on the capitalist world market in the 1970s increased even further the price differentials to the detriment of most developing countries (nonpetroleum exporters). The indicator of value factors in their foreign trade, which take into consideration the specific commodity structure of exports and imports, was as follows (1970 = 100): 1971, 93; 1972, 93; 1973, 96; 1974, 93; 1975, 87; 1976, 88; 1977, 91; 1978, 86; and 1979, 80. Even the bourgeois economists of an organization such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), dominated by the imperialist countries, are forced to acknowledge the tremendous losses suffered by the developing countries from such price differentials. According to GATT estimates, the 1979 imports by developing nonpetroleum producing countries increased in value by nearly 30 percent, compared with only 8 percent in terms of real volumes, while the purchasing power of their income from exports that same year averaged a 6 percent drop. "Ten years ago," notes E. Sauma, director general of the FAO, "a country which exported 1 ton of tea leaves earned sufficiently to purchase 17 tons of fertilizer. Today this income would suffice for 8 tons only.... Ten years ago, one could buy a ton of steel for 1 ton of bananas, whereas today it takes 2 tons."

All of these indicators prove that the exploitation of the liberated countries in their trade with the imperialist countries continued to increase with few exceptions (OPEC). Unquestionably, the drastically intensified monopoly practice of price-setting on the world capitalist market, as a result of the growing monopolizing of trade by multinational corporations, whose current greatly expanded arsenal of monopoly ways and means ensures maximum profits in production and trade, plays a main role in this respect. In the 1970s, the use of such ways and means was described as "restrictive business practices."

What does this mean?

As applied to the developing countries, "restrictive business practices" are one of the most flexible and covert forms of contemporary neocolonialism. With the help of their extensive facilities, the monopolies earn tremendous profits from trade with the developing countries, which remain either totally or almost totally unrecorded in the official statistics of foreign trade prices. One of the essentially new such means is the ever-greater concentration of the flows of international capitalist trade within the framework of "intracompany trade," i.e., of intracorporate trade. In 1974, for example, total U.S. imports from the developing countries amounted to 39.5 billion, 14.8 billion (37.4 percent) of which were goods produced by MNM branches in the developing countries. Most such imports took place within the "intercompany trade" system--procurements which the U.S. mother corporation received from its branches. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, in 1975 the share of such deliveries accounted for 82 percent of the total, including 100 percent from Asian countries, 85 from Latin American countries, 95 from African countries, and 43 from the Middle East. However, the marketing of goods produced by foreign branches was by far not limited to deliveries to the mother company. In addition to marketing goods on the domestic markets of the countries where the branches are located, increasing amounts are exported to third countries, mainly as "intracompany trade" among branches of a given MNM.

No specific data or information on the commodity structure of "intracompany trade" are published. This is considered the holy of holies of the monopolies. Nevertheless, several studies have shown that its scale is steadily expanding with an increasing share of parts and semifinished goods shipped from the mother company to a branch and from that branch to another, as a result of their specialization in various technological processes in the course of the manufacturing of the same finished commodity. "Intracompany" MNM operations provide extensive opportunities for transnational price juggling in the interest of maximizing overall profits. For example, by setting an artificially high price for a commodity supplied to its branch, the corporate headquarters thus lowers its profit and, correspondingly, the amount of state tax which the branch must pay in that country. Intracompany trade channels are extensively used in monopolizing markets, and so on.

Therefore, "restrictive business practices" have reached such a scale as to become an important international problem which affects the profound economic and political interests of most developing countries. Unexpectedly, they have found themselves increasingly dependent on the industrially developed capitalist countries in basic matters of foreign trade. The developing countries, which 10 to 15 years ago had allowed extensive investments by the MNM in the imperialist countries, find themselves prisoners



of such "restrictive business practices" to which they object at all international meetings but which they are unable to breach for the time being. Meanwhile, the monopolies have acquired a new tremendous source of superprofits unknown to the old prewar monopolies of colonial empires.

## VI

Finally, the system of capitalist international monetary relations, in which the imperialist "might makes right" is manifested particularly clearly and directly, is the most important weapon of neocolonialism and imperialist exploitation of the liberated countries. After they acquired their state independence, these countries were given the opportunity to create their own national monetary systems. However, both the former colonies and other developing countries with their own financial systems remain subjected to unconcealed diktat and discrimination in the area of global capitalist monetary circulation. They are deprived of the possibility of conducting an autonomous financial policy in their national interest and are forced to settle their foreign accounts and keep their income from foreign trade in the currencies of the imperialist countries which have tied them to their own national currencies.

The breakdown of the postwar Bretton Woods "gold-dollar standard" at the beginning of the 1970s worsened the situation of the liberated countries even more. The Western countries ignored the demand of the developing countries for an equal status within the new system, for taking their interest and need for economic development, to protect them from the export of inflation from Western countries and from depreciation of their export earnings and currency reserves in formulating the new rules of the monetary system.

The new rules of the capitalist monetary system, adopted by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which became officially effective in April 1978, legitimized the system of "floating rates." This made the liberated countries even more dependent on Western currencies and increased their helplessness in the face of the diktat of the imperialist countries and the sharply intensified use by the latter of monetary policy as a tool of trade and economic expansion and means for resolving their domestic and foreign economic problems at the expense of the weaker partners. American imperialism is resorting to such policies particularly unceremoniously, since to this day the U.S. dollar remains the clearing currency for a good half of the entire global capitalist trade. As an international reserve currency it accounts as a whole for more than three quarters of the currency reserves of the capitalist countries. The devaluation and inflationary depreciation of the U.S. dollar in the 1970s struck particularly hard blows at the developing countries by reducing their real income from export and by extending inflation to them.

The International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development are the promoters of imperialist neocolonialist policy in monetary circulation and currency rates. Profiting from the urgent need felt by most developing countries for outside financial aid, both international financial institutions are pursuing a rigid line in granting loans and credits, aimed at supporting the expansion of MNC in developing countries. Both the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development are trying to interfere in their domestic affairs unceremoniously and to dictate to them the directions and content of their domestic and foreign policies.



This description of some recent forms of neocolonialism hardly exhausts the wide range of ways and means used by imperialism for preserving its influence over the liberated countries and continuing their exploitation. Nevertheless, we could sensibly conclude that the liberated countries which are following the capitalist way remain essentially in the role of agrarian countries in the dependent and exploited area of the capitalist global economy despite the fact that many of them have increased their industrial potential. This is based on the distorted nature of capitalism which is developing in such countries, which is dependent on the imperialist monopolies and which is increasingly exposing its inability to lead these countries on the road to independent economic development under contemporary conditions. Naturally, the continuing exploitation of the liberated countries and of their manpower and natural resources by a handful of imperialist countries has resulted in the fact that throughout the entire post-war period no radical changes occurred in their economic structures, industrial level, food supplies and per capita income. The scientific and technical lag of the liberated countries behind the developed capitalist states is increasing. Their unequal status on the global commodity and monetary markets is becoming the permanent reason for their insolvency and a reason for the catastrophic size of their indebtedness.

In other words, imperialism is trying to avenge the loss of political power in the colonies with the help of economic domination and economic colonialism. Today, all nations in the liberated countries perfectly realize that the proclamation of political independence by the former colonies does not put an end to imperialist exploitation. A neocolonialism has developed, which is skillfully adapting to changing circumstances, acquiring new forms and becoming an increasingly sharper weapon in the struggle waged by imperialism against the economic independence of the liberated countries and against a new and more equitable global economic order.

The answer to this is the radicalizing of the domestic and foreign economic policy of even "moderate" bourgeois regimes in the liberated countries, not to mention the situation in countries with a socialist orientation. As before, this radicalization is manifested in the continuing nationalization of foreign capital and the joint offensive mounted by virtually all liberated countries against the hegemony of developed capitalist countries in the global economic division of labor. It could be said that in this area the pressure of the liberated countries is gradually increasing rather than decreasing. They are trying to strengthen their political independence and are basing this aspiration essentially on the acceleration and intensification of their industrial development. The liberated countries are continuing to advance on the economic front of the struggle against imperialism and predictably they will continue to advance, for the contradictions between them and the international monopolies--the contemporary representatives of global capitalism--are increasing rather than weakening.

Neocolonialism failed to bring about the expected results and did not reconcile the young national states with imperialism. Antagonistic contradictions between them have intensified. The integration between liberated and monopoly capital countries, expected by the imperialist politicians and ideologists, did not take place. Most of the liberated countries and peoples are actively opposing imperialism and many of them are trying to pull out of the capitalist orbit. This is difficult and not all of them will succeed. The aspiration to achieve this, however, is irrepressible. It is precisely this that determines the participation of the liberated peoples in the general movement of our age marked by a transition from capitalism and precapitalist systems to socialism.

A new situation has arisen and become exceptionally aggravated, for the developed capitalist countries are increasingly forced to take into consideration their own dependence on raw materials, minerals and fuels procured by the former colonial countries. The hope of perpetuating the system of economic inequality and maintaining the one-sided economic dependence of the liberated countries is in a state of crisis. This leads us to believe that a qualitative change is ripening in the struggle against neocolonialism and for the establishment of more equitable international economic relations. "It is already clear today," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said, "that with the current ratio of worldwide class forces, the liberated countries can oppose the imperialist diktat and achieve just, i.e., equal economic relations." As to the Soviet Union, it is ready to assist and is actually assisting in the efforts to achieve this objective.

#### FOOTNOTE

1. The revolution in Iran, which expelled the American specialists from the country's industry and virtually eliminated the "asymmetric interdependence" between Iran and the United States, proved the ephemeral nature of American-shah industrialization, which was based on a totally one-sided economic and technological dependence. Now everything must be started from scratch, on the basis of a full national reproduction cycle. Here again, the MNM is not an assistant but a major obstacle.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003

CSO: 1802/4

## LIFE DEMANDS REORGANIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 81 pp 88-99

[Article by A. Chekhutov]

[Text] The internationalization of various areas of economic activity has become an inseparable and important feature of contemporary international life. Scientific and technical progress has opened unparalleled possibilities of increasing the scale of economic exchange and upgrading the effectiveness of foreign economic relations on the basis of the expansion and intensification of production specialization and cooperation. However, the current condition of global economic relations proves most clearly that the tremendous opportunities for international trade are still being used to an insignificant degree. In the case of most countries in the nonsocialist part of the world, it is limited to international division of labor, the main benefits of which go to a small circle of developed capitalist countries.

V. I. Lenin deserves permanent credit for his formulation of the problem of the reorganization of the global economy under the conditions of competition between the two social systems. On the basis of the objective long-term trends of economic progress, after the victory of the Great October Revolution he formulated and developed the idea of a new organization of the global economy and its transformation from a power which destroys and suppresses the economic aspirations of the nations to an important factor which contributes to the development of the national economy and the broadening of relations among them (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 42, pp 69-70). These objectives, Lenin emphasized, are consistent with the principles of equality among countries with different ownership systems, mutual benefit, rejection of the policy of ultimatums and respect for national sovereignty (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, p 386; Vol 45, pp 192-193). He also particularly emphasized the need for voluntary cooperation among nations and assistance of weak by strong nations without subordination (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 45, p 37).

In accordance with Lenin's instructions, as early as 1922 the Soviet government offered a program for international steps aimed at settling global economic problems. It called for the denunciation of enslaving treaties and the adoption of measures to prevent inflation and currency depreciations, the struggle against the fuel crisis and improvements in the international transportation system.

At that time, the suggestions of the land of the soviets on the reorganization of the global economy met with the fierce counteraction of the imperialist countries. However, Lenin's ideas were developed and are now being implemented by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The task of organizing new international economic relations was formulated at the 25th CPSU Congress as one of the main directions of Soviet foreign policy. This line was further developed by the 26th CPSU Congress. "The reorganization of international economic relations on a democratic, a just basis," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out at the congress, "is historically legitimate. A great deal can and must be done in this area. Naturally, however, the question cannot be simply reduced to differences between the "rich North" and the "poor South," as is sometimes being done. We are ready to cooperate and are actually cooperating in the organization of just international economic relations."

# I

The unbroken chain of profound upheavals in the capitalist economy in the 1970s convincingly proved the existence of a sharp contradiction between the system of foreign economic relations and the needs of international trade. Difficulties in marketing goods and services on the global capitalist market increased immeasurably. In the 1973-1979 period, the average growth rates of real commodity exports equalled 4.2 percent, or one half the volume of the period between the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s. Another new feature was the declining pace while prices increased promptly and steadily. The annual increase in export prices reached 15 percent, compared with the 2.4 percent level between 1960 and 1973. Inflation limited exports, hindered the use of production capacities and raised unemployment to an unparalleled level.

Chronic disturbances in the balance of payments became a characteristic feature of the global capitalist economy in the 1970s. The average annual increase of current expenditures over income in the liberated petroleum importing countries increased from \$8.1 billion in 1967-1972 to \$43.1 billion in 1974-1980. The balance of payments of many developed capitalist countries began to show considerable deficits. Trade and payment upheavals were paralleled by a disorganization of the capitalist monetary system. The abandonment of the gold-dollar standard and of firm currency parity, which were adopted in Bretton Woods in 1944, and the introduction of "floating" exchange rates did not weaken but instead increased even further the instability of international monetary circulation.

The study of the development of the global capitalist economy leads to the inevitable conclusion that it took a long period of time for the financial, energy and food crises to mature. The "explosion" in the mid-1970s was largely due to the chain reaction nature of the increased interdependence among various areas of the capitalist economy. The interweaving of structural with cyclical crises not only worsened the power of the blow, but profoundly disturbed the system of capitalist global economic relations, as a result of which it became unable to play the role of shock absorber which could reduce disproportions in the development of individual countries and their economic sectors to a certain extent.

Furthermore, the condition of contemporary international economic relations became one of the main factors which predetermined both the depth of the 1973-1975



capitalist economic crisis and the worsening of possibilities of developing the global capitalist economy in the 1980s compared with the previous decade. According to the latest forecast of United Nations experts, starting with the 1980s, a long period of slowed-down growth rates in productivity and trade, a sustained high level of inflation and unemployment, and increased disproportions in monetary payments is expected in the developed capitalist and the liberated countries.

Under the current system of international economic relations, the majority of liberated countries is being seriously hurt by the slowdown in the growth of income from exports, worsened trade conditions and increasing balance of payments deficits. In 1980, the foreign indebtedness of these countries reached the tremendous amount of \$400 billion and is continuing to grow rapidly. The losses suffered by the liberated countries in the various realms of the global capitalist economy are virtually impossible to determine. The tremendous scale of these losses are indicated by official data on profits earned by the developed capitalist countries from the liberated countries, the interest and dividends from which, as we know, are only the tip of the economic exploitation iceberg. In 1970-1978 alone, this outflow of currency amounted to \$120.3 billion, or quintuple the amount of Western financial assistance.

In the final account, the peoples of the developed capitalist countries themselves are not interested in the preservation of the current system of international economic relations. They are experiencing the painful effects of trade-economics, payment and financial crises which increase mass unemployment and reduce the living standards of the working people and undermine their confidence in the future. All of this underscores the urgent need for a far-reaching review of the system of global economic relations under which a small number of countries and their multinational corporations enjoy tremendous privileges, which they use for purposes of discrimination and exploitation of the majority of countries in the nonsocialist part of the world.

Today, there is not only an urgent need for the elimination of the obsolete system of international economic relations but important objective prerequisites to this effect have appeared, such as, above all, the existence of considerable changes in the social structure of global economy. The development of its socialist part, whose nucleus consists of the members of CEMA, was distinguished by the steady growth of its economic potential. The socialist comity proved its role as the most dynamic economic power of our time between 1970 and 1980 as well, during which its annual growth of industrial output averaged 6.3 percent, outstripping developed capitalist countries by nearly 100 percent. The strengthened positions of CEMA countries in the global economy enabled the socialist comity to reach new levels in its competition against capitalism, and increased its influence in international economic relations.

The geographic boundaries of global capitalism were further narrowed in the 1970s and interimperialist contradictions became aggravated. The national liberation movement, which laid the beginning of qualitative changes in relations between liberated countries and developed capitalist states, achieved major successes in the struggle against imperialism. To a certain extent, this turn of events was related to the increased role in the global capitalist economy of petroleum and some other raw materials produced by these countries. However, the determining

factor was their strengthened political independence and national economies and, above all, the pursuit of an anticapitalist policy. Relying on the powerful support of the socialist comity, which blocked the most aggressive aspirations of the imperialist countries, the liberated countries were given the opportunity actively to demand changes in the entire system of the international capitalist division of labor, to oppose imperialist diktat and to strengthen their positions a group of countries which oppose exploitation by industrially developed capitalist centers.

The establishment of a new geographic structure in global trade, which was paralleled by a weakening in the positions of the developed capitalist countries, was yet another prerequisite for the basic changes which took place in the current system of international economic relations. In the 1970s, the expansion of economic contacts among different groups of countries--developed capitalist, liberated, and socialist--was a major line of intensification of global economic relations. At the same time, the share of the developed capitalist countries was reduced and that of other groups of countries--liberated and socialist--increased in the world commodity and capital markets. In the growth of global commodity exports, the share of the developed capitalist countries declined from 74.4 percent in 1961-1970 to 64.4 percent in the 1970s.

These quantitative changes were accompanied by new qualitative phenomena, such as sharply increased dependence of developed capitalist countries on economic exchanges with liberated and socialist countries. Thus, in the second half of the 1970s, supplies from these countries accounted for about 54 percent of consumed energy raw materials by world capitalist centers, compared with only 16 percent at the beginning of the 1960s. In 1979, almost 38 percent of U.S. exports and more than 52 percent of Japanese exports went to these two groups of countries. The changes in the geographic structure of global economic relations reflected the increased role of socialist and liberated countries in international trade and convincingly proved the successes of the inflexible course pursued by world socialism of systematically organizing economic relations among all countries.

In the 1970s, the trend of a general improvement in the political climate in the world, which aggressive imperialist forces have repeatedly tried and are still trying to undermine, was a mandatory prerequisite for the reorganization of the obsolete system of international economic relations. Looked at from the viewpoint of historical perspective, the current attack mounted by these forces on the policy of detente cannot eliminate the favorable changes of the 1970s. The past decade convincingly proved that only successful progress in political and military detente, which is of prime importance in the strengthening of universal security, would enable all countries to focus their efforts on the solution of the topical problems facing the global economy. Naturally, detente and economic reorganization have their own specific contents and to a certain extent reflect autonomous processes. Equally unquestionable, however, is their profound interconnection. They are opening a reliable way to fruitful cooperation among countries regardless of the level of their development or nature of their social system.

## II

The broad scope assumed by the movement for a profound reorganization of international economic relations is due to the fact that it is led by powerful forces which represent global political, social and economic progress. The Soviet government declaration "On the Reorganization of International Economic Relations" provided a broad analysis of the status and faults of the system of global economic relations today. The members of the socialist comity consider their systematic reorganization an important condition for the improvement and development of the global economy on the basis of equality among all countries, big and small, socialist and capitalist. The November 1978 declaration by Warsaw Pact members stresses the need for all countries and peoples in the world "persistently to work for a reorganization of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis and for the establishment of a new international economic order which will ensure the faster elimination of the economic backwardness of developing countries and the dynamic progress of all nations, of all mankind."

The communist and workers parties pay great attention to the reorganization of global economic relations. "The democratization of international relations and the development of international cooperation on the basis of equality and mutual benefit for all nations are important objectives in the struggle for the creation of an international community free from imperialism and neocolonialism, in which the profound disproportions between developed and developing countries can be eliminated and which would be based on the full independence of each nation and its active participation in resolving the problems of mankind," the document issued at the June 1976 Conference of Communist and Workers Parties of Europe stipulated.

The liberated countries have launched a sustained struggle for the elimination of the unequal and discriminatory system in international economic relations. The efforts of the nonaligned movement, which includes the majority of young independent countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, are focussed on strengthening political independence and economic autonomy, and against imperialism, colonialism and all forms of domination and exploitation. These targets are closely related to the establishment of a new international economic order. The establishment of such an order "is one of the most important and vital tasks which face the nonaligned movement. The democratization of international economic relations is the political essence of its activities," the Economic Declaration of the Sixth Conference of Heads of State and Governments of Non-aligned Countries (Havana 1979) stipulates.

The solidarity among the basic revolutionary forces of our time gives requirements on the reorganization of the current system of international economic relations a broad anti-imperialist and general democratic nature. The significance of the declaration and action program for the establishment of a new international economic order and the charter of economic rights and obligations of states, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly, is that they reflect precisely such an approach to the historical process of changes in the global economy. The fourth and fifth sessions of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) of 1976 and 1979, the Third United Nations General Conference on



Industrial Development (UNIDO), the 11th special session on economic problems of the United Nations General Assembly in 1980 and other international meetings were held under the sign of the struggle waged by socialist and liberated countries for the systematic reorganization of the obsolete system of international economic relations.

The discussion of problems of an integrated program on raw materials, the elimination of protectionism in trade in industrial commodities, the settling of monetary and financial problems, and views on international codes on the transfer of technology and on organizing control over the activities of multinational corporations, discussed at these meetings, failed to bring about substantial changes in existing global economic relations. However, the intensive discussions nevertheless yielded positive results. The specific problem which must be solved--broadening and refining of basic requirements and conditions for the reorganization of international economic relations on the basis of recent experience, formulated by the United Nations in the mid-1970s, has been quite clearly defined.

It is entirely natural that today the elimination of "assigned" roles to some countries to produce raw materials while others manufacture finished goods is being considered increasingly inadequate. The elimination of the conflict between the growing potential for the development of contemporary production forces and the method of obsolete international economic relations which tie their hands<sup>1</sup> is considered extremely topical. Recent experience has proved that partial and isolated changes in one or another area of global economic relations and in relations among various groups of countries, however promising they might seem on the surface, cannot correct the situation. Under contemporary conditions it would be utopian to rely on any substantial improvement in the positions of the liberated countries as long as artificial restrictions and discrimination against socialist countries remain in this area. That is why the simultaneous and radical reorganization of all levels of global economic relations has become the prerequisite for the organization of individual areas of international trade and relations among different groups of countries.

The profound reorganization of international economic relations must make them consistent with the realities of the contemporary world. This presumes mainly the elimination of the clear contradiction between the new correlation among global political, social and economic forces and the privileged status of imperialist countries which, as they have done in the past, are trying to impose their will on the other countries. The elimination of this faulty situation would create favorable conditions for securing state sovereignty, putting an end to foreign intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries, and respect for the inviolable right of the country to choose its own social and economic system. This would offer any country the possibility of freely assuming effective control over its wealth and natural resources, guiding economic activities on its own territory and developing relations with any country throughout the world. At the same time, all interested countries would be guaranteed full and equal participation in joint discussions and resolution of topical global economic problems.



In this case, we cannot fail to see that the marketplace mechanism and the functioning of international economic organizations within it, subordinated to the interests of the imperialist countries, have proved their inability to ensure the stable development of the global economy, to meet the vital requirements of most countries and to resolve global economic, social and ecological problems. The effect of this mechanism has made the unrestricted expansion of multinational corporations possible. Their predatory aspirations have become a growing menace to the national independence and economic autonomy of even many developed capitalist countries, not to mention liberated states.

The effective control of marketplace forces and above all restraining the arbitrary behavior of multinational corporations on the basis of intergovernmental agreements alone would make it possible to eliminate the imbalance in global economic relations and ensure the more stable growth of global production, including the accelerated industrialization of liberated countries. This would also provide conditions for the equitable distribution of the results of international production, trade, financial and other activities among all countries in accordance with the legitimate interests of producers, consumers, sellers and buyers.

The development of a reliable international mechanism for global economic relations demands not the creation of supranational organs but the formulation and strict observance of a new legal base for intergovernmental economic relations founded on the principles of justice, democracy, equality, mutual benefit, universality, voluntary participation and reciprocal accords. This would put an end to the various forms of domination or hegemony, and all kinds of diktat, coercion and discrimination based on differences in the levels of development of individual countries and the nature of their political, economic and social systems. At the same time, international legal recognition should be extended to the characteristic features of individual groups of countries in the contemporary world, based on their historical, political and socioeconomic development. The experience in international relations most clearly proves the theoretical groundlessness and serious negative consequences to the liberated countries themselves of concepts which divide the world into the "rich North" and the "poor South."

The logic of the new principles stipulates that states responsible for colonialism, foreign aggression, occupation, apartheid and racial discrimination and for the current upheavals in the global economy must compensate the victimized countries and peoples for the damages inflicted to their natural, material and other resources. In particular, this applies to granting liberated countries preferential treatment in commodity, capital, service and technology markets and to increasing the amount and changing the conditions of financial aid provided by the developed capitalist countries.

The imperialist countries and their monopolies are unwilling to surrender their interests and profits or to tolerate the fact that the world over which they have ruled for such a long time refuses to serve and obey them and is fully resolved to follow its own way. Despite certain differences in the approach to demands for the reorganization of international economic relations, essentially the process of the developed capitalist countries follows a single strategic line. As indicated by the Conference on International Economic Cooperation (Paris 1976-1977) and the

"International Meeting on Cooperation and Development," which was held in Cancun last October, this line is based on the stubborn desire to preserve Western predatory privileges and to impose upon the liberated countries a way of development which would keep them within the sphere of the capitalist system in the position of a subordinated raw material neocolonialist periphery. The imperialists are relying not only on their still powerful economic positions but also on their comprehensive encouragement of lack of faith and fear of the difficulties which accompany the creation and the consequences of the implementation of a new structure of international economic relations among a certain social segment in the nonsocialist countries. Maximal efforts are being made to disorganize and divide the ranks of supporters of far-reaching change and to force them to accept the imperialist "model" of global economic development by using the tactics of delaying talks and reneging on already assumed obligations. That is why the reorganization of international economic relations is impossible without a firm and systematic struggle against the policy of imperialist countries and their multinational corporations. The promising nature of this struggle is based mainly on the changed ratio of social forces in the world and on the sum total of economic and political changes.

As the role of the countries in regulating global economic processes becomes more important, the implementation of objective prerequisites for the development of a new system of reciprocal relations is increasingly exceeding the boundaries of the purely economic area and is shifting to the level of intergovernmental relations. It is becoming a political battlefield with its specific laws, trends and factors. Consequently, political demands for equality and justice are assuming prime importance in the reorganization of global economic relations. On this basis, the joint active efforts of socialist and liberated countries, supported by broad Western public strata, can greatly increase their pressure on the governments of imperialist countries and involve them in the process of profound reorganization of international economic relations.

### III

The strengthening of the socialist comity marked the strengthening of international economic relations of a new type, as Lenin so perspicaciously predicted. Lenin's ideas found their fullest manifestation in the reciprocal cooperation among CEMA-member countries. On the basis of a single ideology and social development targets, their ruling communist and workers parties, achieved the organization of economic relations of tremendous historical significance. The difficulty which accompanied the creation of a previously unknown type of mechanism of intergovernmental economic cooperation was intensified by differences in the rate of development of a socialist production method in the individual countries and the influence of the world capitalist market. The socialist countries replaced the principles of rule and obey and division of benefits according to the amount of strength and capital inherent in imperialism with the principles of respect for equality, independence and national sovereignty, noninterference in domestic affairs, respect for mutual benefits, comradely mutual aid and international solidarity.

Today the implementation of the comprehensive program for socialist economic integration has become the firm pivot of CEMA activities. The collective development of natural resources and the joint construction of major industrial complexes, which are aimed at meeting the needs of all participants, are taking place in the course of conscious and planned production internationalization.

The cooperation among a large group of countries, which are combining their national and international interests more and more harmoniously, made it possible for the CEMA-member countries to increase their reciprocal trade rapidly and consistently. Between 1970 and 1980 foreign trade increased by a factor of 3.3, reaching 121 billion rubles. The development of specialization and cooperation among CEMA-member countries, currently coordinated on the basis of about 120 multilateral and more than 1,000 bilateral agreements, plays a major role in strengthening the socialist division of labor and upgrading its effectiveness. The expanded scale and qualitative improvement of reciprocal relations considerably increased the individual efforts of the socialist countries in ensuring the upsurge of their national economies and improving the life of their people. Cooperation contributes not only to the fast growth of the economic potential of all participating countries, but ensures the accelerated progress of economically less developed CEMA-member countries. The gradual rapprochement among the development levels of socialist countries has assumed the nature of an important law in shaping the global socialist economy which is visibly embodying the Leninist idea of unification among nations building "a new world of unity among working people of all nations" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 23, p 150).

The advantages of intergovernmental economic relations of a socialist type are receiving an increasingly broader acknowledgement. Cuba joined CEMA in 1972 and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam joined in 1978. The high international reputation of CEMA is confirmed also by the increasing number of countries which are participating in one way or another in its activities. Agreements on cooperation with CEMA have been concluded by Finland, Yugoslavia, Iraq and Mexico. Economic relations, including relations on a multilateral basis, are being strengthened between CEMA and the People's Republic of Angola, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the People's Republic of Mozambique, Socialist Ethiopia and other liberated countries.

The contribution of the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity to the establishment of a new system of international economic relations is by far not limited to their cooperation within CEMA. At different international forums they actively speak out in favor of excluding all types of diktat and coercion, inequality and discrimination, a variety of artificial administrative barriers and the fallacious practices of international monopolies in international economic relations. At the very first session of the UNCTAD in 1964, the socialist countries formulated the basic principles of international economic cooperation, the adoption of which became an important landmark in the struggle for a profound reorganization of international economic relations.

It is indicative that while these problems are already being discussed at different international meetings for the time being, the Soviet Union and the entire socialist comity have been developing relations with their partners in the



nonsocialist part of the world. Particular attention is being paid to broadening economic cooperation with the liberated countries. Along with the principles we pointed out, on the initiative of the socialist comity the principle of supporting their efforts in surmounting their socioeconomic backwardness is being applied in relations with this group of countries.

Not only the increased number of participating countries but the fast growth of their economic exchanges have become characteristic features of such cooperation. Currently, the CEMA-member countries are maintaining regular commercial relations with more than 100 young independent countries, trade with which reached 19.7 billion rubles in 1979, representing an increase by a factor of 3.9 compared with 1970. The economic and technical cooperation which CEMA-member countries are currently providing to 90 liberated countries is rapidly expanding along with trade. This cooperation has become purposeful and assumed a long-term nature thanks to the conclusion of intergovernmental agreements which call for the creation of 4,658 industrial enterprises and projects, 3,157 of which have already been completed.

The additional funds which the socialist comity has granted the liberated countries short of their own resources for the implementation of their national programs for socioeconomic construction are a structural component of trade and economic relations. Thus, the total amount of credits granted to them increased by a 2.1 factor from 1970 to 1980. Estimates indicate that the efforts of CEMA-member countries to provide financial aid to the liberated countries reached a coefficient of 0.1 in 1974-1979, compared with 0.05, or one half of that figure, on the part of the developed capitalist countries. Practical experience proves that the stable development of the entire set of economic relations maintained with the socialist countries effectively helps the young independent countries to increase their output, improve employment, mobilize and use resources and capital investments more efficiently, strengthen the state sector and consolidate their economic independence.

The members of the socialist comity are fully resolved to pursue their policy of expansion and improvement of economic cooperation with Asian, African and Latin American countries. This target is concretized in the long-term realistic program of measures for reciprocal cooperation, which was formulated by CEMA and submitted to the UNCTAD. The program sums up the rich positive experience acquired in economic relations between socialist and liberated countries. At the same time, it includes new aspects which reflect progressive trends in the international division of labor and take into consideration the growing opportunities and needs of the socialist states and the liberated countries. The implementation of the program provides solid foundations for the further upsurge of their reciprocal cooperation and the strengthening of the unity among the forces of world socialism and the national liberation movement in the struggle against imperialism and the present system of international economic relations it supports.

The code of international behavior toward the liberated countries, formulated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, plays an important role in ensuring their political sovereignty and in strengthening their economic autonomy. Based on the United Nations charter, the final act of the Helsinki Accords and the familiar agreements concluded between the USSR and the United States in the 1970s, this code is aimed at



protecting the legitimate interests of the young independent countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Its recognition and observance not only by the socialist countries but by the other permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and by all other countries can reliably protect the young states from the onslaught mounted by aggressive imperialist circles headed by the United States.

The members of the socialist comity are steadfastly pursuing a course of expanding equal and mutually profitable economic relations with the developed capitalist countries as well. In this connection, the 1975 Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was of major importance. It confirmed the possibility and real benefit of the consideration and resolution of most complex international problems with the participation of all interested countries. Regardless of differences in sociopolitical systems, the participating countries were able to reach an agreement and to codify in the final act principles of international economic relations suggested by the socialist countries such as the sovereign equality of the parties, the just distribution of benefits among partners, consideration of reciprocal interests and rejection of discrimination. The results of the conference contributed to the strengthening of the base of and provided a new impulse for the conclusion of bilateral treaties and agreements on trade, economic, industrial and technical cooperation between socialist and developed capitalist countries.

The signing of long-term intergovernmental documents provided a significant incentive for the fast expansion of economic trade between the two groups of countries. Trade between CEMA and the West reached 56.6 billion rubles in 1979. Ordinary trade operations began to be combined ever more frequently with industrial cooperation, use of scientific and technical relations, and compensation deals. The validity of intergovernmental agreements was extended to 10-15 and even 25 years, and the agreements themselves are becoming comprehensive, covering not only trade and production sectors. Bigger individual deals are being made in the range of billions of rubles. The socialist states raised the question of concluding agreements on the foundations of relations between CEMA and the European Economic Community (EEC) which would stimulate both bilateral and multilateral economic cooperation on the continent.

Despite such accomplishments, the volume and extent of reciprocal economic relations between socialist and developed capitalist countries nevertheless clearly fall short of the possibilities of the participating countries. Ignoring the spirit of the Helsinki Accords, some Western countries are still preserving and sometimes even increasing their discriminatory restrictions in trade with the socialist countries. They are trying to use such Cold War vestiges for purposes of exerting political pressure on them. The urgent need to eliminate protectionist and discriminatory areas in East-West trade was pointed out in the main United Nations document drafted for the 11th Special General Assembly Session on Economic Problems. It stipulates that such barriers "hinder the normal development of trade among countries with different systems and limit the possibility of the growth of trade between socialist and developing countries."

The intrigues of the Cold War supporters are countered by the constructive policy of the socialist comity and the essential economic interests of the West. Because of this, step by step and not always consistently, most Western countries favor of the development of equal and mutually profitable cooperation with the

socialist states. Such cooperation is of major international importance as well. To begin with, it must become an important part of global cooperation based on a new system of international economic relations. This is supported by the commitment of the participants in the Helsinki Conference to develop relations with all other countries in accordance with agreed-upon principles. Secondly, in the course of economic cooperation between socialist and Western countries, promising forms of international relations have been developed such as, for example, cooperation agreements, and trilateral agreements which are fully applicable in relations with other countries as well. Thirdly, as a result of expanded economic cooperation between socialist and developed capitalist countries, additional amounts of commodities and services become inevitably involved in international trade. Real benefits can accrue from this for the liberated countries, which thus gain new opportunities as a result of their participation in specialization and cooperation measures and in multilateral investment projects.

The main characteristics of the beginning of the 1980s cannot be ignored in assessing the contemporary condition of global economic relations and the problem of their reorganization. Under the influence of the successful progress made by socialism in its competition with capitalism, the old social structure of the world on which the respective system of international economic relations was based has irreversibly become part of the past. The insurmountable process of the erosion of imperialist domination in the global capitalism economy and the restriction of its influence on global developments has intensified.

The vital interests of the progressive economic development of all states and nations and the radical change in the ratio of forces in the world arena in favor of democracy and socialism make the effective reorganization of international economic relations not only a topical but a real task. The socialist states are ready to make their contribution to this important matter. The "Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985 and the Period Through 1990" calls for "active participation in the solution of international problems in the areas of raw materials, fuel, power, food, environmental protection, peaceful development of outer space, and utilization of the resources of the world's oceans and the improvement of international economic relations on a just and equal basis."

The constructive policy of the members of the socialist comity is that they do not limit themselves to a firm criticism of the faults of current international economic relations. Their practical activities have proved the vitality and the real advantages of the new organization of intergovernmental economic relations free from discrimination or any other artificial obstacles, dictated and exploitation of some countries by others. The experience of the socialist countries indicates reliable ways for the improvement of the global economy and for organizing truly equal, democratic, just and mutually profitable international cooperation in the interest of all countries and peoples.

#### FOOTNOTE

1. Soviet science deserves great credit for the study of the laws governing the development of global economic relations in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. Profound studies of such problems are found in the following works: "Sovremennyye Monopolii i Konkurentsia" [Modern Monopolies and

Competition] by I. D. Ivanov. Mysl', Moscow, 1980; "SSSR i Mezhdunarodnoye Ekonomicheskoye Sotrudnichestvo" [The USSR and International Economic Cooperation] by M. M. Maksimova. Mysl', Moscow, 1977; "Strukturnyye Izmeneniya v Mirovom Kapitalisticheskom Khozyaystve" [Structural Changes in the Global Capitalist Economy] by V. V. Rymalov. Mysl', Moscow, 1978; "Mezhdunarodnoye Razdeleniye Truda i Razvivayushchiesya Strany" [The International Division of Labor and the Developing Countries] by V. L. Tyagunenko. Nauka, Moscow, 1976; "Kapitalizm i Mezhdunarodnyye Ekonomicheskiye Otnosheniya" [Capitalism and International Economic Relations] by V. P. Fedorov. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1979; "Mezhdunarodnaya Kapitalisticheskaya Torgovlya" [International Capitalist Trade] by P. I. Khvoynik. Mysl', Moscow, 1977; and "Sotsializm i Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya" [Socialism and International Relations] by N. P. Shmelev. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1979. Along with other works by Soviet authors, these books are a necessary scientific theoretical foundation for the study of more specific problems of reorganization of international economic relations, some of the topical aspects of which have been considered among others in works published in this journal (see KOMMUNIST No 11, 1979).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003

CSO: 1802/4

## DARKNESS FROM OVERSEAS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 81 pp. 100-101

[Answer by V. Nikolayev to a letter to the editors]

[Text] In his letter to the editors, war veteran engineer E. K. Khudoba writes from Leningrad, among others, that "for many years the NATO military has been working on Western Europe to accept mass-destruction weapons, thus converting it to a powderkeg. Now, U.S. President Reagan is publicly stating that the European continent could quite likely become the place where a "limited" nuclear conflict may break out. Obviously, the gentlemen have lost their memory and forgotten the lessons of the last war. How can they fail to understand that such a conflict would have catastrophic consequences for entire countries and peoples in Europe and for all of European civilization? Apparently, the United States is counting on sacrificing Western Europe while once again sitting it out on the other side of the ocean."

The author of this letter is entirely right. The recent statement by U.S. President Reagan, which clearly indicates the possibility or one could even say the desirability from Washington's viewpoint of a so-called "limited" nuclear war in Europe which, allegedly, will not entail a direct nuclear confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States, literally triggered a political storm in the European countries and beyond that continent. Essentially, the leader of the White House appears to have said nothing that had not already been said by those whom Americans call "hard hats." However, the public declaration by the highest executive of the most powerful capitalist country which has a tremendous nuclear missile potential is a major political action. It confirmed the widespread fear of the relatively scornful attitude which the rule of the haves overseas shows toward the most basic and vital interests of the Western European nations, including the U.S. allies.

The overseas adventurers are trying to teach the world to think not simply in terms of the admissibility of a nuclear conflict but its probability. It is as though they are already legitimizing the area where it should break out--in one of the most densely populated parts of the world, mankind's center of development of culture, science and technology. Such is the frightening prospect presented by the plans for waging a "limited" war.

Actually, of what kind of "limited" war could there be a question if nuclear or neutron bombs can destroy tens and hundreds of thousands of people, mainly civilians, in a single instant? What kind of "local conflict" could there be when it is



entirely clear that as a result of nuclear explosions anything in huge areas of space could be destroyed and subjected to radiation contamination, when the biggest centers of European civilization would perish and only the ruins of Notre Dame, the cathedral in Koln and other accomplishments of the human genius would stand up like monuments in the graveyard of a desolate land? Where, incidentally, is the guarantee that the infamous "button" of a big war will not be pressed the moment the first twisted mushrooms of "local" nuclear explosion rise? Such guarantee neither exists nor could be given.

The facts prove that the concept of "limited" nuclear war has now gained the status of official military doctrine in the United States. It is precisely on its basis that new and increasingly refined systems of mass-destruction weapons are being created overseas. It is precisely this concept that determines many of the actions taken by the American administration in the military and foreign policy areas.

It could be said that, having inherited from its predecessors plans for the deployment of new medium-range nuclear missile systems in some Western European countries, the Reagan administration is twisting the arm of its allies in order to ensure the soonest possible implementation of these plans. However, what are medium-range missiles other than a weapon aimed exclusively for war on European soil, weapons which make such war far more likely and the situation less predictable, and which increase the danger of a surprise attack. Judging by everything, Washington is hoping that, bearing in mind this possibility, the Soviet Union will aim its missiles at dealing a crushing retaliatory strike above all at the "Euromissiles," as a result of which the threat to the United States may be reduced, leaving it in the role of an observer of a devastating conflict in Europe.

It is necessary to reassert firmly and unequivocally that this is a most profound error. It is impossible to limit this conflict within a certain framework. This was most definitely stated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his answer to the question asked by a PRAVDA correspondent: ". . .to rely on victory in a nuclear war is dangerous madness. Let me add that only someone who has decided to commit suicide could start a nuclear war in the hope of coming out the winner. However great the power of the attacker may be, whatever means of unleashing a nuclear war he may have chosen, he would not attain his objectives. The retribution would be inevitable."

The decision of the American administration to undertake the production of the neutron bomb is frankly provocative. There is no question at all that this weapon, which can kill everything living while preserving material values for the winner, which Washington imagines itself to be, is not being developed against Canada or Mexico--the neighbors of the United States. It will be used above all on European soil, in which thousands of people from different countries will be indiscriminately destroyed. Unquestionably, used as close-combat weapons, neutron warheads at the disposal of the local military commanders would make the outbreak of a nuclear conflict more likely.

We must also point out the idle speculations of some American military "theoreticians" on the possibility of reaching an agreement between the USSR and the United States which would make it possible to "dose" a nuclear conflict and to localize it geographically, thus avoiding a global conflict. Needless to say that such

ideas, which fail to take into consideration the characteristics of nuclear warfare, are not merely absurd but criminal and immoral, for their purpose is to make nuclear weapons look like an ordinary foreign policy instrument, based on the concept of U.S. military superiority. However, no such superiority will exist, for the Soviet Union will not allow such a development of events.

Such are the facts which expose the essence of the plans of the American military in their entire unseemly nakedness. It is obvious that those on the other side of the ocean are hoping to make Europe their hostage in a conflict with the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity and to sacrifice millions of European lives for the sake of meeting the aspirations of the United States for global hegemony. Such hopes are the most convincing proof of the entire irresponsibility and high-handed chauvinism displayed by the leading U.S. circles, who are ready to manipulate the policy of countries and the destinies of entire nations shamelessly and cynically, with unconcealed egotism. This is the way the "universal rescue" mission of the United States, i.e., of American imperialism, presents itself. From the first atom bombs dropped on Japanese cities to the current plans for a nuclear war in Europe, we can trace in American foreign policy the total absence in the initiators of such steps of any restraining and humane principles, unrelated to the pursuit of profit. The nations cannot fail to draw proper conclusions from all this.

Some Western European politicians as well are ready to follow the U.S. military. Reaction to the crisis which has spread over the capitalist countries and the reduced sphere of imperialist domination in the world, the reactionary Western European circles are displaying the same type of class blindness as did their predecessors, which threw at the feet of German fascism one country after another. At that time, fascism caused unparalleled suffering to the European peoples. Nevertheless, Europe was able to survive thanks to the heroic struggle waged by the Soviet people, who broke the back of the Nazi beast and the dedicated resistance to Hitlerism of thousands and thousands of real patriots in the European countries. Today, American imperialism is essentially contemplating the total destruction of Europe, while Western European monopoly capital, which dominates politics, is revealing its readiness to accept these plans.

The riskiest gamble with the destinies of mankind in its entire history, in which the possibility of annihilation of hundreds of millions of people is at stake, is taking place. However, the situation in the world is not such as to give the newly appeared gravediggers of Europe any chance of success. This is clearly confirmed by the powerful antiwar movement of the masses, which is shaking up the Western European countries. Those on the other side of the ocean are vainly trying to ascribe it to "Moscow's intrigues." The nations are becoming ever more profoundly aware of the fact that they are struggling to preserve their lives in Europe and throughout the world. The slogan "Prevent Euroshima," i.e., not allowing the politicians overseas to destroy Europe, as they destroyed Hiroshima in 1945, is clear proof that millions of people see where the true source of the danger lies. That is precisely why the principle-minded peace-loving course pursued by the Soviet Union and its tireless initiatives aimed at strengthening peace and preventing a nuclear catastrophe--a responsible policy consistent with the realities of the nuclear age--are meeting with the growing support of the nations.

The Soviet Union rejects clearly and unequivocally the very idea of a nuclear attack, a nuclear war, as criminal. Moscow's appeal to all countries, including the United States, not to be the first to use a nuclear weapon, is in vivid contrast to Washington's irresponsible actions. The preservation and consolidation of peace is the lofty objective of Soviet policy, consistent with the expectations of all mankind.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003

CSO: 1802/4

## ON THE BASIS OF EQUALITY, VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION AND FRATERNAL COOPERATION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 81 pp 102-114

[Review by Prof M. Kulichenko, doctor of historical sciences, of the collection "V. I. Lenin, KPSS o Sovetskom Mnogonatsional'nom Gosudarstve" [V. I. Lenin and the CPSU on the Soviet Multinational State] (Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 558 p)]

[Text] The elimination of class and national oppression, systematic implementation of the practice of true democracy and humanism, and ensuring the social and international unity of the working people of all nationalities and the fraternity and friendship among nations is a unique achievement of socialism and its greatest advantage over capitalism. All of this was achieved for the first time in history by the Soviet multinational state--the USSR--the 60th anniversary of whose foundation will be celebrated in December 1982. This explains the great interest in the collection under review, which contains the complete or abridged articles, speeches, letters and statements by the great Lenin and party documents, reports and speeches by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, which reflect the Leninist principles and practices of national-statehood building and the internationalist nature of the party's policy.

The study of the documents in the collection let us feel the pulsebeat of Lenin's thinking in the period of the founding of the USSR, to realize more profoundly the greatness of the party's contribution to the treasury of Marxism-Leninism and gain a clear idea of the implementation of its ideas in the policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state and in the practice of the joint building of socialism and communism by the peoples of our country.

Tribal, racial and national conflicts have gone on for thousands of years. The blood of the peoples of individual countries and entire continents has flowed like a river. The best minds of mankind struggled on resolving the problem of the reasons for conflicts and wars and dreamed of a time "when nations, forgetting their quarrels, will unite in a great family." K. Marx and F. Engels were the first scientifically to substantiate the conclusion that hostility and hatred among nations are created by private property and that the national problem can be resolved only on the basis of a socialist victory. On the basis of the ideas of the founders of scientific communism, Lenin thoroughly described the nature of the national problem created by capitalism and formulated a program for its resolution. The dialectics of the Marxist-Leninist formulation of the national problem, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has pointed out, is "to progress toward solidarity, unity and all-around rapprochement



among nations through their total liberation from social and national oppression and the creation of maximally favorable conditions for their individual development" (p 315).

The victory of the October Revolution marked the beginning of the practical implementation of the socialist method of resolving the national problem by supporting the freedom of nations rather than their oppression and through unification rather than separation.

One of the principal means for resolving the national problem was the building of a Soviet national statehood by the peoples. Whereas in the time of the bourgeois struggle for power the establishment of a national statehood was essentially the final aspect in the solution of the national problem, to the working class and its party it was merely the first. One may say that this was the most important characteristic of the emancipation of previously oppressed nations and nationalities in Russia, which Lenin described with full justification as "the jail of the peoples." The RSFSR, Ukrainian SSR, Belorussian SSR and Transcaucasian SFSR, which included the Azerbaijan, Armenian and Georgian Soviet socialist republics, 10 autonomous republics and 16 autonomous oblasts, were founded as early as the end of 1922. "We gave all non-Russian nationalities their own republics or autonomous oblasts," Lenin pointed out (p 81).

In supporting the initiative of the peoples for the creation of their statehood and unifying the various states within a single Soviet multinational state, Lenin and the party displayed great theoretical and political wisdom and daring: this was an entirely new project which required an inflexible faith in the revolutionary creativity of the masses and in the eventual positive results, particularly under circumstances in which the enemies of the revolution and conciliationists of all hues were accusing the bolsheviks of "breaking down" the country. Lenin's and the party's views on this matter underwent a complex development from a rejection of a federal system during the period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, to the acceptance of its essential admissibility in the spring and summer of 1917 and to making the decision of the governmental structure of the country on the basis of a socialist federation in the first months following the victory of the October Revolution.

This is explained by a number of circumstances. To begin with, on the eve of the October Revolution, Lenin clearly defined the trend toward the increased role of the socialist content in the national liberation movement and realized that it was becoming closely interwoven with revolutionary democratic ideas which were becoming steadily stronger in opposition to the current followed by those who hesitated or supported nationalistic slogans. Secondly, in the struggle for their social liberation, the working people of the national outlying areas forged a firm alliance with the Russian working class and with all working people of Russian nationality. However, a considerable percentage of the working people in the outlying areas were still mistrustful of the Russian nation in the matter of national liberation. This played into the hands of the nationalists, who saw to it that after the October Revolution a number of nationalities were in fact separated from the revolutionary center of the country, as a result of which the establishment of a federation represented a step forward from their separation to unification with the RSFSR. Thirdly, the first Soviet republics which appeared in the outlying areas unconditionally expressed themselves in favor of unity with Soviet Russia. Fourth, under the

conditions of the developing socialist system and the systematic leadership by the proletarian party, the federation based on Soviet socialist principles and autonomy did not contradict democratic centralism in the economic and political life of society in the least, although it was precisely such fears that had been particularly strong in the pre-October, proved to be possible. Fifth, the socialist federation turned out to be the most acceptable means for the preservation of the unity between the working people in the center and in the outlying areas under conditions in which the local bourgeois nationalistic counterrevolution, allied with foreign imperialism, had tried for a long time to separate these outlying areas from Soviet Russia and to preserve the power of the capitalists and the landowners in them.

It would be no exaggeration to say that the real luck of the peoples liberated by the October Revolution was that the first steps in the national-statehood organization of the land of the soviets took place under the direct leadership of the great Lenin. Thanks to its brilliance, the party and the working class were able to provide conditions under which the socialist system not only withstood and consolidated its positions in the midst of the petit bourgeois element, but drew over on its side the tremendous mass of the population, which was still quite remote from socialism, but which was ready actively to participate in revolutionary-democratic change, through its democratic nature, humanism and internationalism. To this day, we are impressed by the depth and perspicacity of Lenin's revolutionary vision and thought, expressed in the published documents, on the problem of the ratio among class forces in the revolution (particularly in the Ukraine and the Caucasus), the place and role of the national problem in the class struggle and the importance of the practical-political measures for its resolution formulated by the party in the first years of the revolution.

Based on the strict consideration of social requirements and the will of the toiling masses of the previously oppressed nationalities, Lenin and the party attentively guided the processes of national-statehood construction in the country. The entire power of Lenin's strategy and tactics in this area was manifested most clearly in the awareness of the international and national interests of the working class and its allies in the center and the outlying areas. In the third year of the revolution, summing up the experience which had already been acquired in taking such interests into consideration, Lenin wrote that the party must "lay as a cornerstone not abstract or formal principles but, first of all, a precise consideration of historically specific and above all economic circumstances; secondly, it must clearly separate the interests of oppressed classes, the working people, and the exploited from the general concept of national interests in general, which meant the interests of the ruling class; thirdly, an equally clear division was necessary between oppressed, dependent and unequal nations and oppressing, exploiting and equal nations . . . ." (pp 67-68). The party persistently disseminated among the masses its understanding of the real processes of national development and their interaction. It asked the working people always to consider the nature of one or another phenomenon in national life and national relations, and the correctness of the demands and slogans raised in the course of the revolution mandatorily through lens of class interests.

In analyzing the very essence of the objective and subjective factors of life and interrelationship among nations in the initial years of the revolution, Lenin noted

the main feature: the national struggle with all of its manifestations "almost disappears," for the full forces of workers and peasants "are entirely absorbed in the great struggle against the bourgeois, a struggle which rallies the working people of all nations" (p 65); the policy of giving the nations the possibility of creating a variety of national-state systems "strengthens and unites all Russian nations within a single powerful family" (p 74). The thorough consideration of these basic and profound processes has always been the foundation on which Leninist national policy has rested in the matter of the content and forms of the founding and strengthening of the governmental alliance among free nations in the country.

Lenin's works and party documents exclude the possibility of a simplistic interpretation today of the entire complexity and frequent contradictoriness of the processes of national-state construction in the First Five-Year Plan of the Soviet system. It is important to note that it is precisely the accurate consideration of the realities of the period that enable us to see the actual volume of truly gigantic work done by the party for the creation of a new multinational state, which could ensure the liberation of the peoples from social and national oppression, defend the gains of the victorious revolution and become a tool for the building of the new society. It is particularly important to emphasize the durable significance of the tremendous theoretical work done by Lenin and the party on summing up the living experience of the revolutionary creativity of the masses and defining the ways and means of scientific management of this creativity without restricting it in the least.

Although ready to make concessions in the area of national policy, if required, Lenin and the party adamantly struggled for the elimination of reciprocal mistrust among nations, inherited from czarism and capitalism. According to Lenin, the best way to achieve this was joint work in the defense of the dictatorship of the proletariat. "We, communists," he wrote, "whether we are Great Russians, Ukrainians or members of any other nationality, must be unyielding and intolerant concerning the basic problems affecting all nations in the proletarian struggle, dictatorship of the proletariat, inadmissible agreement with the bourgeois and opposition to the division of our forces. . . ." (p 55).

Governmental alliance among the peoples of the land of the soviets could be ensured only on the basis of their comprehensive rapprochement in the course of the revolution and the building of a new life. The extent to which this problem was important to Lenin can be judged by the following note: "Rapprochement. . . its forms . . . specific suggestions on how to achieve it" (p 61). Lenin's works enable us to see the daily and persistent work by the leader of the party and the revolution on the content and forms of governmental unification of the peoples, in the course of which he had to surmount tremendous difficulties. The reality of the period rarely provided immediate answers to these questions. The only unquestionable fact which faced Lenin and the party was that of the starting positions held in resolving this most complex problem: "We want a voluntary alliance among nations, the type of alliance which would prevent any coercion of one nation over another, an alliance which would be based on the greatest possible trust, clear awareness of fraternal unity and entirely voluntary agreement. Such an alliance cannot be accomplished immediately. It must be reached with the greatest of patience and caution if the project is to succeed. . . ." (p 52).



The basic principles of a socialist federation were defined in the very first months of the revolution: equality, voluntary participation, democratic centralism and comprehensive proletarian internationalism. The solution of the problems of the forms and types of federation, its specific content in general and in terms of one or another stage in the establishment and development of the multinational Soviet state proved to be considerably more difficult.

The documents in the collection prove the thoroughness with which Lenin undertook the study of the nature of the new socialist federation and the way he defined its place and role in interrelationships among nations. Thus, we find the following entry in the materials related to the Second Comintern Congress: "Experience of the RSFSR: specific consideration of the content of the federation (railroads, mails, military affairs, national economy, etc.)" (p 61). A note by Lenin on the margin of a letter which stated that there is virtually no difference between a federation of independent republics and a federation based on autonomy, read that "There are different types of federations" (p 66). However, in the summer of 1920, Lenin pointed out that "A federation has already shown its practical value" and pointed out that "We must aspire to an increasingly closer federal union" (p 68).

Other documents show how under the leadership of the communist party a powerful unification movement among working people of all nationalities was increasing steadily and how the peoples, as they created their sovereign Soviet republics, were rallying around the Russian people and the RSFSR. The Russian working class and all working people in Russia displayed true internationalism by giving tremendous help to previously oppressed nations in establishing a Soviet system, building a new life and defending the gains of the revolution.

The party resolved the problem of ensuring the unity among nations strictly in accordance with the specific historical conditions of their development. Thus, in the Transcaucasus, where the rule of the nationalists had aggravated national relations to the extreme, the joint building of a new life by the peoples and the unification of the republics within a Transcaucasian Federation proved to be the most expedient. In Central Asia, taking into consideration the extreme backwardness of its populations (the nomad way of life of the majority of the population, the tremendous influence of the mullas, etc., priority was given to "the overthrow of feudalism but not the building of communism" (p 65)) whose class and national awareness were only taking shape, the development of national statehood immediately after the revolution was premature. The national development of more than a dozen of nations within the Turkestan ASSR, initially, and in two national Soviet republics--the Khorezmskaya and Bukharskaya subsequently--prepared the grounds for the founding of union and autonomous republics. This as well contributed to the unification of the peoples to a tremendous extent.

Whereas in the period of the struggle for the victory of the October Revolution, unity of revolutionary action by the working people of all nationalities was the essence of the unification movement, during the civil war and foreign intervention a military and political alliance among sovereign Soviet republics had already been developed, representing an essentially new, so-called treaty federation. With the conversion to peacetime construction, an economic followed by a diplomatic alliance was added to the military. The most powerful stage in building the Soviet multinational state was the last, which included tens of millions of working people in the center and the



outlying areas. Lenin, the party and all nationalities in our country faced the urgent problem of shaping the union of Soviet republics as a single united and stable state which was extremely necessary in ensuring the complete solution of the national problem and, above all, the joint building of socialism and communism. The desire of the people for unity had to be translated into efficient and scientific organizational forms which could ensure the full-bodied and comprehensive development of the Soviet multinational state on the path of progress.

A variety of suggestions were formulated in the course of the extensive discussion of the problem. One of them was giving "autonomy" to sovereign republics within the RSFSR. This suggestion, which was based on the accurate concept of the need for maximal complete unity among nations and the republics they had founded, failed to take into consideration the entire complexity of national relations and the practically inevitable negative consequences of the conversion of independent into autonomous republics. Another suggestion was based on the aggravated contradictions which had developed in the spring and summer of 1922 in the course of an unusual energizing of relations among the nations, based on the treaty federation, and, expressing a general mistrust in the possibility of a socialist federation, was reduced to replacing it by a confederation. Whereas the first suggestion represented a step backward compared with the achievements already reached in building a Soviet multinational state, the second was an actual retreat from the gains which the revolution had achieved in resolving the national problem.

It was Lenin who suggested the only correct solution to the situation. Essentially, his suggestion was that the RSFSR would proclaim its equality with all other sovereign Soviet republics and together with them would join "a new alliance, a new federation" (p 84). "It is important," he wrote to the RKP (b) Central Committee Politburo, "not to support the 'independists' or destroy their independence but to add a new level to it, a federation of equal republics" (ibid). In that letter and in his meetings and talks with leading officials from the center and the republics, Lenin comprehensively substantiated an efficient specific plan for completing the building of a multinational Soviet state based on a socialist federation. The plan was subsequently adopted at a Central Committee plenum and approved by the entire party and by all the peoples.

Lenin's contribution to the building of the USSR, particularly at its final stage, was the natural result of all previous efforts to ensure the governmental unification of free nations on the basis of the principles of internationalism. This predetermined to a tremendous extent all of their subsequent successes in resolving the national problem, building the new society and defending their socialist gains.

Loyal to the behests of the great Lenin, the CPSU invariably showed concern for strengthening and developing the USSR and the further unification of its member nations and nationalities and national and ethnic groups. "On the basis of long practical experience, all peoples in the country realized," states CC CPSU decree "On Preparations for the Celebration of the 50th Anniversary of the Founding of the Union of Soviet of Socialist Republics," the rich results of their unification within the USSR and the most extensive opportunities which this provides for the future" (p 298). The founding of the USSR created conditions for the maximum utilization of the great advantages of the socialist system, compared with the capitalist system, the elimination of hostility and hatred among nations, inherited from czarism and capitalism, within the shortest historical period, the creation of "model national peace" (p 77), the elimination of the actual inequality among nations and nationali-

ties, and the possibility of ensuring their steady and gradual rapprochement in the course of their cooperation and mutual aid, unbreakable friendship and all-around blossoming.

The circumstance that the free nations were given the opportunity to make full use not only of their own sources for the renovation of all facets of life but of the new and powerful source of progress born of the socialist system--the power of their unity, common interests and objectives--and the possibility of accumulating material and manpower resources, backed by a single union state was particularly important. The party took all the necessary steps to ensure the accelerated progress of previously backward peoples. This was manifested above all in economic life. Thus, in 1924-1925 the share in the budget of domestically generated income was no more than about 7.7 percent in Tadzhikistan and slightly more than 10 percent in Turkmenistan; less than 40 percent of budget outlays in the Ukrainian SSR came from domestic income. Even during the First Five-Year Plan, for example, union budget subsidies to Tadzhikistan were, respectively, 73, 78.5 and 87.8 percent of all outlays in 1928-1930. As a result of the purposeful redistribution of funds, material resources and cadres, the party saw to it that already before the war virtually all nations and nationalities in our country had developed an identical social structure. Many of them had developed national cadres of the working class and the intelligentsia.

Throughout the period of socialist building, the party continued to pay steady attention to the growth of political consciousness and the creative activeness of nations and nationalities in the USSR. This led to the development of their national statehood and to the continuing strengthening of the unbreakable alliance among them. Such processes developed particularly rapidly among the nations of Central Asia, the North, Siberia and the Far East. Following the adoption of the 1936 USSR Constitution, the number of national states and national-state formations in the country rose to 51. This included 11 union republics, 22 autonomous republics, 9 autonomous oblasts and 9 national okrugs (p 6).

The country's spiritual potential grew particularly rapidly. The cultural revolution, which took place during the period of socialist building, was a tremendous contribution to this growth. Many nations in our country were given an alphabet after the Great October Socialist Revolution. Illiteracy, which was virtually total among many nations in the pre-October period, was essentially eliminated even before the war. Literature began to be published in vast editions in the languages of the peoples of the USSR. As a result of the victory of the October Revolution, all nations reached the heights of socialism. A considerable number of them became socialist nations and nationalities, bypassing capitalism. For the first time, full national consolidation based on socialism took place in the historical development of many nations, whose living body had been torn into several pieces in the ages of feudalism and capitalism.

The party implemented Lenin's behest by giving equal priority to the emancipation of oppressed nations, elimination of their actual inequality and economic and cultural upsurge as basic tasks in the building of socialism, such as the country's industrialization, agricultural collectivization and implementation of the cultural revolution. During the celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the USSR, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out that "the national problem, as we inherited it from the past, has been fully, definitively and irreversibly resolved" (p 319). The triumph of the Leninist national policy and the solution of the national problem in the Soviet Union--

one of the gravest and most difficult problems of social life--was rated by the party as "a matter of tremendous importance, a major step in the social development of mankind" (p 223). The Russian working class, the entire Russian people, played an outstanding role in the solution of the national problem. "Essentially, this was the great exploit of an entire class, an entire people, accomplished in the name of internationalism," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said. "The nations in our homeland will never forget this exploit" (p 231).

The solution of the national problem predetermined to a tremendous extent our victory in the Great Patriotic War, in the course of which the friendship among the peoples of the USSR, born of socialism, was strengthened and tempered even further. In the postwar years of restoration of the national economy and in the subsequent period of the building of communism, the CC CPSU pointed out, on the occasion of the golden anniversary of the founding of the USSR, the outstanding features of Leninist friendship among nations were strengthened: "Never before has universal history seen in relations among dozens of nations and nationalities such inviolable unity of interests, objectives, will and action, spiritual relationship, trust and reciprocal concern as are being steadily manifested in our fraternal union" (p 297). Friendship among the peoples and socialist internationalism became inseparable features of the Soviet way of life. The atmosphere of true collectivism and comradeship and steadily growing unity and friendship among all nations and nationalities were listed in the CC CPSU accountability reports to the 25th party congress among the main past accomplishments. These accomplishments were characterized as vivid aspects of our way of life and as the great gains of socialism, which have become part of the flesh and blood of Soviet reality.

A developed socialist society was built in our country under the leadership of the CPSU for the first time in history. A new ideological, social and international community--the Soviet people--developed in the course of its establishment. The party considers its appearance as "a kind of summarized result of the economic and sociopolitical changes which had taken place over the past half century" (pp 330-331). The USSR Constitution also describes the establishment of the Soviet people as a concluding and founding accomplishment (p 412). In its accountability reports to the 25th party congress, the CC CPSU deemed it necessary to emphasize that "we continue to proceed from the fact that a new historical community--the Soviet people--has developed in our country, based on the inviolable alliance among the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia, with the leading role of the working class, and the friendship among all nations and nationalities in the country" (pp 391-392). Essentially, the new historical community is the social and international foundation for the further strengthening and development of the Soviet multinational state.

The party documents and the speeches by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev show the reasons why under the conditions of the building of communism as well it is still urgently necessary to continue to improve national relations, to strengthen friendship among nations, to multiply the contribution of the individual nations to the common cause and to take into consideration national and international factors in shaping the personality of the builder of communism. This is because the solution of the problem of building a classless society, which is of unparalleled complexity and scale, requires the maximal utilization of all advantages provided by the friendship among the peoples as the motive force of our social development and of anything which can be gained from the national and international processes of this development in enriching



the individual and increasing his activeness in the historical creativity of the entire people. The party proceeds from the fact that we must keep in sight all processes and trends in this area. We must study them, draw the necessary practical conclusions, and improve the specific economic and political forms of fraternal cooperation among Soviet peoples (see p 223).

The objective need for the comprehensive strengthening of the USSR and the complete utilization and advancement of all forms of Soviet national statehood, stipulated in the CPSU program, is clearly manifested under the conditions of mature socialism and its growth into communism. The most important conclusion drawn by the party on this problem is the following: "In the course of the building of communism, the importance of the USSR as a historically fully justified governmental form of joint struggle waged by free nations for the programmatic objectives of the party and the ideals of communism becomes more important" (p 301). The main way to the full utilization of these objective trends is the expansion and intensification of socialist democracy, which became a determining feature in the adoption of the October 1977 USSR Constitution.

The objective processes of internationalization of all aspects of social life, the appearance of prerequisites for social homogeneity in Soviet society and the increasing rapprochement among nations and nationalities in our country, as well as the more important role played by subjective development factors, the party's organization and educational work in particular, provide new opportunities for the development of the multinational Soviet state, for strengthening the foundations of its union above all. As the constitution emphasizes, the USSR is a single united multinational state, which "embodies the statehood unity of the Soviet people and rallies all nations and nationalities for the joint building of communism" (p 416).

The strengthening of the nature of the functioning and development of the Soviet state as a union is a particularly clear manifestation of the increasingly richer content of democratic centralism. It is entirely obvious that the increased complexity and scale of the building of communism call for paying particular attention to the strengthening of centralism. The importance of this is enhanced by the fact that our state is a state of the whole people and that now the entire course of social progress gives increasing priority to the need to resolve precisely nationwide problems which are becoming increasingly important in terms of the progress of each nation and nationality. At the same time, having reached the conclusion that the federal structure of our state has justified its usefulness fully, the party believes that the possibilities of federation and autonomy have not as yet fully exhausted their creative and organizing principles and that the role and significance of these principles are even continuing to increase in a number of areas. In particular, federation and autonomy play an essential role in increasing the equality among nations and nationalities, the harmonious combination of their national and international interests and the further unification of all nations, big and small, within the new historical community.

Increasing the number and enhancing the role of union-republic organs is one of the important areas in which union statehood is realized and developed by the party.

While comprehensively strengthening the union principles in the functioning of the Soviet state, the party also pays unwavering attention to the improvement of national statehood. CPSU policy in this area proceeds from a consideration of the



intensifying process of internationalization of all areas of social life and of each nation within it, and from upgrading the importance of international values and enhancing the role of the internationalist ideals of the working class, the working people, the entire Soviet people, as a new historical community; increasing the objective need for cooperation and mutual aid among nations and nationalities, broadening the scale of their joint work and the growing multinational nature of the population in union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts and okrugs.

The materials in the collection show how much has been accomplished during the past 20 years to substantiate the theory of mature socialism, including the development of Marxist-Leninist doctrine on nations and national relations and the nature of the blossoming and rapprochement among nations and nationalities in our country today. Inseparably related to the solution of these problems are conclusions on the strengthening and growth of the social role of the Soviet people as a new historical community, the development of the Soviet federation and many others. In connection with the establishment of the new historical community and the strengthening of the union nature of the Soviet state, the party pays particular attention to the dialectics of development and correlation between the national and the international in our life. "Lenin considered the proper combination of national with international features in the activities of proletarian parties and of all detachments of the revolutionary movement the main problem of internationalist policy," the CC CPSU emphasized in the theses on the centennial of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin's birth (p 220).

The dialectics of the national and the international, and the changes in their ratios are permanently in the center of party theoretical and practical activities, as the resolutions of its 26th congress clearly indicate. The basis of the new features which the congress introduced in the theoretical substantiation and practical implementation of the Leninist national policy is that, first of all, the party brought to light new areas and facets in the nature and social role of the national and the international as the most important factors in the functioning and development of the new historical community--the Soviet people; secondly, it proved the inseparable link between the processes and phenomena taking place in the republics and the increased equality among nations and nationalities and national and ethnic groups. Naturally, all of this is most directly related to the development of all aspects of life and activities in the multinational Soviet state. In pointing out that "today unity among Soviet nations is greater than ever," the CC CPSU noted in the accountability report to the 26th congress that "naturally, this is not to say that all problems in the area of national relations have been resolved. The dynamics of development of a big multinational state such as ours creates many problems which require the party's close attention" (p 536). As our society becomes more mature life raises new problems which were either previously nonexistent or were less important, but without the solution of which no further progress can be achieved under the new conditions. Particularly important among the problems resolved by the party is "the finding of the most accurate ways for the development of individual nations and nationalities and for most suitably combining the interests of each one of them with the common interests of the Soviet people at large" (p 333).

The 26th CPSU Congress particularly emphasized the importance of expanding the scale and increasing the forms of cooperation among nations and republics in the USSR in the development of the new territories in the eastern part of the country and in joining efforts to ensure the upsurge of the Nonchernozem in the Russian Federation.

The implementation of the USSR Constitution on the systematic development of socialist democracy also brought to light the growing role of the more active solution of problems of national policy on other levels of development and correlation between the national and the international factors--in republics and labor collectives and on the level of individuals. This is an objective requirement of the progress of the mature socialist society. At the same time, it is also an indicator of still-existing unfinished aspects in the formulation of national policy in the local areas.

The universally acknowledged successes achieved by the party and its local organizations in strengthening the Leninist friendship among nations and raising the new man--the builder of communism--enable us to gain a better knowledge of the renovated content of national relations and systematically to resolve the problems raised by the practice of the building of communism.

To begin with, the 26th CPSU Congress drew attention to the need to expand the scale of training skilled workers among the native nationalities in the republics in which demographic processes are developing more intensively and manpower surpluses exist, particularly among the rural youth. Thus, statistical data show that in the republics of Central Asia, population migration from the villages is entirely insignificant compared with population expansion which is triple the national average. Consequently, this means mainly that available manpower resources are not used fully, thus unwittingly hindering the implementation of the international duty of the Soviet people and reducing the republics' possibilities of making their contribution to the solution of all-union problems. Secondly, the national features in the life of the rural working people are artificially preserved and allowed to interact with internationalism in a relatively minor way.

The measures formulated by the party make it possible to take a new step toward the development of production forces in union republics and contribute to the further expansion of the role of national cadres of the working class in the progress of the nations and in ensuring a level of maturity of national factors consistent with the interests of developed socialism and their manifestation on a truly internationalist basis. At the same time, the training of new national working-class cadres as the main productive force of each republic, will contribute to the strengthening of its active international participation in the common project of developing the country, including the most important new construction projects and development of new territories. In the final account, this will contribute to the even greater rapprochement among nations and nationalities in the USSR and to the strengthening of their unity and fraternity.

Secondly, the 26th congress emphasized the need to pay greater attention to the satisfaction of the needs of the non-native population in union and autonomous republics. It is a question mainly of all nations and working people of different nationalities enjoying equal rights and proper representation in party and state organs, naturally on the basis of the strict consideration of the practical and ideological-moral qualities of every person. Furthermore, it is a question of the fact that the non-native segment of the population in the individual republics has its own specific requirements in the areas of language, culture, and way of life. As we know, today approximately 50 million members of nations and nationalities enjoying one or another form of national statehood live outside their states. This means that

nearly one-fifth of the population is living and working in a non-national environment. The majority has been there for several generations, so that classifying them as "non-native residents" is rather arbitrary and hardly justified. However, in some areas such national groups are sometimes insufficiently actively involved in political life and in the administration of social affairs. Occasionally, no proper concern is shown for their extensive participation in the creation of new material and spiritual values by the native population. For example, the problem of the systematic observance of equal rights and equal opportunities includes the enrollment of the children of working people of different nationalities in higher educational institutions. Understandably, lack of control in these and some other areas, which sometimes violates the principles of socialist equality, may have a painful effect upon some people in maintaining practical relations among nationalities. This must be emphasized, the more so since in our country the levels of development of the individual nations, nationalities and national groups have become essentially equalized.

Unfortunately, the unquestionable fact that socialism does not automatically "eliminate" various negative phenomena and that this requires a great deal of persistent work, mandatorily based on the Marxist-Leninist science of society and the principles of proletarian internationalism, which imbues its entire content, is not always properly understood. In practice, the Leninist behest to the effect that nothing brings nations closer to each other as real equality is occasionally violated. In some cases, an erroneous understanding is manifested of the nature of national statehood, according to which some kind of privileges are granted to the founding nation or nationality. In others, there is failure to understand that the socialist society itself does not develop without contradictions and that such contradictions may arise also as a result of the failure on the part of our cadres to take promptly into consideration the great complexity and specific difficulties of the development of a classless society and the satisfaction of the objective requirements governing its progress. In other cases again, a great deal is "ascribed" to "vestiges of the past," although sometimes negative phenomena, including those of a nationalistic nature, are simply based on a tolerant attitude and to basic shortcomings in educational and organizational work. In this connection, it is expedient to recall how thoroughly and profoundly the reasons for such negative phenomena in national relations were exposed and the important conclusions drawn from this by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his speech on the occasion of the semicentennial anniversary of the founding of the USSR (see pp 332-333). The republic party organizations have gained extensive experience in the struggle against such phenomena.

The 26th CPSU Congress reemphasized that in our country the national feelings and national dignity of every person, the development of which is possible only on a truly internationalist basis, are respected. "The CPSU has struggled and will always wage a firm struggle against manifestations alien to the nature of socialism such as chauvinism, nationalism or other nationalistic quirks such as anti-Semitism or Zionism," the Central Committee's accountability report to the congress states (p 536). In pointing out that the party opposes trends aimed at the artificial elimination of national differences, the CC CPSU noted that it considers their artificial inflation equally inadmissible. "The party's sacred duty," the accountability report stipulates, "is to raise the working people in a spirit of Soviet patriotism, socialist internationalism and proud feeling of belonging to the single great Soviet homeland" (pp 536-537).



The resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress are a model of truly Leninist and internationalist concern for the systematic practical implementation of the norms of socialist democracy and for providing conditions for the comprehensive blossoming of all nations--big and small, native and non-native--and for strengthening their inviolable unity within the Soviet people as a new historical community. "Life has proved," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the congress, "that the intensive economic and social development of each of our republics accelerates the process of their all-round rapprochement. Blossoming and reciprocal enrichment of national cultures and the shaping of the culture of the single Soviet people--the new social and international community--are taking place. This process is developing in our country the way it should be under socialism: on the basis of equality, fraternal cooperation and voluntary participation. The party strictly watches over the observance of these Leninist principles of national policy from which we shall never retreat!" (p 537).

The course of world history after the victory of the October Revolution, as reflected in the documents in the collection, convincingly proves that it is truly impossible to overestimate the contribution which the USSR, created by the will of the peoples, on Lenin's initiative and under the leadership of the communist party, has made to the history of mankind during the six decades of its existence. "The fact that a socialist society was built for the first time in the USSR and that for the first time the meaning of truly equal and fraternal relations among nations was shown in practice," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out, "will be unquestionably remembered and valued by all nations for all times" (p 340).

The Soviet Union is advancing toward the 60th anniversary of its founding in the prime of its strength and power. It is convincingly proving to the entire world the strength and vitality of the Leninist national policy of the CPSU, the triumph of the ideas of friendship and fraternity among nations and the importance of their joint efforts in ensuring the comprehensive blossoming of each one of them and the growth of the economic and spiritual potential and the strengthening of the defense capability of the first country in the world where socialism won and reached maturity. The systematic implementation of the historical decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, which enriched the Leninist program for the building of communism in our country and for strengthening the gains of world socialism, will bring new successes along this way.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003

CSO: 1802/4



## PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT--OBJECT OF RESEARCH

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 81 pp 114-116

[Review by P. Bunich, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, of the book by A. G. Aganbegyan "Upravleniye Sotsialisticheskimi Predpriyatiyami" [Socialist Enterprise Management]. Problems of theory and practice. Ekonomika, Moscow, 1979, 448 pages]

[Text] Izdatel'stvo Ekonomika has published the book by Academician A. G. Aganbegyan "Upravleniye Sotsialisticheskimi Predpriyatiyami." The work is an interesting attempt at combining modern scientific concepts on production management with the rich practical experience of front-ranking associations and enterprises.

The study begins with a consideration of topical problems of the economic development of the country and the tasks of economic management today. This is followed by a presentation of the methodological foundations of management oriented toward end national economic results. A special section deals with the ripe problems of improving the system of socialist production management. The final part of the work is a consideration of a range of problems pertaining to management organization and technology.

The book covers almost the entire range of management problems on the level of the basic economic unit--the enterprise (association). However, in order for the conclusions to be consistent with general and broad requirements, each problem is considered first on the level of the sector and the entire national economy. It is important to emphasize that the author considers the enterprise not as an economically separate and autonomous unit but as part of an entity. His argument is that the property of the whole people combines and fuses all elements of the national economy under socialism. Local objectives are subordinated to the main target in the development of all public production. "Therefore," the author believes, "the approach to production management on the level of the association and the enterprise must be based on the interest of the entire Soviet society" (p 12).

The author focuses his study on the application of the specific conclusions of the science of management in the practical management of associations and enterprises. He goes beyond the formulation of general requirements and recommendations. The thorough study of the progressive experience of the best associations and enterprises in the various economic sectors is the basic means described in the monograph for the solution of the problem.

In describing the nature of the economic experiment, the author cites specific examples on how to choose, carry out, summarize and broaden the experiment (in particular, he analyzes the introduction of the cost effectiveness system by the USSR Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment and Control Systems and the Glavmosavtotrans Association and the Shchekino, Zlobin and other experiments). He discusses at length management ways and means at enterprises such as the VAZ, KamAZ, Ural Turbomotors Plant, Lvov Motors Plant, Krasnyy Proletariy Machine Tool Building Association in Moscow, LOMO, Kuznetsk Metallurgical and Moril'sk Ore Mining and Concentration Combines, Omsk Tires Plant, Krasnoyarsk Silk Combine and many others. He analyzes experience in production cooperation among the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Department and its institutes (Central Economic-Mathematical Institute, Institute of Economics and Organization of Industrial Production and others) and the Electric Welding Institute imeni Ye. O. Paton of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, experience in the application of economic-mathematical methods in the solution of production problems and so on.

The author also sums up the experience of foreign companies, which, with some stipulations and conditions, is useful in terms of socialist management. Thus, we find on pages 121-123 a method for the systems analysis of the Pattern System developed by the American Honeywell Company in planning the development of new equipment. The system calls for the classification of objectives according to the coefficient of their relative importance. It defines the condition of each of the necessary developments and their reciprocal influence. This makes it possible to determine operations which must be carried out more quickly and the interaction among solutions. The result is the efficient allocation of resources among different measures aimed at the implementation of different objectives.

The author considers the problem of improving public production in the USSR from the viewpoint of intensifying social purposes of party economic policy. He explains the increased role of the social functions of management by the sharp economic turn aimed at considerably raising the population's living standard, radically improving labor conditions and ensuring the full development of the population's creative potential. All of this is organically related to the CPSU line of effectiveness and quality, intensive economic development methods and accelerated scientific and technical progress in all economic sectors.

The author accurately considers that the main way in improving labor conditions is the implementation of a comprehensive program for production mechanization and automation. Today, more than 40 million people are engaged in manual labor, including repairs, in material production sectors. This applies to one out of two workers in industry and construction and about two thirds of all workers in agriculture, trade and loading and unloading operations. Several more five-year plans will be required before manual labor has been totally replaced by mechanization. The question which arises is what to do today? How to fill increasing job vacancies? Unfortunately, no answer is provided to this question. However, interesting experience has been gained in combining skills, alternating labor operations within brigades, creating factory-assembly lines in light industry and providing additional incentives to workers engaged in mechanical operations.

The author justifiably emphasizes that today the stimulating role of wages and bonuses must be upgraded and that the proper prerequisites to this effect exist: over the past 20 years minimum wages in the Soviet national economy have more than tripled while average wages have roughly doubled. The question arises of linking more closely

wages and individual work results. To this effect, the priority of basic wages in the income of the working people must be retained. The factual data cited in the book proves that in recent years the percentage of wages in the population's income structure has been rising. Thus, whereas in the 8th Five-Year Plan the growth of social consumption funds exceeded that of wages by a 1.3 factor, it was higher by a factor of 1.2 in the 9th and 1.1 (planned) in the 10th. A. G. Aganbegyan singles out the psychological factors among the special group of labor incentives whose significance is increasing. He emphasizes that the effectiveness of these factors greatly depends on management and continuing concern for developing a healthy psychological climate and an atmosphere of reciprocal understanding and mutual aid in the collective.

Production effectiveness can be increased either by maximizing results with specific outlays or minimizing outlays with fixed results. The author considers both methods. The problem of maximum results should be formulated and resolved in the case of shortages of one or another item such as plastics, chemical fibers, or high-quality consumer goods. The system of minimum outlays is better when needs have been more or less satisfied and demand is either saturated or close to saturation levels.

The author analyzes possibilities of increasing the effectiveness of developed capacities and calls for a reduction of specific outlays, of capital investments in particular, which are scheduled to decline this five-year plan rather than increase, as in the past. We consider controversial his view that the optimum plan calls for very rigid central management, which hinders local reaction to new opportunities. In order to ensure the necessary enterprise autonomy, the author introduces the concept of adaptable planning as more advanced than optimal planning (see page 206). In our view, this is unjustified, for the optimum plan also includes an optimum ratio between centralization and autonomy and stipulates the existence of reserves which are necessary in maintaining planned proportions under conditions of economic growth.

The arguments cited in the book which oppose planning based on the achieved level, which must be replaced now by planning on the basis of scientific norms and engineering computations, are worthy of attention. However, the author does not oversimplify the new tasks and explains the durability of planning "from the basis" above all in terms of its simplicity. "Whereas plan automizing requires a scientific system of norms, joint consideration of plans of interrelated projects and the work of highly skilled specialists, including people who can use methods of economic-mathematical modeling, which calls for complex computations, planning based on achieved levels is possible with the help of routine methods and by less skilled cadres" (pp 204-205). In order to put an end to planning on the basis of the achieved level, the incentive system must be restructured. We must convert to direct incentives for reaching a certain level of effectiveness rather than paying bonuses for the plan regardless of how stressed it is, which sometimes gives a privileged position to a collective which conceals its reserves. If enterprises operate under conditions which give better rewards to those who work more effectively, they will try to include this in their plans. In other words, assessment based on the level of the actual effectiveness will encourage the adoption of stressed plans and strengthen the planning base in economic development.

The author considers the strengthening of cost effectiveness levers and incentives from the same viewpoint. He believes that the use of group incentive economic norms will force the enterprises to adopt bigger plans (and, naturally, to implement them).



Methodical instructions were issued in the aftermath of the new party and government decisions on improving the economic mechanism, according to which, as a rule, wage norms must be unified by sector while incentive norms must be sectorial or group. These measures are exceptionally important. However, further efforts are needed to ensure their implementation, for the ministries were given the right to differentiate between these norms without restrictive stipulations.

The author accurately discusses the fact that incentive is inseparable from responsibility. He cites interesting experience in organizing responsibility, particularly in relations between the State Sel'khoztekhnika Committee and the Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building. A system of guaranteed supplies has also been organized between the USSR Gosplan and the sectorial ministries. These ministries submit to the Gosplan their lists of suppliers with their respective wage funds, partial material stocks, working capital, automotive transportation facilities and warehouses. In turn, the procurement organs guarantee full and comprehensive deliveries of materials to the enterprises.

The author convincingly proves the need to develop cost effectiveness on a vertical basis, on the level of all-union industrial association (VPO) and the sectorial ministry. We consider debatable the suggestion that VPO be created only in special cases, while as a matter of principle the two-step management and cost effectiveness system be used. However, the VPO is not an unnecessary step but is absolutely necessary in a number of sectors.

The author pays proper attention to specific cost effectiveness indicators and to conditions which ensure their consistency with the public interest. He justifiably points out that because of shortcomings in price systems and the incomplete consideration of national economic outlays, profits do not always properly reflect effectiveness, for which reason they must be used in combination with a number of additional indicators such as labor productivity, capital returns and so on (see page 298). He emphasizes the importance of the net profit which, with the extensive use of rental payments, higher interest rates, increased payments for assets (by lowering some benefits), the application of full penalties, etc, must become a more accurate indicator in assessing the activities of collectives compared with the overall amount of profits (ibid).

The book under review offers our economic managers knowledge of modern aspects in management. The author uses a clear language accessible to the reader at large. The work fills the gap between the scientific level of development of management problems and their practical utilization to a considerable extent. Most of the new developments it contains are presented as scientific recommendations and offer an idea of future developments in economic management.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003

CSO: 1802/4



## SOCIALIST SOCIETY AND SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 81 pp 116-120

[Review by G. Shakhnazarov, doctor of juridical sciences, of the book "Sotsializm i Nauka" [Socialism and Science]. S. R. Mikulinskiy and R. Rikhta, editors. Nauka, Moscow, 1981, 422 pages]

[Text] Never before has science played such an important and responsible role in human progress as it does today. Never before has so much depended on its condition and orientation and on the use it makes of its power and social prestige. This explains the steadily increasing interest in current scientific accomplishments and problems on which millions of people are working in scientific institutes, establishments and laboratories, and the lofty objectives of scientific thinking. This is explained also by the desire to gain a deeper understanding of the laws governing the development of scientific knowledge, to formulate a philosophy of interrelationship between science and reality and define the complex mechanism which links science, on the one hand, and politics, economics and other areas of social activity, on the other.

How is scientific research organized and what is its financing procedure? What is the ratio between basic and applied research, between the immediate needs of society for scientific data and the accumulation of theory. What are the optimum means for combining science with practice and what is the efficiency of scientific research? What should be the working and living conditions of scientists and auxiliary personnel in scientific institutions? What characterizes the psychological motivations of scientific activities and is it possible to intensify the creative process further? How to assess individual contributions to the collective solution of major scientific problems, streamline the flow of scientific information and reduce unproductive experimental outlays to a minimum? All of these and many other very topical problems arise in the study of the actual process of the growth of scientific knowledge.

Such problems become even more important in the case of socialism. The first social system in history whose very appearance and establishment is related to the implementation of Marxist-Leninist social theory, which provides full scope for the blossoming of science and ensures opportunities for its most favorable development.

The very close link between socialism and science is major proof of the advantages of the new society. At the same time, it formulates strict requirements regarding the mechanism of practical interaction between scientific ideas and social

institutions and the search for and utilization of the most effective means of participation of science in the building of socialism and communism. Regardless of all objective prerequisites, the system of relations between science and society under socialism does not develop immediately or in its finished aspect, but needs steady improvements.

The monograph by a group of Soviet and Czechoslovak scientists discusses the various aspects of this topical subject. The main purpose of the work, as stated by the authors themselves, is to consider the situation and role of science under socialism and show not only what science gives socialism as a society which cannot develop normally without the all-round utilization of its highest accomplishments but also what socialism contributes to science by becoming the social foundation of its development, a quality which is essentially different from the foundations of science under capitalism.

Let us immediately point out that as a whole the authors have resolved this problem successfully. We wanted to point this out immediately, for it is no secret that the weak spot of collective monographs is their insufficient cohesiveness. Frequently such works break down into separate parts and assume the aspect of collections of scientific articles. The organic combination of separate parts is further complicated when scientists from different countries engage in a joint project. However, in this case full coordination has been achieved.

The creative method selected by the authors, thanks to which depth of research is combined with clarity of presentation, must be acknowledged as well. This work proves yet once again that in science seriousness and popularity are not mutually exclusive. The wish to make this work accessible to broad readership circles is particularly important in this case, for the status and role of science in society are of interest not only to the specialists.

Finally, the monograph is distinguished by a sensible ratio between descriptive material, which informs us of the nature of one or another problem and its present status, and assumptions concerning improvements in the forms of interaction between science and society and means for upgrading the standard of scientific research and accelerating their use in social practice.

These are some of the general impressions from the book. Without describing its content, we shall list the problems it discusses: the Marxist-Leninist theory of scientific development; the essence of the contemporary scientific and technical revolution; science as part of the social relations system; the social function of science under socialist conditions; scientific policy and the management of scientific development; science, production and social management; problems of international scientific and technical cooperation; the scientist in the socialist society; science and man; and the historical significance of science under socialism. Let us point out that such a full coverage makes this work suitable as a VUZ textbook.

We shall discuss two problems which in our view deserve particular attention. This applies, above all, to the problem of the objectives of science, the solution of which is of essential importance both in terms of the self-assertion of science and for the proper determination of its place in society.

We know that views on the objectives of scientific creativity have changed substantially under the influence of social and gnoseological factors. To the philosophers

of antiquity scientific knowledge was of educational value. It was considered a necessary foundation for the development of an outlook, without which a state of harmony among man, society and nature was impossible.

In the time of Galileo and Newton, which is universally recognized as the beginning of contemporary science, scientific knowledge assumed a clearly utilitarian function. Actually, this utilitarianism was quite complex. Whereas during the Renaissance and Enlightenment the initial steps which were taken in the practical application of scientific knowledge were essentially experimental and imbued with a spirit of well-wishingness toward man as the center of the universe, after gathering strength and assuming its proper position, capitalism used science for commercial purposes. To a certain extent, it made it a direct participant in the exploitation of labor.

Views pitting the "pure and lofty knowledge" against various forms of application of science, which allegedly brought only misfortune and threats, developed as a kind of reaction to this fact among moralizing historians. Although justified to a certain extent, this primitive antisocialism is still extant and is recruiting new supporters among Western scientists who are seriously worried by the numerous manifestations of the negative views of science without acknowledging (or without acknowledging fully) that it is capitalism which is to be blamed for this and who consider this to be a general pattern.

That is why the combination of the productive and cognitive functions of science was of essential significance. It could actually be achieved only on the basis of a certain common denominator and the only such denominator was the subordination of the two main aspects of scientific knowledge to the interests of man and to the all-round development of his essential forces.

This problem could be resolved only by a society whose entire development was subordinated to the same noble objective. Without the socialist revolution and the assertion of the new principles of human commonwealth, at a given stage science would inevitably have reached the total rejection of the fact that it was created by man and would have turned against its creator. Without the scientific and technical revolution, socialism would have been unable to improve its material base and move ahead in the other areas of social life.

Many parts of the book offer convincing proof that the social structure of the socialist society and its economic and political systems not only create favorable conditions for scientific upsurge but adamantly demand its systematic application in all areas of life. This in itself offers opportunities for the harmonious combination of theory with practice.

Understandably, it is not a question of a kind of one-time act of reciprocal enrichment but of a steady process which is reaching new levels thanks to the successful building of socialism. As the authors prove, this approach to the scientific and technical strategy of progress becomes particularly clear at the stage of mature socialism. It is reflected in the ever stricter requirements regarding scientific results related to qualitative changes in production principles, comprehensive management of social processes, programmed social and economic planning and shaping of the socialist way of life, the new character of labor and the upsurge of the creative initiative and activeness of the working people (see page 208). All of these forms of social development are in themselves the objective of



socialism and also a means for further progress and utilization of science as a socially productive force. The Marxist-Leninist theory of science was given a further creative impetus at the 26th party congress. In this respect, the conclusion contained in the CC CPSU accountability report to the effect that the close integration of science and production has become an urgent requirement of today, is of essential significance. Accordingly, the efforts of "big science," along with the development of theoretical problems, must be focused to a greater extent on the solution of key national economic problems and discoveries which can lead to truly revolutionary changes in the production process.

Another aspect noted in the Central Committee accountability report assumes great importance as well: the initiative-minded role of science not only in the implementation of its assignments but in ensuring the timely formulation of problems. Today, when success depends increasingly on the proper definition of prospects and on reliable and properly substantiated forecasts, science, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized, "must be the constant 'disturber of tranquility,' pointing out the areas of stagnation and lagging or where the contemporary level of knowledge makes progress faster and more successful. We must think of how to make this an inseparable part of the management mechanism."

The reader will find a number of interesting considerations in this respect. Great attention has been paid to the problem of the ties between science and practical work and to the proper combination of methods and economic conditions which will ensure the most effective application of the results of scientific research. This is entirely justified, for as was pointed out at the 26th CPSU Congress, the application of scientific discoveries and inventions is today "the decisive, the most critical sector."

Combining the efforts of scientists from different countries is one of the most promising directions in ensuring the further upsurge of science and upgrading its applied significance. Naturally, such cooperation and exchange of knowledge and results of scientific research have been practiced in the past as well. However, it is precisely today that international cooperation among scientists is developing on a rather broad scale. It is one of the consequences (and one of the incentives) of the process of internationalization of the entire social life of mankind.

The importance and advantages of the intensification of such cooperation are self-evident. Its main result is a tremendous economy of intellectual labor. We know that today one of the essential indicators of the industrial power of a country is the share of its national product created through foreign trade, cooperation and other forms of economic interaction. The following analogy is quite apt: the criteria which determine the level of national science must include the extent of its worldwide integrative relations.

That is why the work done by the communist and worker parties, government, academies of sciences and other national organizations of the socialist countries for the integration of scientific efforts is of tremendous importance. Today integration processes cover literally all scientific sectors. The joint space flights by USSR cosmonauts and space pioneers from the fraternal socialist countries are the most vivid symbol of achievements in this area.

Good results have been achieved in unifying the forces of social scientists. The book under review is a good example. It offers yet another real illustration of



one of the stipulations contained in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee accountability report to the 16th party congress. "International cooperation in science, cooperation with Soviet scientists in particular," Comrade G. Husak said, "brought considerable success. Let us recall space and nuclear research, research in molecular genetics and the theoretical summation of the experience gained in the struggle for real socialism."

Big science in the socialist comity does not alienate itself from the rest of the world but actively promotes cooperation with scientific institutions of other countries. Such cooperation is useful not only because of its practical results. The ethical aspect of joint efforts is no less important. Exchange of experience, participation in various symposia, conferences and congresses, coordination and, even more so, cooperation in scientific research enable us to provide a collective interpretation of arising problems. They enhance the responsibility of science to mankind, the dissemination of progressive ideas and the duty of the scientist to present and future generations.

The very nature of international cooperation in science predetermines its humaneness. Actually, the development of new mass destruction weapons has never been nor will ever be the theme of such cooperation. Its agenda includes the search for the solution of urgent problems of a divided world such as the settlement of conflicts, limiting the arms race, elimination of hunger and epidemics, developing the wealth of the world's oceans and other contemporary global problems.

The coordination of its aspirations with the interests and the good of the working man is a tradition of Soviet science, which was born of socialism and is ennobled by the Marxist-Leninist methodology. This consistently humanistic orientation has had a tremendous influence on the entire system of international scientific cooperation which has developed in recent decades. Our science has always considered it its obligation not only to share achievements and borrow everything of value created by scientists from other countries in the world arena but also to see to it that the structure of scientific relations contribute to the unification of the actions and interests of all nations and all mankind and to the collective struggle against that which threatens it.

Progress along this way has always involved numerous hardships. An adamant and sharp struggle had to be waged against the aspiration of reactionary imperialist forces to hinder scientific contacts. Of late, the ruling Western circles have mounted one more concentrated effort to reduce scientific contacts between socialist and capitalist countries to a minimum if not to break them off entirely. Despite all this, common sense and a feeling of responsibility encourage the true scientists to engage in joint actions in defense of man and his future. Such precisely was the nature of the meeting between Soviet and American physicians, which took place in the United States recently.

Modern science, as the authors justifiably write, cannot develop successfully apart from the social objectives of society or the ethical problems with which it is faced by our age--the age of revolutionary change and conversion to socialism. The reaction of the scientists to this situation depends on their outlook, social orientation and concepts. However, increasingly broader scientific circles are becoming aware of their greater social responsibility and moral duty under present-day conditions (see page 371).

The other question related to this work by Soviet and Czechoslovak scientists is the comprehensiveness of scientific research.

The view that we are experiencing the finest hour of physics has become quite popular. It is based on very firm grounds. The unraveling of the secrets of the atom and the creation of a nuclear power industry are unquestionably actions of historical significance with a revolutionary impact on the entire development of mankind.

However, the biologists are reasonably pointing out that their finest hour is coming for their science, which is successfully unraveling the secrets of the organic cell, on the basis of which many major problems of human activity will be resolved. But are there any lesser reasons for saying that this is also the finest hour of political economy, a science without whose recommendations even the most extraordinary discoveries in the natural sciences and technical developments may not be properly applied or may even become harmful?

Yes, today just about each branch of knowledge can claim that this is its finest hour. This is because the great social and scientific and technical revolution, which is changing the face of the world, is creating prerequisites for progress in literally all areas of scientific knowledge. This has already been achieved by some sciences, although the others are not far behind.

However, today we can speak with the best of reasons not only about the finest hour of the individual sciences but of the growing integration of scientific knowledge. A great deal has been said on this subject and the thought which, incidentally, is confirmed by many practical examples, that the most important and sometimes unexpected discoveries occur precisely at the crossroads of the sciences, when their "critical masses" are combined and the spark of inspiration is struck, has become quite commonplace. Many sciences have already "paired up" and created a progeny, such as chemical physics, astrophysics, astrobiology, etc. In other cases, the interaction is not as yet close and contacts among different areas of knowledge are sporadic. Cooperation and integration in the social sciences, particularly political economy and law, which are of great applied significance, are taking place to a far lesser extent than is dictated by the interests of science and practice.

As the authors suitably indicate, today we can see with particular clarity the line of interaction among social, natural and physical sciences. This is a profoundly objective process. The attitude of man toward nature goes through social relations and mastering the latter is increasingly becoming a prerequisite for mastering the forces of nature and establishing a conscious control over the "exchange of matter" between society and nature.

Justifiably pointing out that the socialist society is the initiator of integration among the three main areas of scientific knowledge (see pp 179-180), the authors direct our attention to a number of problems which must be resolved before a united front among the natural, technical and social sciences can be established. Unfortunately, they have not covered problems of scientific organization with the necessary thoroughness. Yet it is precisely this that is the key to the further development of the integration process.

Thus, efforts are currently underway to apply individual features of one or another branch of knowledge in base research institutes which shape a related scientific sector. Frequently, however, such efforts fail, for a big scientific organism,

which is strictly oriented toward a given direction, seems to be rejecting alien tissue. Whenever the experiment is successful and the cell becomes part of the "body" of another science, as a rule its influence is so insignificant that it does not justify the hopes. We believe that in this case the creation of new comprehensive scientific institutions, based on the equal participation of various scientific sectors and aimed at their organic fusion, on the basis of a certain common denominator representing practical requirements, should become the main way.

Not all chapters of this monograph are of equal value. Some of them (chapters 2 and 8, for example) cannot be considered independent works. They are based on already published works and do not expand our knowledge of the problems discussed. One of the main ideas in the book is that of the development of a new type of science, consistent with socialist social relations and characterized by an even firmer orientation toward man, toward the improvement of his intellectual and creative capabilities, and the deepening of his outlook. This is a very accurate and essential idea in terms of the development of the topic. However, we must point out that the concept of the new historical stage in the development of science has been long and fruitfully developed by Soviet social scientists. This is a fact which, unfortunately, the authors fail to mention.

The considerations expressed here apply merely to an insignificant part of the content of this monograph by Soviet and Czechoslovak scientists. The readers will be able to see that this study makes a definite contribution to the Marxist-Leninist science of science and of its social significance.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003

CSO: 1802/4

## AFRICA TODAY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 81 pp 121-123

[Review by V. Iordanskiy, doctor of historical sciences, of the following books: "Velikiy Oktyabr' i Afrika" [The Great October and Africa]. Anat. A. Gromyko, responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1980, 279 pages; "Dva Napravleniya Sotsial'no-Ekonomicheskogo Razvitiya v Afrike" [Two Directions in African Socioeconomic Development]. Anat. A. Gromyko, responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1980, 192 pages; "Ideologiya Revolyutsionnykh Demokratov Afriki" [Ideology of African Revolutionary Democrats]. G. B. Starushenko, responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1981, 288 pages; "Afrika: Progress, Trudnosti, Perspektivy" [Africa: Progress, Difficulties, Prospects], by Anatoliy Gromyko. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1981, 272 pages]

[Text] Four major works on the problems of the African continent--three collective and one individual--have been published by the USSR Academy of Sciences Africa Institute.

A profound and major theme binds together the books "Velikiy Oktyabr' i Afrika," "Dva Napravleniya Sotsial'no-Ekonomicheskogo Razvitiya v Afrike" and "Ideologiya Revolyutsionnykh Demokratov Afriki." They show the different aspects of the historical process which was started by the Great October Revolution and one of whose most important milestones was the elimination of the colonial system on the continent and whose contemporary content is the aspiration toward socialism. This process covers economic construction, the breakdown of the old social structures, the shaping of new social relations, the development of national self-awareness and the strengthening of statehood. Although few of its aspects have been described with equal vividness, unquestionably we acquire a deeper understanding of a number of problems of contemporary Africa.

A very interesting part in "Velikiy Oktyabr' i Afrika" is the description of the way the experience of building socialism in the Soviet Union became familiar to the African public despite all the obstacles erected by the colonizers, and how it had an increasing revolutionizing effect on it. In the very first years following the victory of the October Revolution, direct contacts between Soviet Russia and some African countries were broadened. Later on, in the 1920's and 1930's as the authors justifiably point out, along with the first communist parties created in Africa, the League of Struggle Against Imperialism and Colonial Oppression, the International Organization for Aid to Revolutionary Fighters (MOPR), the International Workers Aid (Mezhrabpom) and the Red Trade Union International played a special role in disseminating the truth about the Soviet Union. Further studies



of Soviet-African relations of that period may prove to be quite rewarding. From this viewpoint archive documents and files of newspapers and journals published in Africa remain insufficiently studied.

The gaining of political independence enabled the African peoples to establish direct friendly relations with the first country of victorious socialism, make comprehensive use of the experience of the Soviet Union and rely on its economic and political power.

The book discusses extensively the various aspects of rapidly developing cooperation between African countries and the USSR without concealing the still existing difficulties in this area. The authors emphasize that it was precisely the Great October Socialist Revolution that laid the foundations of a new system of international relations based on the principles of mutual trust, equality and freedom from exploitation--a system for the comprehensive establishment of which the African peoples are struggling. The principles proclaimed by the October Revolution determine the nature of relations existing between Soviet and African peoples to this day.

One of the topics of this collective work is the struggle waged by different classes and social strata on the ways which African countries must follow. This question, which was raised in the book "Velikiy Oktyabr' i Afrika," is discussed in detail in "Dva Napravleniya Sotsial'no-Ekonomicheskogo Razvitiya v Afrike." In particular, the authors have been able to interpret economic policy and party and state construction in countries with a socialist orientation from a variety of angles. After noting the unquestionable successes of this group of countries, they justifiably point out that there still is no country in Africa which has directly undertaken the building of socialism or has even come close to it. The state sector is of tremendous importance in the development of national economies on the continent and, naturally, the authors have paid particular attention to its organization. They do not conceal the difficulties existing in this undertaking new to African countries.

We read with interest the chapter on the reasons for which some countries have abandoned their socialist orientation. It describes the objective difficulties encountered by revolutionary-democratic and patriotic forces in countries such as Ghana, Mali and Egypt, and the political errors they made. Nor should we ignore the imperialist pressure on African countries with a socialist orientation. In order to attain its objectives, imperialism is making ever more extensive use of a great variety of means against them, ranging from terrorism and military intervention to economic sabotage.

The situation in countries in which capitalist relations have developed and the national and mercantile bourgeoisie has grown, initially under the guided influence of imperialism and subsequently, to a certain extent, spontaneously, remains complex and extremely conflicting. The authors have made a thorough study of the difficult economic consequences to these countries of their continuing dependence on the West: increased foreign indebtedness, distortion of the economy oriented toward foreign markets, weakness of industry and sharp property contrasts. However, this picture would unquestionably have been even more expressive had the authors traced more profoundly not only the economic but the social processes which, in the final account, undermine the base of regimes linked with neocolonialism. In particular, problems such as the ruination of broad masses of the peasantry, the social

stratification in the countryside, the structure and increased strength of the unemployed labor army, and the nature of social relations developing in African cities deserve a very close study.

The authors offer rich data for a comparison between the results of the development of African countries toward socialism and toward capitalism. If we include the social aspects of the problem, the advantage of a socialist orientation is unquestionable. However, the authors themselves have not ventured into a detailed comparison between the results of the development of the two groups of states, leaving this to the reader. The book "Ideologiya Revolyutsionnykh Demokratov Afriki" describes the ideological and political aspects of the struggle waged on the continent for defining the directions of socioeconomic development. This problem runs throughout its three sections which deal with the shaping of a revolutionary-democratic ideology, the study of the views of revolutionary democrats on major problems of social and economic development (class struggle, socialism, economic program, African unity) and a characterization of the ideological features of the separate detachments of revolutionary democrats. In addition to Soviet authors, the work includes contributions by K. (Hutschenreuter), a jurist from the GDR, B. Doubrava, a Czechoslovak historian, Imre Marton, a Hungarian philosopher, and others.

This book is the first scientific Marxist study of a complex and dynamic phenomenon such as contemporary African revolutionary-democratic ideology. The authors have properly focused their attention mainly on the study of the most significant contributions of one or another detachment of revolutionary democrats or political leaders to its development. To a certain extent, this gives the work the aspect of a monograph. However, despite the great importance of the personal contributions made by major thinkers such as, for example, Kwame Nkrumah or J. Nyerere to the development of revolutionary thinking in Africa, we must bear in mind that these people themselves were subjected to the steady influence of the ideas which prevailed in their immediate surroundings. That is why a deeper understanding of the shaping of a revolutionary democratic ideology and the sources of its weakness and strength requires a study of the views which continue to prevail among the left-wing intelligentsia on the continent. This ideology was and remains the work not only of individual outstanding minds but of the broad revolutionary masses. This aspect of the problem is as yet unstudied. Nor does the work discuss the ideology of revolutionary democrats in countries with a capitalist orientation or its manifestations in literature and the arts, although the works of the Senegalese Semben Usman, the Kenyan Ngugi Va Dhiongo and other leftist authors play a major role in awakening the political self-awareness of African working people. However, let us repeat that the book provides a rather complete idea and proper assessments of increasingly powerful ideological currents on the continent.

What makes most parts of this book interesting? Above all, a comparison between the views of revolutionary democrats and the practice of building a new life. Let us note in this connection the chapter "The Problem of Social Progress in the Theoretical and Practical Activities of the Party of the Mali Sudanese Union." The contradictions inherent in revolutionary democratic ideology are convincingly described.

The monograph by Anat. A. Gromyko "Afrika: Progress, Trudnosti, Perspektivy" is the extended and intensified development of the topics raised in the collective works we have described. It offers a clear contrasting picture of the current

situation on the continent, analyzes the basic socioeconomic and political problems of the African countries and assesses the methods used in resolving them. The author's approach to this material is noteworthy for its spirit of militant party-mindedness.

One of the main problems of interest to the author is the nature and characteristics of the class struggle waged in the various parts of the continent. The author notes that in some African countries there is no working class as yet. At the same time, however, he notes its rapid growth in most important economic areas and the high percentage of relatively well-organized workers in the processing and extracting industries. The author particularly emphasizes that the proletariat is experiencing qualitative changes: the number of seasonal workers within its ranks is declining while that of hereditary proletarians, whose hired labor is the only source of existence, is increasing.

The weak national bourgeoisie and its allies would have been unable to remain in power in a number of African countries without the direct support of imperialism. Protecting its political partners from the people's anger, imperialism thus becomes a direct participant in the class struggle in African society. The author convincingly describes the economic and military-strategic and political interests of imperialism on the continent and the ideological and political levers used by the Western powers in suppressing national liberation aspirations. He cites new facts which indicate, among others, the close cooperation between imperialist ideological centers and Beijing in the propaganda war waged against African nations.

Belief that the solution of the difficulties experienced by many African countries should be sought in the development of cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity is becoming increasingly stronger among Africans. The author describes the inner logic of the process of the growing strength of Soviet-African relations in a great variety of political, economic, cultural and scientific areas. He describes in detail previously little known initial diplomatic contacts between Soviet Russia and Ethiopia. He traces the basic stages of Soviet-African cooperation and indicates the scale it has reached today.

The polemical charge contained in the book is one of its important qualities. The convincing nature of the arguments formulated by the author in criticizing various bourgeois development theories is supported by the phenomena of African reality themselves. Compared with them, we can clearly see the sterility and danger of various "development models" imposed on Africa by neocolonialist propaganda or by Beijing.

These four books by Soviet scientists are a noticeable contribution to the social sciences. They deepen our views on revolutionary processes in Africa and the ideological searches of its patriotic forces. They also earmark important directions to be followed in future research.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003

CSO: 1802/4



## UNITED STATES: POLITICS AND POLITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 81 pp 123-128

[Review by V. Petrovskiy, doctor of historical sciences, of the following books: "Sovremennoye Politicheskoye Soznaniye v SShA" [Contemporary Political Consciousness in the United States]. Yu. A. Zamoshkin and E. Ya. Batalov, responsible editors. Nauka, Moscow, 1980, 446 pages; "Amerikanskoye Obshchestvennoye Mneniye i Politika" [American Public Opinion and Politics]. Yu. A. Zamoshkin, responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1978, 294 pages; "Sotsial'naya Filosofiya Sovremennogo Amerikanskogo Konservatizma" [Social Philosophy of Contemporary American Conservatism] by A. Yu. Mel'vil'. Izdatel'stvo Politicheskoy Literatury, Moscow, 1980, 142 pages; "Demokraticheskaya Partiya SShA: Izbirateli i Politika" [The Democratic Party of the United States: Voters and Politics], by V. O. Pechatnov. Nauka, Moscow, 1980, 248 pages; "Zapadnaya Psikhologiya kak Instrument Ideologii i Politiki" [Western Mentality as an Instrument of Ideology and Politics], by S. K. Roshchin. Nauka, Moscow, 1980, 302 pages]

[Text] The worsened international situation and the attempts of U.S. ruling circles to "reideologize" relations among countries in accordance with their current aggressive foreign political course face Soviet social scientists with the task of making a comprehensive study of the characteristics and methods of ideological struggle today and with a consideration of the deeper reasons for the sociopolitical phenomena which have aggravated the situation in the world. The solution of this problems requires the adoption of a comprehensive approach which must include the various facets of this complex problem. A number of works prepared and published mainly by the USSR Academy of Sciences United States and Canada Institute exemplify this approach.

The depth and actual scale of the turn in U.S. foreign policy, generally explained as a reaction on the part of the most aggressive segment of the ruling class to the change in the ratio of forces in the world, enables us to gain a full understanding, among others, of the entire set of complex processes which have brought about changes in the ideological and political climate within the United States, including changes in the area of political consciousness.

When we speak of political consciousness in the United States, we are discussing a political approach, the attitude of the main classes, strata and population groups toward the most topical problems of our time. It is a question of the political approach to problems, the growth of unemployment and inflation, the increasing frequency of production declines and shortage of energy resources, and the overall attitude toward the policy of the monopolies and the intervention of



the bourgeois state in economic life. It is also a question of the approach to problems such as social security, medical services and aid to the unemployed and to the particularly needy Americans. Finally, it is a question of the approach to the most important problems of foreign policy--the arms race and the prospects for reducing the threat of nuclear catastrophe, problems of national and international security, relations with the USSR and the other members of the socialist comity, detente and the principles of peaceful coexistence, the specific situations which arise today in various parts of the world and the upsurge of the struggle waged by the peoples for social and national liberation.

A broad spectrum of political positions and viewpoints is developing in the United States in connection with these and other problems, frequently quite disparate and mutually exclusive.

Naturally, this is above all a manifestation of the basic and radical distinction between political consciousness of an anti-capitalist nature, as a rule oriented toward Marxist-Leninist doctrine, and a consciousness still linked to the existing social system and the customs and traditions born of the practice of American capitalism. However, even within the consciousness bound by bourgeois and petit bourgeois illusions, prejudices and biases, an increasing differentiation and an aggravation in the struggle among different positions and views are taking place in the United States today. In the course of this struggle, the following find themselves at opposite poles:

A social consciousness which is stubbornly trying to preserve, to "conserve" the most traditional structures of American capitalism in ideology, economics and domestic and foreign policy, and a consciousness which is trying to adapt to one extent or another to the realities and irreversible changes in the contemporary world, i.e., a consciousness which is essentially reformist;

A consciousness which leans toward the traditions of the Cold War, chauvinism, militarism and hegemonism and frenzied militant anticommunism and anti-Sovietism, and a consciousness which reveals a trend toward a more realistic approach to problems of international relations and which supports the ideas of detente, normalizing relations with the USSR, talks and constructive settlement of disputes.

A number of intermediary links exist between these poles. The political views of many Americans are characterized by an inner complexity, contradictoriness and frequent eclecticism. Quite noticeable in the sharp ideological and political debates which are taking place today is a gamut of political beliefs and clear elements of disorder, hesitations and wanderings.

The collective monograph on this topic is very helpful in the comprehensive and systematic review of the complex structure of political consciousness in the United States and in singling out and analyzing its basic and practically most important types. Its authors have undertaken "to offer the most accurate possible idea of the overall spectrum of non-Marxist political consciousness, the various components of this spectrum," the basic direction in the evolution of this consciousness and its links with the traditions of a political culture which developed in the course of the 200-year-long history of the United States and the deepening crisis in American capitalism (see page 12). Soviet American studies already include works on one or another feature of ideological and political aspects of American life. However,

this is the first time that an attempt is being made to provide a systematic study of the structure of political consciousness. This proves the qualitative novelty of this study which presents a summarized integral picture of the development of this subject.

In our view, the monograph is an overall successful effort to single out and describe the basic and most significant types of political consciousness. This was a difficult project, made more complex by the fact that in the United States itself a rather simplistic and narrow system of internal differentiation among basic types of political consciousness has become rooted, in which the entire variety of views is reduced to pitting liberals against conservatives. This system is not merely narrow and simplistic, but very subjective and arbitrary, for the traditional U.S. understanding of liberalism and conservatism is clearly obsolete today. It does not cover the truly essential differences of views and positions. More accurate, objective and principled criteria are needed in distinguishing among the various types of political consciousness. Criteria which show the socioclass nature of its most important varieties and of the groups representing them are needed, together with criteria which depict the real attitude of these types (determined not only in terms of statements but practical actions) toward the most topical problems of domestic and, something particularly important today, foreign policy.

The authors of this monograph have been able to accomplish this more extensively, accurately and freshly compared with previous works. We see as a result specific and politically important differences among those who either describe or consider themselves liberals or conservatives. For example, the authors describe the difference between liberals who call for greater state intervention in the economy, public life and power related to authoritarian-bureaucratic structures, liberals who have remained loyal to the traditions of bourgeois democracy and reformist liberals who call for expanded social services and aid to the needy. The analysis is expanded by a description of differences between supporters of detente and liberals who, while as a whole displaying the features characteristic of American liberals today, conversely favor a turn to the policy of militarization of the country and the use of force or threat of force in international relations.

We find an interesting study of the internal divisions which are currently taking place in the ranks of American conservatives, particularly between those who favor "free enterprise" and major restrictions in state intervention and neoconservatives who are trying to adapt to the already established U.S. mechanism of state-monopoly organization of management. There are also differences between conservatives who support the so-called "new right"--the main spokesmen for an aggressive foreign policy course--and relatively moderate conservatives who support a comparatively restrained and realistic approach to international relations.

The authors describe the specific nature of contemporary right-wing radical and extremist groups in the United States and the types of political awareness which express them. Another important study deals with the current status of internal differences in the awareness of those who could be classified as left-wing radicals in the United States: the difference between left-wing extremists, rebellious-anarchic and utopian awareness and a radical democratic awareness which supports to one extent or another revolutionary democracy and a socialist orientation.

This analysis makes a fuller characterization of the struggle of ideas and political groups in the United States and of changes occurring in the U.S. ideological and

political climate possible. For example, the strengthening of some conservative trends in recent years, the dissemination of a traditionalistic and neoconservative type of awareness in particular, does not mean the disappearance of the variety of liberal, mainly liberal-reformist, consciousness. Furthermore, the active external manifestation of some types of consciousness may contribute to the strengthening of an opposite consciousness which, in the presence of proper objective conditions, may acquire a dominating influence.

The monograph helps us to gain a deeper understanding of the ideological views of leading American political figures who, as a rule, are not ideologues-theoreticians but pragmatists, for which reason their views are based on political circumstances. In today's America, the type of political personality, in whose views and speeches, particularly during electoral campaigns, ideas which may seem quite conflicting on the surface and may be qualified as belonging to different types of political consciousness, has become quite commonplace. A systematic study makes it possible to reconstruct the overall complete picture of the ideological and political positions of one or another personality and to show the contradictions with which this integral picture is fraught, a picture which is so typical of a political awareness which reflects the increasing aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism.

The research tools presented by the monograph may be used in the study of the development of the ideological-political situation not only in the United States but in other capitalist countries and in the analysis of the internal mechanisms of the conservative turn to the right, toward conservatism, which took place in the United States in the second half of the 1970's. The increasingly contradictory structure of contemporary political consciousness in the United States, as shown by the researchers, is of great help in defining the scale and depth of this shift, and its analysis indicates the possibility of other turns in different directions. Essentially, obviously it is already possible to speak not only of the general growth of conservatism in the mood of the majority of ordinary Americans but of the conscious political and ideological-propaganda strategy adopted by some U.S. bourgeois circles to encourage such a shift and the obvious energizing of the conservative political bloc.

This conclusion is supported by the materials in "Amerikanskoye Obshchestvennoye Mneniye i Politika," in which we find a comprehensive systematized analysis of numerous and varied data obtained in the course of public opinion surveys in the United States, based on the scientific and critical consideration of the overall practice of such surveys, their methodology and techniques and the specific ideological and political positions of those who organize and conduct them.

Both the study of public opinion surveys and the typological analysis of political consciousness indicate that the process of mass political alienation, i.e., of the growth of the discontent, above all among the toiling masses, and the activities of the main bourgeois power institutions, which began in the mid-1970's, is continuing in the United States. Some elements of this mass dissatisfaction have indeed assumed a conservative aspect. However, this hardly covers its entire content. Frequently, this conservative form is merely the external expression of a deep discontent with the existing political system or with one or another specific political program.



Furthermore, although a shift to the right may be noted in political consciousness in the United States on a number of problems, the movement is far from being comprehensive and unconditional. Public opinion polls, for example, indicate that despite the anticommunist and anti-Soviet psychosis encouraged by imperialist circles, a considerable percentage of Americans are aware of the need for constructive talks with the Soviet Union, particularly for the positive completion of talks on the limitation of strategic armaments and armament control.

It is equally important to separate the basic political positions which are apparent today within conservatism from right-wing radicalism or right-wing extremism, which is an essentially different ideological and political trend. In this connection, we find interesting the monograph by A. Yu. Mel'vil', which analyzes the ideological-political and sociophilosophical foundations of American conservatism at its present stage and which concretizes and develops the theses formulated in "Sovremennoye Politicheskoye Soznaniye v SShA" [Contemporary Political Consciousness in the United States]. The author systematically proves that "conservatism must be viewed as a particular type of thinking and behavior of social strata whose position in society is threatened by objective trends of social progress" (page 12). The main function of U.S. conservatism at the present stage is not an attempt to turn back the development of bourgeois society through radical measures and means of political coercion (which are precisely the ideas of right-wing radicalism), but the desire to limit the scale of social change, to reduce the gravity of social conflicts and to consolidate, "to conserve" a great deal of that which was previously achieved in the course of liberal reform. Naturally, such "conservation" does not exclude but presumes a certain regression. This means reanimation of the tradition of a policy "from a position of strength" and bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism in foreign policy, and the reanimation of the illusion of "free enterprise" in the field of economics. In his work, A. Yu. Mel'vil' also properly proves that the present intensification of conservative trends in the United States is a reaction to the crisis in liberalism under the specific conditions of present-day America. However, although this crisis has contributed to the current change in the ratio of forces between liberalism and conservatism in favor of the latter, this does not mean the definitive decline of American liberalism.

Nevertheless, the profound and comprehensive study of the problem of conservatism, as a current which has emerged in the foreground of ideological and political life in the United States and in a number of other countries in the capitalist web, must be considered today as one of the theoretically most important and politically most topical tasks of Marxist researchers.

The complexity and contradictoriness of the ideological and political situation in the United States today are considerably intensified by the obvious heterogeneity of the conservative circles rallied around the new administration. On this level, we must take particular note of the substantial reanimation of the so-called "new right"--organizations and groups which hold even more rightist positions, based on conservative and right-wing radical ideas of anticommunism, chauvinism, nationalism, racial prejudice and extreme conservatism in social matters and which, to a certain extent, come closer to neo-Nazi and racist forces. We can single out in the "new right" movement a political wing represented by organizations such as the Committee for the Salvation of a Free Congress, the National Conservative Committee for Political Action and others, on the one hand, and the religious wing, on the other. The latter includes right-wing religious fundamentalist organizations of a primarily Protestant nature, whose ideological positions are generously spiced with anti-communism, reaching the level of the McCarthy hysteria and "witch hunting" of the 1950's.



The "new right," which is trying to channel into the reactionary current the increasingly clear mass discontent with the moral crisis in the United States and the decline in mores, and is attempting to speculate on the racist, anti-Soviet and anticommunist prejudices rooted in some American social strata, gave Reagan substantial political support in the 1980 presidential campaign. However, we must bear in mind that in the very first months of the life of the new administration, various tensions and reciprocal distrust between it and the "new right," which pressured the government from its extreme reactionary positions into pursuing a more rigid conservative course in domestic and foreign policy, above all toward the USSR and the socialist countries, became quite clear. The existence of a rather significant "right-wing pressure" group in terms of its mass base and resources is a serious factor in the contemporary ideological and political situation in the United States.

The study of political consciousness alone is insufficient in forecasting the steps which one leader or group or another could take in the United States in domestic and foreign policy. In this case the study of mechanisms which shape the political course of the country and the platforms of the leading parties is of great importance. Unquestionably, in this connection the work "Demokraticeskaya Partiya SShA: Izbiratel'i i Politika" by V. O. Pechatnov is worthy of attention. This party, which is the main and traditional bearer of the ideas of liberalism in American political life, is in a state of crisis which reflects the overall condition of bourgeois reformism in the United States. As properly noted by the author, "the evolution of the Democratic Party and of its policy clearly shows the limits of bourgeois reformism, which is unable to ensure any lasting stability in the contemporary U.S. political system" (page 238). The profound discontent with the activities of Carter's Democratic administration was convincingly proved by the results of last year's presidential elections.

As we know, profiting from the weakening of the party's liberal wing, the Carter administration made a deliberate right turn. This was most clearly manifested in foreign policy, which resumed its "military-power trend" in recent years. In this connection we have to remember that in their time "liberals who proceeded from the need for a continuation of the reformist policy within the country...linked it with a reorientation toward detente, which would have released scarce material and political resources" (page 155). However, the growth of social discontent in the United States proved to be excessively stormy for the ruling upper crust to be able to neutralize it with the help of bourgeois reformism. This largely determined the conversion of the ruling elite of both Democratic and Republican parties to more conservative positions which called for mounting an offensive on the rights of the working people within the country and the energizing of an aggressive foreign policy course and anticommunist and anti-Soviet propaganda. The propaganda stir related to an alleged "military threat" and "threat to petroleum and raw material supplies to the United States" created by the USSR was used as a demagogic argument in justifying the global aspirations of American imperialism and as a means to "discipline" American society.

The book by S. K. Roshchin "Zapadnaya Psikhologiya kak Instrument Ideologii i Politiki" (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Psychology) has a similar theme. It is a study of the use of various psychological schools in the interest of the ruling classes and with a view to molding public opinion in capitalist countries, mainly the United States. This is the first work in Soviet scientific literature which describes the role and place of American psychological science in the ideological and political struggle in detail and on the basis of extensive factual data.

The author makes a critical analysis and proves the scientific groundlessness of neo-Freudian, behavioristic, neosocial-Darwinist and so-called "humanistic" concepts of relations between the individual and society, the essence of class contradictions, and the problems of the state and law and of war and peace--concepts on which attempts to manipulate social consciousness in the United States and the other capitalist countries are largely based.

S. K. Roshchin convincingly describes the way some general principles of social psychology, which is an area of the science of psychology which comes the closest to problems of social relations, are converted into specific political theories and practices by the ruling U.S. circles. For example, clinical psychology, which may seem to be quite distant from problems of ideology and politics, is used by them to equalize the conditions of the mental patient, drug addict and political fighter in order to justify attempts at "correcting" the enemies of the rule of monopoly capital with forced "treatment." The ideological and political functions of bourgeois psychological science and its role in shaping a perverse political consciousness are specifically implemented in the applied sectors of social psychology in the United States--the psychology of organization, management, advertising and propaganda.

The question of the latest direction in U.S. psychological science, which has been actively developing since the end of the 1960's, is new and as yet unanalyzed in our scientific publications. This applies to political psychology, which deals with the psychological aspects of domestic and foreign policy and international relations. This branch of American psychological science appeared at the function of political and psychological sciences. "Research" in this area clearly reveals attempts at somehow "explaining" recent U.S. foreign policy failures and attempts to "improve" foreign policy decision-making processes in Washington. Many such works are practically implemented in one step or another taken by the state. U.S. political psychology clearly reflects the link between the science of psychology and bourgeois ideology and politics. For this reason, S. K. Roshchin's monograph is an interesting contribution to the study of problems of politics and political consciousness in the United States and of the ideological struggle within bourgeois society and in the international arena.

The studies described in these works enable us to gain a better understanding of the results achieved so far by the chauvinistic, militaristic and expansionist propaganda conducted by the ruling U.S. circles among the American people. They also indicate the prospects for the development of the positive trends which became apparent to a greater or lesser degree in the foreign political orientations of the various American social strata throughout the 1970's. This applies to the fact that most Americans support the ideas of detente and talks with the USSR on the limitation of armaments, mainly of strategic weapons. It is a question of the fact that many millions of Americans are becoming clearly aware of the growing threat of a nuclear war and its catastrophic consequences for the United States itself. Finally, it is a question of the fact that most Americans consider armament control on a global scale a most important foreign political objective. Public opinion surveys in the United States have repeatedly confirmed the existence and stability of these trends.

It would be difficult to assume that such positive trends, which have consistently made themselves apparent for a long period of time could disappear immediately and totally. Naturally, the scale at which they are manifested and their share and

significance within the overall context of American political life may fluctuate as they follow the fluctuations affecting the conflicting forces in the country--those who favor detente from the positions of realism and those who represent militarism, hegemonism and anticommunism. Such fluctuations could be significant and sometimes dangerous from the viewpoint of strengthening international peace. Positive trends may disappear from the surface of general public opinion and go so to speak "underwater" and penetrate the deep strata of political consciousness only to reemerge later on the surface.

We must proceed from the fact that the objective reasons and factors which make peaceful coexistence and detente historically inevitable will not disappear under the present circumstances but will conversely manifest themselves with increasing persistence and strength. The active efforts of peace-loving forces in the contemporary world, including in the United States, have not ceased. Soviet peace initiatives, which have been so clearly embodied in the new proposals on the development of the peace program and were formulated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 26th CPSU Congress, play a tremendous role in the further energizing of these forces.

The works under review clearly prove that the abandonment of illusions traditional in U.S. mass political consciousness relative to the "exclusive" historical development of the country and guaranteed U.S. military superiority and invulnerability, is a rather difficult and painful process. The supporters of anti-Sovietism are relying on some aspects of the troubled feelings which develop in the course of this process, as the supporters of chauvinism, militarism and foreign policy expansionism continue to frighten the Americans with the imaginary "Soviet threat."

These works enable us to assess properly the scale of the changes occurring in the mass political awareness and public opinion in the United States and to anticipate the further intensification of conflicting trends in the development of the ideological and political situation in the country. They are a useful contribution to the specific study of complex political processes of not only scientific but mainly practical interest. They shed new light on the conflicting processes taking place in contemporary America and contribute to upgrading the effectiveness of Soviet diplomatic action and the struggle against the bourgeois ideology.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003

CSO: 1802/4

END

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

JANUARY 20, 1982