

302211

JPRS-UKO-85-015

13 September 1985

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 9, June 1985

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED #

20000104 127

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED #

9
165
A08

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.

13 September 1985

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 9, June 1985

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

CONTENTS

Editorial - Readiness To Assume Responsibility	1
Fundamental Issue of Party Economic Policy. M. S. Gorbachev Speech at the CPSU Central Committee Conference on Questions of Accelerating Scientific-Technical Progress 11 June 1985	13
TOWARDS THE 27th CONGRESS	
Transformation of Nonchernozem Zone: Results, Problems, Prospects (V. Vorotnikov)	40
Verifying With Lenin, Guided by Party Demands (V. Chebrikov)	57
OUR KNOWLEDGE, STRENGTH, AND WEAPON	
Lenin and the 'Awakening of Asia' (Nguyen Thi Thu, Nguyen Anh Thai)	71
Greatness of the Immortal Lenin (Radjeshvar Rao)	79
HISTORICAL MEMORY OF THE PEOPLE	
In Search of a Path to the Future. Leitmotiv of A. I. Herzen's Ideological Works (A. Volodin)	83

Path of Trials and Victories (Irakliy Abashidze)	95
REALITIES OF THE PRESENT AGE	
War Veterans in the Struggle for Peace (A. Zheltov)	101
Topical Problems of the Antiwar Movement and the World Revolutionary Process (V. Bushuyev)	113
Portugal: Economic Crisis and Political Struggle (Alvaro Cunhal)	125
SINCE THE 'KOMMUNIST' ARTICLE	
Economic Indicators and Economic Practice	137
CRITICISM AND BIBLIOGRAPHY	
New Additions to Scientific Leniniana	148

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 9
June 1985

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author(s) :

Editor(s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : June 1985

Signed to press : 19 June 1985

Copies : 953,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1985

EDITORIAL - READINESS TO ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY

AU191445 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 85 (signed to press 19 June 85)
pp 3-12

[Editorial--Capitalized passages published in italics]

[Text] The April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum entered our lives as an appeal, demanding and passionate in the Leninist manner, for a sober, profound analysis of the state of affairs, for bold decisions and for energetic actions. The weighty and binding word "RESPONSIBILITY" was pronounced more than just once or twice in various combinations from the platform of the plenum. Well represented in the Leninist political vocabulary, this word firmly entered our working practice long ago. But recently it has begun to be heard more insistently both at workers, party, trade union and Komsomol meetings and at the party committee plenum convoked this spring to examine problems of contemporary cadre policy and to discuss concrete measures for fulfilling the decisions of the April Plenum.

The question of responsibility was also raised widely and demandingly at the CPSU Central Committee conference held in June, which talked about urgent measures to implement the concept formulated by the April Plenum of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development on the basis of scientific-technical progress.

The task of increasing responsibility in all work sectors as well as the task of strict observation of the Leninist principle of cadres' personal responsibility for the assigned task have never been removed from the agenda of our internal party, economic and social life. They were also set by the 26th CPSU Congress. It is also significant that the discussion at the April Plenum about responsibility directly corresponds in tone and content to the directives of the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. This is one of the many proofs of continuity in implementating the strategic course developed by the 26th Party Congress and by subsequent plenums of its Central Committee. In the Leninist sense, continuity means both the creative assimilation of everything positive from past experience and also permanent movement forward, the revelation and solution of new problems and the elimination of everything hindering development.

It is possible to assert with certainty that the formulation at the plenum of the question of readiness to assume responsibility is a Leninist formulation dictated by today's needs and by the party's concern for the comprehensive perfecting of developed socialism.

Such a readiness is the distinguishing feature of the political makeup of a party of consistent revolutionary action, as the CPSU is. Such readiness is the embodiment of historical initiative and its active creative search for ways of accelerating society's socioeconomic progress. This is a synonym for the scientific substantiation and political courage with which the CPSU and its Leninist Central Committee make decisions on the fundamental questions of contemporary social development and a synonym for the political honesty with which the party conducts a dialogue with the people and reveals miscalculations and errors committed and also of the firm resolution with which it corrects them, while persistently perfecting the forms and methods of its activity. All this was given brilliant new conformation by the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the June Plenum on questions of accelerating scientific-technical progress.

Where is the newness of the discussion developing in the country about responsibility concretely to be seen? By what is it dictated?

This newness consists primarily in the political acuteness of the very formulation of the question. In this connection it is of principled importance that the discussion about increasing responsibility does not remain within the sphere of wordy formulations where it is so easy to achieve an impression of acuteness and even practicality, but that it is persistently transferred to a practical plane. The novelty can further be seen in the fact that, together with the demand to increase the responsibility of workers at all levels for the assigned task, a demand which although unusually topical is fairly traditional, the question of their readiness to assume responsibility was also formulated. This demand is undoubtedly addressed to all communists, all working people, all party organizations and labor collectives, all party committees and all soviet, trade union, Komsomol and economic organs. In the formulation of the question, which undoubtedly reflects the increased role of the objective, human factor in the development of the new social formation, emphasis is laid on developing the initiative in every possible way and increasing the creative activity of the masses and on overcoming the sluggish force of inertia.

Preparations for the regular 27th CPSU Congress are being made ever more widely and intensively. Its significance is determined by the paramount importance of the questions submitted for discussion, which include a question on the new edition of the CPSU Program and a question on amendments to the party statute. The 27th Congress is expected to become a milestone in the development of our country; this is connected with the peculiar nature of the period through which we are living and with the newness and scale of the tasks facing us. With its dynamism, life has rigorously demanded that our society achieve a new qualitative state in the widest sense of the word. The reaching of new historical boundaries by the country of the October Revolution is primarily connected with the scientific-technical renewal of production and the achievement of the world's highest level of labor productivity. Reaching

these boundaries means perfecting social relations, primarily economic, activizing the entire system of political and social institutions, deepening socialist democracy and also self-government by the people.

The achievement of the above boundaries is indissolubly connected with the improvement and intensification of all the multifaceted work to form a free, comprehensively developed individual. And this naturally presupposes the development of that individuals' creative activity and the instilling into every person of feelings of social and moral responsibility. Readiness to assume that responsibility should to an increasing extent become the internal stimulus motivating the individual's behavior. The level of that responsibility, which is the indispensable attribute of the socialist way of life, is indicative of the maturity of both the individual person and society as a whole.

The Soviet poet Leonid Martynov spoke very accurately about this:

I have grasped,
What it means to be free.
I have gained an understanding of this difficult feeling,
One of the most personal feelings in the world.

And do you know what it means to be free?
It means, after all, to be answerable for everything.

The readiness to assume responsibility is one of the most important components of the Leninist style of work which, the party never tires of reminding us, it is necessary to master to an increasingly full extent. What is involved today is thus the resolute breaking of obsolete stereotypes in people's consciousness and practical activity and the renunciation of outmoded views and habits. This readjustment, as Comrade M. S. Gorbachev stressed, speaking at a meeting of the aktiv of the Leningrad party organization on 17 May 1985, is equally obligatory for all, from worker to minister, to the secretary of the party Central Committee, to government leaders. Ahead lies the need to pass as rapidly as possible through its most difficult stage, the stage of psychological readjustment of cadres in the spirit of the new demands. The basis of these demands and of the new approach to work is consistent orientation toward scientific-technical progress. This will inevitably entail profound structural shifts in the national economy, technical and technological reequipping of all its branches, fundamental reconstruction of the economic mechanism and modernization of the entire system of planning and managing the national economy and will require mastery of the "algebra" of the political economy of socialism and more respect for the conclusions of contemporary science.

But that means that all scientific activity, too, should be readjusted from the point of view of considerably increasing its effectiveness. A decisive turn by science toward the needs of social production is needed. And here it is necessary to talk about scientific and civilian courage as inseparable qualities of each Soviet scientist without exception and of the research collective and about the need for a profound realization by them of their responsibility not only for the future of this or that development study, but

also for the fate of the motherland and the whole of world civilization. In this context, individual or collective attempts to be guided in scientific activity by repetition of the past in order to avoid any risk of offending someone's authority, or by blind copying of foreign scientific or technical ideas, or to be guided in the choice of research subject by the aspiration to lengthen a list of printed works or acquire a scientific degree at cost of minimum efforts, look vulgarly narrow-minded and far removed from the demands of professional ethics. The contemporary potential of Soviet science makes it possible to expect from our scientists and sociologists the development of carefully considered and at the same time genuinely innovative recommendations of real practical significance regarding the most promising ways of qualitatively renewing production forces and perfecting production relations.

The CPSU Central Committee conference on questions of accelerating scientific technical progress talked about a sharp turn toward intensification of the economy and about the reorientation of every enterprise, branch and of the entire national economy toward an intensive path of development. The Soviet Union, which was and continues to be the embodiment of people's age-old hopes, should also be an example of the highest level of organization and of the efficiency of its economy. Thus, the task of accelerating the country's development has acquired today a paramount political, economic and social significance. Its implementation is an urgent all-party and all-people's task.

This formulation of the question is the only one possible in contemporary conditions. The achievement of deep transformations of a revolutionary nature is, after all, impossible on the road of cautious minor improvements. A leap and a break in gradualness are needed here. Otherwise there will be a very real threat of a decrease in the rates of increase of the people's standard of living and of a curtailment of the program of material welfare growth.

Setting out on the road of minor improvements would also mean lagging hopelessly in the historical competition between the two opposing social systems. However much it reiterates its "love of peace," imperialism does not abandon its attempts to decide by military means the outcome of this antagonism which never ceases for a minute. History does not give us time for any kind of respite.

Speaking at a meeting of the aktiv of the Leningrad party organization, M. S. Gorbachev recalled how before the war the older generations had solved the tasks of traversing in decades a road traveled by other countries in centuries so that our country did not find itself in a critical situation. It was possible then to do not all, but the main thing in order to avert the mortal danger and the foundations for victory in 1945 were thus laid. Today, too, we also need to traverse a great road, and in a short time.

It is all the more necessary to do this because the rates of our forward movement have slowed in recent years. Alongside the undoubted successes in the economic development of the country, a considerable number of difficulties have arisen. Thanks to the active work of the party, starting from 1983, it has been possible to enhance the work of many links in the national economy

and somewhat improve the situations. However, these difficulties are far from having been overcome.

All this taken together explains why the necessity of accelerating our movement and the necessity of more intelligent, more responsible and more disciplined work are being the linchpin of party policy. An enormous mobilization of forces and an ability to conduct work in a new way will be required not only in the economy but also in the social sphere, in the sphere of culture and ideology and, in a word, in all areas of our lives.

Following Lenin's behests, the CPSU is examining the problem of increasing initiative and responsibility in indissoluble connection with the tasks of strengthening discipline, order and organization. The party sees the solution of the above tasks as one of the main preconditions for substantial acceleration of the rates of economic growth. An important aspect of this question is the timely and qualitative delivery of raw materials, fuel and component products, the supply of railway cars and so on. Another reserve for acceleration is the struggle against wastefulness and excessive losses of live and embodied labor. Scientific-technical progress and the growth of production efficiency are inseparable from a decisive improvement in product quality. The question of strengthening discipline is, as we can see, being posed on a wide scale by the party. This also includes a high standard of production, strict technological discipline, on which the level of product quality is directly dependent, efficient fulfillment of product delivery plans by enterprises and, of course, work discipline. And the starting point of the struggle to establish such discipline in all sectors of communist construction is a high level of exactingness toward people, toward leading cadres and toward all links in the political system from top to bottom.

Readiness to assume responsibility is the bridge which binds word and deed into one. The firmness of this stability depends primarily on how precise, weighty and honest the word addressed to the masses is. As is known, Lenin did not shy from or avoid the most bitter, biting and harsh words, and he evaluated the facts and phenomena of reality with merciless sober-mindedness. Indirect, evasive words are, as a rule, accompanied by halfway practical measures, or else they are completely limited to imitation of reality or to the semblance of an act.

Profound analysis of the reasons for the difficulties which the country is experiencing is of principled importance to the party. "Of course, the influence of natural and a number of external factors has had a telling effect," the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum noted in this connection. "But the main point, it would seem, is that changes in the objective conditions of the development of production and the need for acceleration of its intensification and for changes in economic management methods were not properly evaluated at the right time, and, what is particularly important, persistence in developing and implementing large-scale measures in the economic sphere has not shown."

Such frankness and self-criticism have evoked the broadest response in the party and among the people. Irrefutable proof of this is the markedly raised temperature of critical analysis of the state of affairs, together with the

unusual--let us say frankly--sharpness and preciseness of evaluations which distinguished the work of a large number of the plenums of party committees of republic, kray, oblast, city and rayon party organizations which were held after the March and April CPSU Central Committee plenums.

It would, however, be unforgivable to overestimate through complacency the positive shifts which are occurring. There was an obvious lack of sharp and principled criticism in the work of some plenums. Far from all cadres were able to rapidly renounce the habit of only criticising from above to below which has taken root within many party organizations. Even today it will not be difficult to find organizations in which criticism of the bureau and secretaries of the party committee is considered bad form and is thus, at best, expressed in the form of extremely polite requests and timid wishes.

A lack of self-criticism in some party committees' evaluation of work done and an unwillingness to assume responsibility for miscalculations in economic and cadre policy are also found. A tendency to understate the scale of omissions and unhealthy phenomena and to confine oneself to censure, even with sharp words, of particular individual cases and of the most odious figures of unsound, totally bankrupt workers, continues to make itself felt. In fact it turns out that leaders who have been publicly criticized have been ruining affairs for a long time, sometimes for a period of a good 10 years, but nevertheless remain in leading posts. Where is the logic in that? And is the practical value of such criticism great?

This spring, some negative phenomena in our work became the subject of particularly acute and interested discussion by communists and the broadest public. These phenomena speak of the obviously weakening of the sense of responsibility of a certain section of party, soviet and economic cadres and of the varied and fairly inventive attempts to avoid it.

Does not the practice of correcting national economic plans which has become established almost everywhere in recent years, and which weakens the centralized principle in management of socialist economy and complicates its normal functioning, attest to this?

Instead of engaging seriously and for a long period in fundamental improvement of the organization of work and production, many economic leaders, including some ministers, and with the blessing or connivance of party organizations, expend their main efforts on "beating out" or "pushing through" an easier plan or on reducing it at the end of the quarter, half-year, or year. And then they report on the successful "overfulfillment" of the plan with an easy conscience. It is no secret that the higher management organs find it fairly easy to set about correcting the plans of enterprises and associations, being frequently guided by far from practical or principled considerations. Behind this lightness lies a hypertrophied concern for departmental honor and an attempt to "settle accounts" in this manner with production collectives for the plan's imbalance and for its lack of provision for sufficient resources. The desire of various levels of management staffs to create a semblance of prosperity in the "territory under the department" at any price also gives rise to the practice of correcting the plans of successfully working enterprises and economic units in an upward direction. Initiative and

enterprise are thus punished, while an irresponsible attitude to work, lazy-mindedness and excessive dependence on the state are rewarded both morally and materially.

The forms of this dependence are fairly varied. But all of them are to a greater or lesser extent the outcome of a decrease in responsibility. The habit of economic or soviet cadres, which is so difficult to eradicate, of turning to party committees for help on any grounds in order to place the burden of their own immediate official obligations on the shoulders of others by means of humble telegrams or insistent telephone calls, also speaks of this. It is clear that an active economic life, which is full of contradictions and the imperfection of the economic mechanism, sometimes requires the direct intervention of party committees into purely production matters and forces them to assume the role of arbitrator in departmental strife. However, this does not at all mean that party committees should act in the role of "fixers" or supply agents.

One sometimes hears that industrial enterprises and associations situated on the territory of a rayon, oblast, or kray which could organize the output of products of economic use in mass demand, do not respond very willingly to corresponding requests from local soviets. The underdeveloped nature of the social infrastructure of some of our towns and villages can be explained by the same motives.

Narrow departmental egoism is undoubtedly strong and makes itself felt in the solving of problems, including those connected with construction projects in one or another territory. And nevertheless this is not the whole truth. The soviets of people's deputies are today provided with rights which make the prospects of satisfactorily resolving such questions completely real, given, of course, a certain amount of persistence.

Lenin's letter to the presidium of the Moscow Soviet of Workers and Red Army Deputies, after the latter had tried to disclaim responsibility for not having fulfilled the decree of the Council of People's Commissars on erecting monuments in the capital to outstanding figures of the revolutionary movement and culture, is profoundly instructive in this respect. "If the Commissariat of People's Education does not respond and does not fulfill its duty to you," wrote Lenin, "then you are obliged to COMPLAIN with documents as well... You should have FOUGHT FOR YOUR RIGHTS." In Lenin's opinion, the institutions invested the authority should rigorously be made to bear the strictest responsibility "for the inaction of authority" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 50, pp 191-192).

At one time the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers adopted a special resolution on measures to assist the Kalinin Oblast in developing agriculture. Taking into account the funds allocated for these purposes, the basic assets of the oblast's kolkhozes and sovkhozes have grown by more than two times in the past decade. But the average gross annual production in the social sector of agriculture has been reduced by 7 percent in the 11th Five-Year-Plan period as compared with the 9th Five-Year Plan period. Less meat and milk has been produced than in the 10th Five-Year Plan period. It turns out that the oblast, which had received considerable aid

from the state, was unable to utilize it sensibly and had been standing still for the entire 10 years.

At the April Plenum the attention of communists and of the entire public was turned toward serious shortcomings in party leadership of the economy, in cadre and educational work and in the activity of the bureaus and secretaries of the Kalinin and Tselinograd obkoms, whose accountability reports on questions of developing the agroindustrial complex were heard by the CPSU Central Committee. "The main source of shortcomings here," the plenum noted, "is an uncritical attitude to work done, a tendency to exaggerate results achieved, and an unwillingness to notice negative phenomena." There is every reason to assert that this style of activity is the direct result of a lack of responsibility and its extreme, although fairly typical, manifestation.

In 1984 the agricultural administration of the Tselinograd Oblast issued 854 orders and sent out 7,000 telegrams to various authorities, which was almost twice as many as in the previous year. However, the results of the financial and economic activity of the sovkhoses and kolkhoses not only did not improve, but they turned out to be much worse than in 1983. It hardly needs to be said that the overwhelming majority of circulars and directives were of a superficial and formal nature!

The whirl of paper, examples of which have been cited at almost every plenum of republic party committees, kraykoms and obkoms, eloquently attests to the obvious disorder of the structure of the national economic complex, to the existence of superfluous links, to the excessive growth of the management apparatus and the undeveloped nature of its economic methods and to defects in the economic mechanism as a whole. However, it is important to bear in mind that the virus of creating paperwork which substitutes live work has far from struck the economic sphere alone. It is necessary to conduct a struggle against it without delay and with all available resources, constantly bearing in mind the fact that the paper style of leadership was a clearly expressed bureaucratic form of distancing cadres from responsibility and a method of shifting that responsibility onto the shoulders of others. The outcome of no responsibility is paper and also verbal red tape, the struggle against which, Lenin demanded, should be organized "in a practical manner, according to all the rules of military art" (op. cit., vol 54, p 120).

Lenin's insistent appeals for a merciless struggle against the outrageous abundance of commissions, which he viewed as the embodiment of irresponsibility and as an inability to organize matters in practice, are also addressed directly to our times. It was noted at a recent plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine that some leading workers have become too accustomed to participating in numerous commissions, councils and staffs, and by no means want to renounce this. A semblance of collectivity is created, although in essence this is frequently nothing other than what Lenin condemned as mere talk. The Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine and the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR considered it necessary to abolish 37 (out of 51) various republican commissions and councils, in which more than 1,000 people had participated. And in the Chelyabinsk Oblast about 530 invented staffs, commissions and operations groups have been liquidated in the last 1.5 years.

Unfortunately, it has to be admitted that the Leninist style of working is not being mastered as rapidly as the CPSU Central Committee demands today. And one of the important preconditions for successfully solving set tasks in contemporary conditions is the eradication of relapses into bureaucratism, of petty guardianship of cadres and of the command method of leadership.

Life attests irrefutably to the fact that bureaucratic distortions lead to the devaluation of exactingness and to an atrophizing of sense of responsibility. The opposite is true: trusting workers of all levels and ranks and giving them broad independence is a hundred times more effective in this respect. It stands to reason that trust must be demanding and must be accompanied by control and verification of fulfillment in the Leninist sense of the words.

Getting rid of bureaucratic ways is not so easy. Their vitality is explained both by the excessive zeal of numerous departments and by the inadequate standard of their work and their blind faith in the force of "outgoing" paper. Disrespect toward people and the desire of workers who have been infected with communist conceit to see their subordinates as obsequious fulfillers of a "higher will" also make themselves felt. Communist conceit is the first and bitterest enemy of Soviet power, an enemy which Lenin never tired of warning about. And an unthinking fulfiller of others' commands is a bad worker. And attempts to provide leadership based on administrative pressure, including the sending out of various kinds of representatives to localities, giving a dressing-down over the telephone, issuing threatening orders and directives, and massive announcements of penalties, are capable at best of bringing transient, temporary success.

People sometimes attempt to justify this style of leadership by the need to strengthen discipline and order in every way possible. There is still a common view that strict regulation of economic or other generally useful activity by applying numerous prohibitive instructions and total control of that activity in the form of frequent checks, inspections and requests for various kinds of information and summary reports (including those using illegal forms of accountability) must promote a significant increase in the responsibility of leading cadres and of all ordinary workers. But views of this kind are absolutely invalid. According to Lenin, socialist discipline is "comradely discipline, discipline of respect of every kind and discipline of independence and initiative in the struggle" (op. cit., vol 36, p 500).

Present-day concerns and the development of socialist self-government make a deeper reading of the Leninist interpretation of democratic centralism and also the search for ways and forms of more consistent implementation of this principle in government practice extraordinarily urgent.

The need to strengthen in every way possible the centralized principle in leadership of the national economy is obvious. However, democratic centralism, as the cornerstone of Soviet organization, has in recent years frequently been substituted by bureaucratic centralism which is irreconcilably foreign to socialism. The danger of such a substitution evidently cannot be excluded, either, in the development of new, more perfect economic management procedures which is presently being conducted. And it is necessary to

constantly remember this danger, while rigorously following Leninist instructions, which have not lost their methodological value even today, in the entire work to perfect the economic mechanism.

The serious and practical formulation of the question of developing initiative and of increasing responsibility will obviously require deeper incursion into the sphere of the economic interests both of the individual worker and of the production collective and society as a whole, and also painstaking and thoughtful work to make them interconnect more fully and precisely. K. Marx himself stated that the "IDEA" invariably disgraced itself as soon as it became separated from the "INTEREST" (K. Marks and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 2, p 89). The development of real rather than formal economic accountability along both horizontal and vertical lines of the national economic structure is expected to play an important role in "combining" them. Full economic accountability can and must become another effective instrument for activating the human factor in solving the most complex tasks of all possible acceleration of scientific-technical progress and of the most rapid shift of our economy on this basis to the track of intensification.

With all the diversity of complex problems facing Soviet society, it will be necessary, first and foremost, to set about improving the entire activity of the party and of all our cadres, in order to accelerate the socioeconomic development of Soviet society. This is the main condition. And the second condition is that it is necessary to use the force of the party's ideological and organizational influence and of its enormous authority among the people in order to raise the entire country immediately to solve the new tasks which time has placed before us. That is how the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo formulate the demands of the moment.

But where is the lever which will help to more rapidly break and overcome the force of inertia, to bring about a turning point in cadres' minds and attitudes, concentrating their attention on the most important matter, scientific-technical progress, and to turn the face of the broad masses of working people toward topical questions of the day? This lever is to be seen in the raising of the activity and militancy of primary organizations, which are the party's main potential and the political nucleus of work collectives. It is precisely these primary organizations--which possess the right to control the activity of the administration--which must assume full responsibility for the fate of the state plans of the final year of the five-year plan and also for the consistent implementation of the urgent measures outlined by the CPSU Central Committee to accelerate scientific-technical progress and perfect the system of planning and managing the national economy and all aspects of the life of Soviet society. It is precisely these organizations which are called upon to become the pioneers and organizers of the purposeful and uncompromising struggle for further strengthening of the alliance of science and work, for the establishment everywhere of a regime of strictest economy, for acceleration of the technical reequipment of enterprises, for a cardinal improvement of affairs in capital construction, the disorder of which largely brings to nothing the efforts in the sphere of scientific-technical progress and also for the liquidation of the lags in transport, communications, material-technical supply and other branches of the production infrastructure, which led to great losses.

The collectives of the central organs of economic management will have to take the most active part in the most rapid elimination of all that stands in the way of scientific-technical progress and in the creation of new economic and organizational conditions capable of really accelerating that progress. Meanwhile, as the June CPSU Central committee conference noted, the party committees of ministries have in places weakened their political acuteness in perceiving and resolving the most important socioeconomic questions, and have become removed from the control to which they have the right under the party Statute. Such an approach does not correspond to contemporary demands and in no way promotes an increase in the responsibility of workers of the state apparatus for the consequences of decisions taken by them.

The primary party organizations are called upon to activate in every way possible the struggle against any manifestations of group egoism and to stand vigilant guard over all-state and all-national interests. It is precisely the primary party organizations which must markedly increase the demand, primarily on communist leaders of all links, for conscientious and creative fulfillment of their obligations by them and for rigorous observation of the CPSU Statute and the norms of socialist morality.

In connection with this, it is difficult to overestimate the role which must be played in the life of primary party organizations by the regular reports of member communists. The reports of members and candidate members of the CPSU, which are closely bound up with the concrete tasks being solved by the labor collectives, broaden the opportunities for a more active influence on production, on solving social questions and on the improvement of ideological-educational work. The experience accumulated by a number of the country's party organizations convincingly attests to this.

It is necessary to further develop and perfect the practice of such reports, adopting the rule that they should be made not only by rank-and-file communists but also by the leaders of labor collectives. Particular attention should be paid to the moral makeup of members and candidate members of the CPSU. Reports by communists in the party organizations of ministries and departments must be aimed at overcoming bureaucratism, red tape, departmentalism and lack of organization. In a word, the broad, universal spreading of the practice of reports is expected to promote an increase in the responsibility of communists for the state of affairs in their party organization and in the party as a whole.

It is no secret that when some communists are confronted with unfavorable circumstances they lose heart and reduce their creative and practical activity, covering up their far from combative nature and their lack of a firm class position in life by grumbling about the imperfection of the present planning procedure and about shortcomings in the organization of production or in the remuneration of work.

How can one help not recalling Lenin here, whose lessons can also be addressed to people living today: "The petit bourgeois member of the intelligentsia who has lost his sense of purpose whimpers, cries and loses control of himself in the face of any manifestation of ugliness or evil, he loses his self-

possession, repeats any gossip and makes efforts to say something incoherent about the 'system.'

"The proletarian (not according to his former profession, but in his real class role) sets about struggle in a practical manner when he sees evil: he openly and officially supports the candidacy of the good worker Ivan, he proposes that the bad Petr be replaced and he institutes proceedings--and conducts them energetically and firmly to their end--against Sidor the rogue, against Tit's protectionist tricks and against Miron's most criminal deals..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol. 52, p 228).

These words of Lenin's which reflect the reality of those distant years are at the same time capable of telling the present-day proletarian ("not according to his former profession, but in his real class role") more accurately and clearly than ever what assuming responsibility in practice means in contemporary conditions. In our time responsibility is inseparable from the worker's competence, from his desire to learn how to work and from his ability never to lose sight of the political meaning of his activity.

An exceptionally important role in the life of the party is expected to be played by the approaching accountability report and election campaign, which must become not a parade review but a truly businesslike and strict review of the party organizations and their readiness to solve tasks which arise. In the course of this campaign it will be necessary to take care of the formation of an electoral aktiv, of the arrangement of forces and of increasing party influence on all sectors of work. The selection and deployment of people, their training and education, the control and verification of fulfillment and the strengthening of living links with the masses--this is what further increasing the party's leading role in society is capable of ensuring in practice.

The main slogans of the moment, which as the April Plenum stressed must be made the leitmotiv of pre-congress meetings and of all preparations for the 27th Party Congress, are creative work, unity of word and deed initiative and responsibility and exactingness toward oneself and one's comrades. It is up to communists to provide an example. It is necessary to intensify the demand made on each party member for his attitude to his social duty, for the fulfillment of party decisions and for the honest and pure makeup of the party member. A communist is judged by his acts and deeds. There can be no other criteria.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985.

CSO: 1802/15-F

FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE OF PARTY ECONOMIC POLICY. M. S. GORBACHEV SPEECH AT THE
CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE CONFERENCE ON QUESTIONS OF ACCELERATING SCIENTIFIC-
TECHNICAL PROGRESS 11 JUNE 1985

AU171427 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 1985 (signed to press 19 Jun
85) pp 13-33

[Report delivered by M. S. Gorbachev at the 11 June 1985 Conference on the
Acceleration of Scientific and Technical Progress, held at the CPSU Central
Committee, in Moscow. The report was carried in the "Vremya" newscast on
Moscow Television Service 1700 GMT 11 Jun and reported in the FBIS Soviet
Daily Report on 12 June 1985, pp R2-R19. Capitalized passages are KOMMUNIST
additions and changes; passages in brackets are deleted in the KOMMUNIST
version.]

[Text] Comrades, all of you know with what approval the decisions of the
April CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the program it put forward for
accelerating the country's social economic development have been received in
our party and among the broad strata of the people. Testimony of this is
provided by the results of party committee plenums and by the numerous
responses reaching the central organs. Soviet people welcome the open and
truthful discussion of problems in society and completely approve and support
the course to raise exactingness, introduce order everywhere and resolutely
improve methods of economic management. They respond to it with practical
deeds. The successful fulfillment of the tasks of the May plan is clear
evidence of this.

A good, businesslike atmosphere is taking shape in party organizations, in
labor collectives and in the country as a whole. The Central Committee
Politburo values highly the working people's confidence in CPSU policy. But
support is also a kind of credit: it places us under an obligation to
consolidate what has been achieved and to move further. [evaluating soberly
both the favorable changes and also the importance of the things that lie
ahead.] Nor can one fail to mention the anxiety of Soviet people: Supposing
the work that has begun turns out in the end to be no more than yet another
campaign? In this connection, critical observations are being made against
all party organizations and leading officials who take an inactive position
and exert themselves too weakly--those who are incapable of rousing and
uniting people, of mobilizing them to solve the great and responsible tasks of
the present stage of society's development. I will say this: Everyone, from
the Central Committee to the primary organizations, bears full responsibility

before the party and the people for the consistent implementation of the line of the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The party views the acceleration of scientific and technical progress as the main direction of its economic strategy, as the main lever for the intensification of [all other economic and social issues.] THE MOST IMPORTANT SOCIAL ISSUES. THE TASKS OF DEVELOPMENT OF SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL PROGRESS are so pressing that action must be taken without losing any time. They embrace a wide circle of current and long-term problems--economic, organizational and social problems, those concerning the development of culture and education, the activity of the upper echelons of management and of every link in the national economy. They affect every collective, every communist, every Soviet person.

The Politburo decision to hold the present conference on the threshold of the 27th CPSU Congress was brought about precisely by this. Problems of accelerating scientific and technical progress must be placed at the center of the pre-congress report-back and election campaign, at the center of all the party's political, organizational and educational work. The attention of state and economic organs and of all the people must be fixed on this. I would like to invite you to take part in a most candid discussion of the real state of affairs and the causes of the brake on our development; and the main thing--on the ways and the reserves for accelerating scientific and technical progress and the growth of the Soviet economy.

ACCELERATION OF THE SOCIOECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IS THE TASK OF THE ENTIRE PARTY AND OF ALL PEOPLE

Comrades, in setting the task of accelerating social and economic development, the Central Committee has in mind not simply raising the growth rate of the national economy. It is also a question of a new quality of growth, of putting development onto the intensive track, of rapid movement forward in strategically important directions, of the structural rearrangement of production, the use of efficient forms of management, the organization of labor and the provision of incentives for it and the fuller solution of social problems.

What has brought about this task?

The need to accelerate social and economic development is determined primarily by our internal requirements. The Soviet economy has always been characterized by a high level of dynamism. Since 1950 the national income has risen by nearly tenfold. Over a period of 3.5 decades, thousands of major enterprises have been built and the appearance of the towns and villages has changed; the level of culture, of education and public health has risen considerably. Much has been done to improve housing, cultural and domestic conditions and the overall material well-being of the people. Real per capita income has increased fivefold. In all of this, the enormous advantages of socialism and of its planned economy have made themselves clear. Our successes are beyond contention; they are generally recognized.

HOWEVER, IT IS IMPOSSIBLE NOT TO SEE THAT CERTAIN DIFFICULTIES HAVE BEGUN TO BE FELT IN THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SINCE THE BEGINNING OF THE 1970s. THE MAIN REASON, AND IT WAS NOTED QUITE DEFINITELY AT THE APRIL CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE PLENUM, IS IN THE FACT THAT THE FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE IN THE ECONOMIC SITUATION HAS NOT BEEN DULY TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT. THE NECESSARY PERSISTENCE HAS BEEN LACKING IN READJUSTING THE STRUCTURAL POLICY, THE FORMS AND METHODS OF MANAGEMENT AND THE VERY PSYCHOLOGY OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY. SHIFTING THE MAIN EMPHASIS TO THE INTENSIVE FACTORS OF ECONOMIC GROWTH HAS BEEN TALKED ABOUT FOR MANY YEARS BUT THE MEASURES TAKEN WERE HALFWAY, INCONSISTENT AND NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED. CONSEQUENTLY, THANKS TO INERTIA, THE ECONOMY HAS CONTINUED TO DEVELOP PRIMARILY ON THE BASIS OF EXTENSIVE OPERATIONS.

At the same time, one also cannot fail to see the other side of the matter. Our party and the entire people have been faced with the task of overcoming negative tendencies and bringing about a sharp turn for the better. Any other approach is ruled out politically for us. We cannot embark upon a path of curtailing social programs [and defense measures]. Society is faced with urgent tasks in the area of food supplies and in the area of the production of goods and services for the people. It is important to continue with the building of housing on a wide scale and to improve the amenities of the towns and villages. We have an obligation to do all that is necessary to further improve the protection of people's health and physical well-being. The innovative and pathfinding role of socialism in the development of education, science, culture and art must be intensified. The necessity to accelerate social and economic development is brought about by serious external circumstances. [We cannot fail to take into consideration the fact that the United States is carrying out a strategy seeking total American superiority. The main reason, and it was mentioned quite definitely at the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum, amounts to this: A proper assessment has not been made of the radical change in the economic situation.] THE COUNTRY IS COMPELLED TO INVEST CONSIDERABLE RESOURCES FOR DEFENSE.

[The necessary persistence in readjusting structural policy, the forms and methods of management, and the very psychology of economic activity has not been displayed. For many years there has been talk of shifting the center of gravity to intensive factors of economic growth, but the measures adopted were half-measures, inconsistent measures, and were not implemented to the full. Due to inertia, the economy continued to develop mostly on an extensive basis.

The situation is complicated by the fact that we are compelled to invest immense funds in defense.] The achievement of military-strategic parity with the United States was a historic accomplishment. We will continue to apply maximum effort to end the arms race and shift matters toward mutual disarmament and curtailing military spending. However, faced with the aggressive policy and threats of imperialism, it is essential that we persistently strengthen the country's defensive might and do not permit another country to gain military superiority over us. Such is the firm resolve of the Soviet people. [applause]

Vladimir Ilich Lenin's statement that socialism would exert its greatest influence on the world around it by its economic policy and its socioeconomic achievement is well known. In the eyes of the progressive world public, the

Soviet Union has been and remains the embodiment of people's age-old social hopes. It should also be an example of the highest organization standards and efficiency of its economy [a pillar of the progressive forces of the world]. Finally, the need to accelerate our development is dictated by the need to ensure the Soviet state's complete economic independence of the capitalist countries, above all in the strategically important areas.

We are not propounding self-sufficiency. The mutually beneficial international division of labor, above all within the system of the socialist community, is one of the real paths towards increasing production efficiency. But we cannot permit our country to depend upon deliveries from the West. The experience of recent years has taught us a great deal.

Thus, BOTH DOMESTICALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY, the task of accelerating the country's development has today acquired prime political, economic and social significance. Before us lies the implementation of the new technological restructuring of the national economy and the qualitative transformation of the material-technical basis of society. The resolution of this problem is an urgent matter, and an all-party and nationwide matter, and this must be done in a very brief period, guaranteeing that the country reaches the upper limits of labor productivity and economic efficiency.

We can only implement what is outlined solely by intensifying production and accelerating scientific-technical progress. The topicality of the problem is further enhanced by the fact that a new stage of the scientific-technical revolution, ensuring a manifold increase in labor productivity, huge savings of resources and an improvement in the quality of output, is beginning. Figuratively speaking, we too must harness scientific-technical progress. There is simply no other way, if we consider the fact that we have basically exhausted the extensive methods of development.

THE "SPENDING" WAY OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE ECONOMY NOW CONDEMNS THE COUNTRY TO STAGNATION.

Calculations show that if we continue to guarantee the planned growth in national income on the previous basis, which is to a substantial degree extensive, it will be necessary to increase output of fuel and raw materials by 10 to 15 percent each five-year plan, the volume of capital investment by 30 to 40 percent and engage an extra 8 to 10 million people in the national economy.

But we simply do not have such possibilities, nor is there any need for them. The so-called deficit is the result of our extensive methods of growth. Strictly speaking, we remain the best provided-for country in terms of resources. It is important to take account of the fact that we cannot do without an acceleration of scientific-technological progress and without revolutionary changes in the intensification of the economy. For this reason, all these documents and, first and foremost, the guidelines for the economic and social development of the country in the 12th Five-Year Plan and up to the year 2000, must contain fresh approaches that embody a sharp turn toward intensification and an energetic pursuit of scientific-technological progress.

The Central Committee Politburo recently discussed the draft guidelines and supported the directions and targets mapped out in them. But serious observations were expressed which require the revision of the draft. It has not yet been possible to include in it measures providing for a transfer to a course of chiefly intensive growth for a number of industries, to deepen the structural rebuilding of the economy, to attain the necessary concentration of capital investments in the priority areas for the development of the national economy, and to balance all indicators. The work on the draft must be continued by the Gosplan, the ministries, the union republics and the production associations and enterprises. They are being notified of the planned figures for the guidelines. The targets being outlined for raising production efficiency must be considered as minimal. The main thing now is to search for and to bring into operation all reserves to raise the efficiency and quality of production and to more fully satisfy public demands in the center and in the provinces. All our cadres must understand the vital necessity of the reorientation of every enterprise and industry, the whole national economy, to an intensive path of development. One year ago, at the conference at the CPSU Central Committee, in which ministers took part, this was very clearly spoken about. However, not all have drawn the correct conclusions from that conversation. With some people, it went in one ear and out the other, as they say, and yesterday's approaches have remained as they were. Continuing to think in the categories of extensive development, many leaders of ministries and departments are striving to obtain as much capital investment and other resources as possible and to obtain smaller production plans. [Comrade] K. Kh. Belyak, minister of machine building for animal husbandry and fodder production, shows enviable persistence in the struggle for additional allocations of funds and the reduction of the outlined plan indicators. The USSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry, headed by [Comrade] A. I. Yashin, and certain other ministries and departments, have occupied a position which is no better. Of course, we will not allow ourselves to be governed by overdependency. Failure to understand the situation, the absence of the desire to readjust, and devotion to narrow departmental interest must not prevail over the general interests of the people. I do not think that managers who are counting on once again drawing the country into enormous, unjustified expenditure can accompany us on our path. Local managers must be shown precisely how to raise the effectiveness of investments. The desire to receive more resources without thinking about the consequences has become a kind of style of work for certain party and [administrative] SOVIET organs and there are unfortunately many such instances.

At one time, major decisions on the development of the production forces of Krasnoyarsk Kray were adopted on the initiative of the kraykom and with the support of a number of ministries and the USSR Gosplan. This is a large area with potential; it must be developed in every possible way. But obviously both at the stage when these important decisions were prepared, and in particular, subsequently in their implementation, all the questions of the new construction were not taken into account in a fitting manner, nor were the possibilities of assimilating thousands of millions in capital investments studied properly.

Huge losses resulted. ENORMOUS FUNDS, 23 BILLION RUBLES, HAVE BEEN INVESTED FOR THE KRAY'S DEVELOPMENT IN THE LAST TWO FIVE-YEAR PLANS. The construction of dozens of enterprises and power stations has not been completed and thus the outlays are not yielding a proper return. THE SAYAN-SUSHENSKOYE HYDROELECTRIC POWER PLANT HAS BEEN UNDER CONSTRUCTION FOR MORE THAN 20 YEARS, THAT IS, IT HAS BEEN BUILT TWICE AS SLOWLY AS THE BRATSK HYDROELECTRIC POWER PLANT. THE BUILDINGS OF THE ABAKAN RAILWAY CAR MANUFACTURING ASSOCIATION HAVE BEEN STANDING EMPTY FOR 9 YEARS. THERE ARE NOW IN THE KRAY SOME 5,000 PROJECTS THAT HAVE BEEN STARTED. AS A RESULT OF A DISPERSAL OF FORCES, THE CONSTRUCTION IS PROGRESSING SLOWLY AND THE LOSSES OF RESOURCES ARE ENORMOUS. AND AT THE SAME TIME, THE KRAY'S LEADERSHIP AND THE MINISTRIES ARE RAISING THE QUESTION OF BUILDING EVER NEWER AND NEWER LARGE PROJECTS. WE HAVE THE RIGHT TO DEMAND FROM PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT BODIES, AS WELL AS FROM PARTY ORGANIZATIONS, THAT THEY INTRODUCE PROPER ORDER AND GUARANTEE THE LARGE OUTLAYS BY THE STATE YIELD A RAPID RETURN AND ARE NOT FROZEN IN THE SIBERIAN SOIL.

On the whole, [comrades] leading major industrial regions must set the example of zealous management and the use of intensive methods of development. As in the past, the Central Committee continues to pin greater hopes on the working class and the Moscow intelligentsia and the powerful scientific-production potential of the capital. One wishes once again to support the significant work being carried out by the Leningrad party organization on transferring the economy into intensive tracks. THIS INITIATIVE OF THE LOCAL PARTY ORGANS MUST BE MET WITH UNDERSTANDING AND SUPPORT IN THE CENTER. I SPEAK ABOUT THIS BECAUSE THIS IS BY FAR NOT ALWAYS SO. A few days ago, Comrade Vedernikov, first secretary of the Chelyabinsk Obkom, said that a program has been prepared for the reconstruction of a number of enterprises in the oblast. At the Chelyabinsk tractor works alone it is planned, because of reconstruction, to increase the volume of production by 1.5 times with a reduction in the workforce of 10,000 people and to decrease consumption of metallurgical and other raw materials. Some interested ministries and the state planning committee formally supported the initiative of the people in Chelyabinsk. However, it looks as though they limited themselves to that. In general, the people of Chelyabinsk are for some reason unlucky in this matter. At one time, a decision was adopted on reconstruction of the "1,220" Mill at the Chelyabinsk Tube Rolling Plant and its conversion to production of large diameter pipes. The outlays on these aims, a total of 150 million rubles, would have allowed economies of 150 million rubles annually in foreign currency and would have enabled us to partially dispense with the purchase of pipes from abroad. This was necessary and advantageous, but it just died. Clearly, the time has come in the interests of the state, to call all those who are responsible for implementing adopted decisions to account for this procrastination and their inability to approach the matter, and to do so in all earnest. The CPSU Central Committee has the right to count on a great contribution to the acceleration of scientific-technological progress and the country's economic enhancement from major scientific-industrial centers such as Sverdlovsk and Kharkov, Novosibirsk and Donetsk, Omsk and Gorkiy and others. This is all the more essential inasmuch as the reserves of many of them are far from being used fully.

All this, comrades, is being said so that, at this moment, in the time that remains for work on basic directions and in preparing the five-year plan, the sort of approach that will guarantee not only the absolute achievement of the indexes contained in the draft, but also an improvement on them, should be manifested at all levels. There is only one reference point here: With smaller outlays we must attain the higher targets of the 12th Five-Year Plan. Such is the economic and, if you like, the political task. The advantages of the socialist method of production are inexhaustible. Unlike any other country we can mobilize the huge reserves we have, and concentrate funds on general directions of scientific-technological progress. The development of the economy according to plan and the active creativity of the masses open up the scope for the development of the national economy. We have not learned how to use all these advantages properly; at times we hold on tenaciously to the old ways. In general, comrades, we have enormous possibilities for growth and they must be brought into action.

READJUSTING INVESTMENT AND STRUCTURAL POLICY

I would like to go on to express, in terms of principle, some thoughts about the main directions of the forthcoming work. I shall begin with the most important thing, the need for a drastic change in investment and structure policy.

[Basically, we must carry out integrated and strictly controlled work on moving the center of gravity from new construction to the technical reequipping of enterprises; from increasing the extraction of resources and the intensification of this work to the utmost economizing on these resources; and from the traditional boosting of production volumes to securing a sharp increase in the quality of output. This needs to be done now, while current and future plans are being drawn up. Otherwise, time will be lost. Ideas that are not embodied in plans will remain only as empty phrases. It is important to unhesitatingly abandon the fixed notions on how to run the economy that developed in the past, notions in which new construction was considered to be the main way to achieve production growth. The bulk of capital investment was channeled into new construction.

Even amortization deductions earmarked for renovation of enterprises went toward this new construction. The main flow of new equipment was also channeled toward new construction. For a long time, many existing enterprises were not refitted with technical equipment and were not modernized. All that happened was that everything possible was squeezed out of them, as they say.]

TODAY THE MAIN EMPHASIS MUST BE PLACED ON THE TECHNICAL REEQUIPPING OF ENTERPRISES, ECONOMIZING OF RESOURCES, AND SHARP IMPROVEMENT OF THE QUALITY OF PRODUCTS. IT IS IMPORTANT TO ABANDON UNHESITATINGLY THE STEROTYPES OF ECONOMIC OPERATIONS WHICH DEVELOPED IN THE PAST AND ACCORDING TO WHICH NEW CONSTRUCTION WAS CONSIDERED TO BE THE MAIN METHOD OF EXPANSION OF PRODUCTION. AT THE SAME TIME, MANY OPERATING ENTERPRISES WERE NOT TECHNICALLY REEQUIPPED FOR MANY YEARS AND, AS THEY SAY, EVERYTHING POSSIBLE WAS SQUEEZED OUT OF THEM AND VERY LITTLE WAS INVESTED IN THEM. IT IS WELL KNOWN TO WHAT ALL THIS HAS LED.

THE FIXED PRODUCTION ASSETS OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY HAVE EXCEEDED THE TOTAL VALUE OF 1.6 TRILLION RUBLES, BUT A SIGNIFICANT PART OF THESE ASSETS IS OBSOLETE AND THIS FACT AFFECTS THE ENTIRE ECONOMY. FOR MANY YEARS NOW, THE RETURNS FROM ASSETS HAVE CONTINUED TO DECLINE, THE NUMBER OF NEW WORKING PLACES HAS CONTINUED TO GROW RAPIDLY AND, AT THE SAME TIME, LITTLE PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE IN MECHANIZING THE PRODUCTION OPERATIONS. ABOUT 50 MILLION PEOPLE ARE NOW ENGAGED IN MANUAL LABOR, THAT IS, APPROXIMATELY ONE-THIRD OF INDUSTRIAL WORKERS, MORE THAN ONE-HALF OF CONSTRUCTION WORKERS AND THREE-FOURTHS OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS.

The capital repair sphere has become inordinately swollen as a result of the aging of production equipment. Last year 35,000 million rubles were spent on these purposes. A quarter of the country's pool of machine tools and 6 million workers are employed in repair workshops. Almost one-fifth of our ferrous metals are used on this. That is the overall picture, but that picture is made up of specific industries, associations, enterprises and their leaders. It has to be said bluntly that many managers and party officials have accustomed themselves to the situation that has developed. All this costs society too much. At the moment, no one denies that the return from capital investment in reconstruction is roughly double that from new construction. But former methods of running the economy are still alive and well. Take a look at ferrous metallurgy. During a 15-year period, 50,000 million rubles of capital investment was allocated to the industry. How has the Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy used these funds? Most of it has been channeled into new construction, what is more, into new construction that is not integrated. Meanwhile, the reconstruction and technical reequipping of enterprises did not receive proper attention. Because of the incorrect technical policy of the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy and its minister, [Comrade] I. P. Kazanets, the industry did not manage to fulfill either the 10th or 11th five-year plans. It is not satisfying the national economy's requirements for good quality metal products. The state of affairs here needs to be fundamentally changed.

In short, [comrades] we must decisively change the correlation between new construction and the technical reequipping of existing enterprises. The Gosplan and ministries have outlined certain positive changes in the area for implementation during the 12th Five-Year Plan, but they cannot be judged as satisfying requirements. The proportion of funds earmarked for reconstruction in the overall volume of production and capital investment must be increased, already in the years immediately ahead, from one-third to at least 50 percent. [This is not a simple matter.] IT GOES WITHOUT SAYING THAT we cannot manage without new construction. [But there must be complete clarity in this matter.] New construction should only be embarked upon when opportunities to increase production by utilizing existing capacities have been exhausted or when it is necessary in order to resolve the contemporary tasks of technical progress.

Our country has embarked on too many projects. They should be carefully analyzed. The construction of some projects should be accelerated while others should be suspended or temporarily mothballed. An approach based on the interests of the state is needed here. This applies not just to the USSR Gosplan and the USSR Gosstroy but also to ministries and all CENTRAL,

republican and local organs. At the same time, an all-embracing inventory of production assets must be drawn up. A long-term program from the technical reconstruction of every enterprise and industry must be outlined.

In the immediate future, the proportion of fixed assets being withdrawn, particularly the active part of these assets, must be doubled. With the entry into service of installations now under construction, it will be possible by the end of the 12th Five-Year Plan to renovate our manufacturing equipment by more than one-third and have up to 50 percent new equipment in use.

To this, I should like to add that what we need is not just any manufacturing renovation, but only renovation accompanied by the introduction of the very latest technology, yielding the highest economic and social result.

On the visit to ZIL, the question of its reconstruction was discussed. The motor vehicle workers are preparing to manufacture a diesel-powered truck. Its carrying capacity will be increased and its fuel consumption per 100 kilometers will be cut from 29 liters to 19 liters. This is an enormous result. But, as it turned out, not all questions of reconstruction have been correctly solved. Provision was made, for instance, to engage an additional 25,000 workers. Is this really rational, especially in the conditions existing in Moscow? Now the ZIL management has submitted a proposal to improve planning to achieve targets without increasing its staff. Well, that is a different matter, as the saying goes, and that is a position that can be supported.

A major and exceptionally acute problem of investment policy is posed by the relationship between capital investments in the resource-extraction, processing and consuming industries. The Soviet Union has at its disposal a mighty fuel and power complex, but it is increasingly difficult to increase extraction of fuel and raw materials. Meanwhile, many countries have taken a more rational path, that of all-around economies and broad introduction of resource-saving technology. This costs one-half or one-third as much.

We too have positive experience in resource economies. The Ministry of the Electrical Industry secured an increase in manufacturing output in the 11th Five-Year Plan without increasing consumption of basic materials, although here too there are still large reserves.

ON THE WHOLE, OUR ECONOMY CONTINUES TO BE WASTEFUL IN MANY RESPECTS. UP TO 8 MILLION METRIC TONS MORE GASOLINE IS BURNED ANNUALLY BECAUSE OF THE LAGGING IN CHANGING THE AUTOMOBILE TRANSPORT POOL TO DIESEL MOTORS. MORE THAN 20 MILLION METRIC TONS OF CONVENTIONAL FUELS ARE USED IN EXCESS ANNUALLY BECAUSE OF THE IMPERFECT EQUIPMENT OF THERMOELECTRIC POWER PLANTS. IN THE COUNTRY THERE ARE HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF PRIMITIVE BOILERS THAT USE FUEL UNECONOMICALLY. LITTLE USE IS MADE OF SECONDARY RESOURCES.

Savings in resources should be one of the main directions of investment policy. The problem is to meet 75 to 80 percent of the national economy's increased demand for fuel and raw and other materials by economizing on them. This will make it possible to stabilize the share of capital investment devoted to the extraction of fuel and raw materials.

In the implementation of investment policy, consideration, consistency and speedy achievement of national economy results are important. Of course a certain order of priority is inevitable in the implementation of various measures, but once we have outlined certain tasks, their resolution must be complete, comprehensive, speedy and energetic. The dispersal of capital investment on the principle of a chicken in every pot cannot be permitted. In the new five-year plan we must move more decisively toward concentration of capital investment.

Let us take the industries of the agroindustrial complex which are called upon to resolve the tasks set by the Food Program. Now that we are drafting the basic directions for the 12th Five-Year Plan, it is vital to make provision for reaching the program's targets. Enormous potential has been created in this sector of the economy. Here we have achieved the rational limits of building up capital investment, but the yield from them thus far is not satisfactory, and one of the reasons for this is poor concentration of resources in decisive sectors and disproportion in the development of industries. We maintain large herds of stock, but their productivity is low because of a weak fodder base.

Quite a lot of equipment is supplied in agriculture and the flow will increase, but the collective and state farms lack the appropriate repair and technical-service base. The conditions now exist for the broad introduction of intensive crop-cultivation technology, but the matter is being pursued very slowly.

More than once there has been talk of the effectiveness of investment in developing the area of the procuring, storing, transporting and processing agricultural produce, but there are no perceptible improvements yet visible and nearly one-fifth of the harvest that is grown is lost. These are the questions that the management organs of the country's agroindustrial complex must deal with in the first place.

Comrades, in the reequipping of the national economy and in the implementation of the scientific and technical revolution, the commanding, key role belongs to machine building. We are faced with radically changing attitudes toward the machine-building complex. While the USSR Gosplan and other central organs have paid lip service to the role of machine building, in actual fact for a long period of time they have not allocated sufficient resources for its development. In the 11th Five-Year Period, only about 5 percent of all capital investment in production was directed toward civilian machine building. One cannot fail to draw attention to the fact that heavy and transport machine building receives 28 times less capital investment than do the industries for which these machines are intended in the main; while machine building for agriculture receives 18 times less; production of machines and equipment for the light and food industry receives 23 times less and chemical and petroleum machine building receives 47 times less.

AS IS EVIDENT PROPORTIONS ARE DISPROPORTIONATE. IT SEEMS THAT IT IS POSSIBLE AND NECESSARY TO MOVE TOWARD A PARTIAL REDISTRIBUTION OF CAPITAL INVESTMENTS TO THE ADVANTAGE OF THE APPROPRIATE BRANCHES OF THE MACHINE BUILDING INDUSTRY.

THIS APPEARS TO BE ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT DIRECTIONS IN RESTRUCTURING THE INVESTMENT POLICY. WE ALREADY HAVE THE EXPERIENCE OF THIS KIND. IT IS PRECISELY IN THIS WAY THAT WE ACTED IN WORKING OUT THE MEASURES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE AGROINDUSTRIAL COMPLEX. AN ADDITIONAL AMOUNT OF NEARLY 56 BILLION WAS ALLOTTED TO THE MACHINE-BUILDING INDUSTRY AT THE EXPENSE OF AGRICULTURE. LIFE HAS SHOWN THAT THIS HAS BENEFITTED THE OVERALL TASK. THE AGRICULTURAL MACHINE-BUILDING INDUSTRY IS NOW CARRYING OUT A PROGRAM THAT SHOULD SOLVE THE TASK OF COMPREHENSIVE MECHANIZATION OF AGRICULTURAL WORK.

[It is quite justified that a partial redistribution of capital investment ought to be able to be carried out, given the fact that the volume of capital investment in industries which are the consumers of the output of machine-building are in excess to this kind of extent.] We ought to return once again to this question, so that in the years 1986-90, capital investment of the civilian machine-building ministries is increased by 1.8 to 2 times, by comparison with the 11th Five-Year Plan. This would correspond to the interests of the technical reequipping of our economy. First and foremost the machine-building industry itself must be reconstructed. Its reequipping requires a sharp increase in the production of modern machine tools, forge and press, foundry, welding and other progressive technological equipment. The Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry will not be able to cope with this task alone. Clearly it is essential, following the example of the defense industries, for the output of special equipment for their own needs to be developed on a wide scale within each machine-building ministry. And in general the experience of the defense industries must be used to full extent. [We have begun this work. It has to be continued actively.]

As is known, the development of microelectronics, computer equipment, instrument building and the whole information industry is the catalyst of present-day scientific and technical progress. They have a decisive influence on the effectiveness of the means of labor and of the technological systems in all industries. Here are some examples: In the Energiya Scientific Production Association, flexible automated sections equipped with Soviet-manufactured machining centers and computer equipment provided a sixfold increase in labor productivity. Use of automated planning systems in the design bureaus of the aircraft industry has made it possible to raise labor productivity threefold and to reduce the time taken in planning manufactures by 2.5 years. This is truly new technology which is bringing with it revolutionary changes in production. HOWEVER, ITS EFFECTIVENESS DOES NOT DEPEND ONLY ON INCREASED OUTPUT BUT ALSO ON SKILLFUL AND COMPREHENSIVE APPLICATION IN THE NATIONAL ECONOMY. AND HERE EVERYTHING IS NOT IN ORDER. FOR INSTANCE, THE COMPUTER TECHNICAL EQUIPMENT IS MANUFACTURED AND SERVICED BY DIFFERENT MINISTRIES BETWEEN WHICH NO NECESSARY COORDINATION EXISTS.

Over the past few years, the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have made a number of major decisions on such key directions of the development of machine building as flexible automated production; rotary and rotary-conveyor lines; and the development, production and use of computer technology in the national economy and systems for automated planning.

They are directed toward the creation of new technological processes, including automated factories working with the so-called technology without

the involvement of people. In this way, the serious base is being laid for a mighty upsurge in Soviet machine building as the foundation of the technical reconstruction of the national economy. This is the main direction of our development, and it must be firmly adhered to, both now and in the future.

COMRADES! THE STATE OF AFFAIRS IN CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION, TOO, SHOULD BE EVALUATED FROM THE POSITION OF A RESOLUTE ACCELERATION OF SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL PROGRESS. THIS PROBLEM HAS BEEN ON THE AGENDA FOR MANY YEARS, BUT SO FAR NO CARDINAL IMPROVEMENT HAS BEEN MADE IN THIS SPHERE.

CONSIDER THE DESIGNING AND PLANNING WORK. MANY ORGANIZATIONS CONTINUE TO PRODUCE DESIGNS AND PLANS INCORPORATING INEFFICIENT TECHNOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS. CONSEQUENTLY, QUITE A FEW OF THESE PROJECTS ARE ANNUALLY RETURNED TO THE DESIGNING BOARD. CAPITAL INVESTMENTS CONTINUE TO BE DISPERSED. THE CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULES ARE INCREDIBLY DRAGGED OUT, AND AS A RESULT OF THIS EVEN THE BEST DESIGNS AND PLANS BECOME HOPELESSLY OBSOLETE. WE CAN NO LONGER CARRY OUT OUR CONSTRUCTION THIS WAY. IT IS NECESSARY TO INTRODUCE ORDER IN ITS DESIGNING AND PLANNING, ENSURE A CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL INVESTMENTS AND ADHERENCE TO THE PROJECTS' CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULES AS SET BY NORMS, AND TRANSFORM THE CONSTRUCTION PRODUCTION INTO A UNIFIED INDUSTRIAL PROCESS.

NOW ABOUT ANOTHER IMPORTANT PROBLEM. THE EFFICIENCY OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY AND THE RATES OF OUR GROWTH DEPEND TO A GREAT EXTENT ON THE STRUCTURE AND QUALITY OF MATERIALS. AT PRESENT WE ARE LAGGING IN THIS TASK.

IT IS KNOWN, FOR INSTANCE, THAT WE PRODUCE MORE STEEL THAN ANYONE ELSE AND YET, THERE IS A CHRONIC SHORTAGE OF THAT METAL. THE MAIN REASONS FOR THIS ARE UNSATISFACTORY QUALITY, LIMITED VARIETY AND ALSO A WASTEFUL USE OF THE METAL. THE PROPORTION OF PLASTIC MATERIALS, CERAMICS AND OTHER ADVANCED NON-METALLIC MATERIALS IS STILL SMALL IN THE OVERALL VOLUME OF MATERIALS. IN THE WORLD THERE IS A VERITABLE BOOM OF LIGHT CHEMICAL INDUSTRY, AND OF MANUFACTURING OF PURE AND SUPERPURE MATERIALS THAT ARE IN MANY RESPECTS AHEAD OF THE LEVEL OF CONTEMPORARY TECHNICAL EQUIPMENT. THEREFORE WE MUST DOUBLE, TRIPLE OUR EFFORTS TO PREVENT LAGGING.

PROCEEDING FROM THE TASKS OF SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL PROGRESS, IT IS NECESSARY TO ADOPT A NEW APPROACH TO OUR FOREIGN ECONOMIC STRATEGY. THE CURRENT WORLD TREND IS THAT IN MANY COUNTRIES THE FOREIGN TRADE IS GROWING TWICE AS QUICKLY AS PRODUCTION. THIS IS A POWERFUL ACCELERATOR OF THE SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. OUR COUNTRY'S FOREIGN TRADE TURNOVER HAS REACHED QUITE A SIZABLE VOLUME, 140 BILLION RUBLES, BUT ITS RATES OF GROWTH CAN AND MUST BE ACCELERATED AND, WHAT IS THE MOST IMPORTANT THING IN THIS CONNECTION, DEEP STRUCTURAL CHANGES MUST BE MADE AND BOTH EXPORTS AND IMPORTS MUST BE MADE MORE PROGRESSIVE.

IN RECENT YEARS, OUR EXPORTS OF MACHINES AND EQUIPMENT HAVE CONTINUED TO GROW SLOWLY. THIS FACT REFLECTS A LOW LEVEL OF COMPETITIVE ABILITY AND AN INSUFFICIENT MATERIAL INTEREST OF INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISES. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO TOLERATE THIS ANY LONGER. IT IS IMPORTANT TO MORE ACTIVELY STIMULATE THE INTEREST OF LABOR COLLECTIVES, ASSOCIATIONS AND WHOLE BRANCHES IN INCREASING THEIR OUTPUT OF PRODUCTS FOR EXPORT.

IN OUR IMPORTS POLICY WE MUST UTILIZE MORE EFFECTIVELY THE OPPORTUNITIES OF THE MUTUALLY ADVANTAGEOUS INTERNATIONAL DIVISION OF LABOR. OF COURSE, THIS PRIMARILY CONCERNS OUR RELATIONS WITH CEMA COUNTRIES. AT THE SAME TIME, THE USSR WILL CONTINUE TO DEVELOP ITS ECONOMIC RELATIONS WITH OTHER STATES ALSO.

IN CONNECTION WITH THE FACT THAT WE WILL FURTHER CONTINUE IN THE FUTURE TO DEEPEN OUR FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL RELATIONS, I WOULD LIKE TO SINGLE OUT A PROBLEM THAT CAUSES US CONCERN. THIS IS THE QUESTION OF THE UTILIZATION OF MACHINES AND EQUIPMENT THAT HAVE BEEN ACQUIRED ON THE WORLD MARKET. THIS IS NOT A NEW PROBLEM, BUT SO FAR NO ESSENTIAL IMPROVEMENT HAS BEEN MADE IN THIS CONNECTION. NOT EVERYTHING HAS BEEN THOUGHT OUT IN PLANNING THESE PURCHASES: AT TIMES THEY ARE NOT COORDINATED WITH THE CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION PLANS. ZEALOUSLY DEFENDING THEIR REQUESTS FOR IMPORTED TECHNICAL EQUIPMENT, THE MINISTRIES AND DEPARTMENTS FAIL TO PAY DUE ATTENTION TO THE CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN WHICH THE PRODUCTION CAPACITIES ARE FORMED ON THE BASIS OF IMPORTED EQUIPMENT. THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM REFINING AND PETROCHEMICAL INDUSTRY CAN BE CITED AS AN EXAMPLE IN THIS CONNECTION. MINISTER V. S. FEDOROV HAS MADE ASSURANCES ON MORE THAN ONE OCCASION THAT ORDER WOULD BE INTRODUCED IN THE USE OF THE PURCHASED EQUIPMENT BUT, AS IS EVIDENT, HE HAS NOT KEPT HIS WORD. INSTRUCTIONS HAVE BEEN ISSUED TO MAKE A THOROUGH ANALYSIS OF THIS MATTER AND TO REPORT TO THE POLITBURO.

COMRADES! THE NEW TECHNICAL RECONSTRUCTION OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY WILL REQUIRE ENORMOUS CAPITAL INVESTMENTS. WHERE SHALL WE FIND THEM? THE ANSWER IN PRINCIPLE IS THIS: THE PLANNED MEASURES FOR THE ACCELERATION OF SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL PROGRESS SHOULD PAY FOR THEMSELVES. AFTER ALL, THEY ARE BEING CARRIED OUT TO RAISE THE LEVEL OF LABOR PRODUCTIVITY, AND THIS MEANS ALSO TO ACCELERATE THE RATE OF GROWTH OF NATIONAL INCOME. HOWEVER, A CERTAIN TIME WILL BE NEEDED BEFORE THE FULL EFFECT IS ACHIEVED, WHEREAS THE FUNDS MUST BE INVESTED IMMEDIATELY. HERE WE CANNOT MANAGE WITHOUT MANEUVERING THE RESOURCES AND CONCENTRATING THEM IN THE KEY AREAS THAT ARE CAPABLE OF QUICKLY PRODUCING SUBSTANTIAL GAINS.

THE MAIN THING NOW IS TO MOBILIZE THE ORGANIZATIONAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL FACTORS, INTRODUCE ORDER, INCREASE RESPONSIBILITY AND DISCIPLINE, AND IMPROVE THE ORGANIZATION OF PRODUCTION AND WORK IN ORDER TO ENSURE A BETTER UTILIZATION OF EVERYTHING THAT THE COUNTRY HAS AT ITS DISPOSAL. EVERY ASSOCIATION AND ENTERPRISE AND EVERY PRODUCTION SECTOR MUST DETERMINE THOSE PRODUCTION LINKS IN WHICH IT IS POSSIBLE TO OBTAIN THE BEST RESULTS WITH MINIMUM ADDITIONAL RESOURCES OR EVEN WITHOUT ANY ADDITIONAL RESOURCES. EXPERIENCE HAS SHOWN THAT THE EXPENDITURE OF LABOR CAN BE REDUCED AND THE CAPITAL-OUTPUT RATIO CAN BE INCREASED BY 5 TO 10 PERCENT AS A RESULT OF CERTIFICATION OF WORK PLACES ALONE. THE INTRODUCTION OF THE COLLECTIVE ECONOMIC ACCOUNTABILITY FORMS OF ORGANIZATION AND STIMULATION OF LABOR INCREASES THE LABOR PRODUCTIVITY BY 15 AND MORE PERCENT AND, AT THE SAME TIME, BRINGS ABOUT A SAVING IN RESOURCES. SYSTEMATIC WORK AIMED AT REDUCING WASTE IN ALL BRANCHES OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY WILL YIELD MUCH.

THE POLICY OF ECONOMIZING IS THE WAY TO OUR WEALTH: IT IS THE TASK ABOVE ALL TASKS, A TASK OF THE ENTIRE PARTY AND OF ALL PEOPLE. THE QUALITY OF OUTPUT IS THE MOST OBJECTIVE AND GENERALIZING INDICATOR OF THE SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL

PROGRESS, OF THE LEVEL OF PRODUCTION ORGANIZATION AND OF THE STANDARD AND DISCIPLINE OF WORK.

IN RECENT YEARS A CHANGE FOR THE BETTER HAS BEGUN TO SHOW IN THIS RESPECT IN OUR COUNTRY. HOWEVER, IT MUST BE ADMITTED THAT THE QUALITY AND THE TECHNICAL-ECONOMIC AND AESTHETIC LEVEL OF MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS REPRESENT ONE OF THE MOST VULNERABLE AREAS OF OUR ECONOMY AND A SOURCE OF MANY DIFFICULTIES AND PROBLEMS ALL THIS CAUSES US A SERIOUS SOCIOECONOMIC AND MORAL-POLITICAL DAMAGE. IT IS ABSOLUTELY IMPERMISSIBLE THAT, ALREADY AT THE DESIGNING STAGE, SOME NEWLY CREATED TECHNICAL EQUIPMENT TURNS OUT TO BE OBSOLETE AND IS LAGGING BEHIND THE BEST MODELS IN ITS RELIABILITY, WORK CAPACITY AND EFFICIENCY. EVEN THE PRODUCTS THAT ARE PLACED IN THE HIGHEST CATEGORIES AT TIMES CANNOT COMPARE WITH THE BEST WORLD MODELS. THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE STATE QUALITY MARK MUST BE OBSERVED MORE STRICTLY. THE QUALITY OF OUTPUT MUST BE NOT ONLY A MATTER OF PROFESSIONAL BUT ALSO OF NATIONAL PRIDE.

IT APPEARS THAT IT WILL BE CORRECT TO CONSIDER THE WORK OF DESIGNERS AND PLANNERS AS BEING OF HIGH QUALITY ONLY WHEN THEIR PROPOSED TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS EMBODY THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE MOST ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC THINKING AND ENSURE A MULTIPLE INCREASE OF LABOR PRODUCTIVITY, MULTIPLE IMPROVEMENT OF WORK CONDITIONS AND A SHARP INCREASE OF PRODUCTION EFFICIENCY. ON THE OTHER HAND, QUALITY IS A MATTER OF ADVANCED PRODUCTION ORGANIZATION AND OF TECHNOLOGICAL DISCIPLINE. TWO-THIRDS OF THE OUTPUT OF LOW QUALITY PRODUCTS ARE CONNECTED WITH THE VIOLATION OF PRODUCTION ORGANIZATION AND TECHNOLOGICAL DISCIPLINE.

THE APPROPRIATE MINISTRIES MUST BE PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF PRODUCTS AND FOR THE OBJECTIVITY OF THEIR CERTIFICATION. HOWEVER, A SPECIAL ROLE IN THIS CONNECTION MUST BE PERFORMED BY THE STATE COMMITTEE FOR STANDARDS. IT IS ITS DIRECT OBLIGATION TO SET UP RELIABLE BARRIERS TO THE OUTPUT OF LOW-QUALITY PRODUCTS.

OF COURSE, THE PROBLEM OF QUALITY CANNOT BE SOLVED BY A SINGLE STROKE. HOWEVER, THERE CAN BE NO JUSTIFICATION FOR ANY KIND OF DELAY IN THIS TASK. NO ONE--NO ENTERPRISE, NO DESIGNER, NO TECHNOLOGIST OR SCIENTIST, NO WORKER OR KOLKHOZ MEMBER, THAT IS, BRIEFLY, NO HONEST WORKING MAN--HAS THE RIGHT TO KEEP APART FROM THIS TASK. THE PARTY WILL ACTIVELY SUPPORT THE STRUGGLE FOR THE HONOR OF THE SOVIET PRODUCTION MARK AND WILL STRICTLY CALL TO ACCOUNT THOSE WHO ADOPT A PASSIVE POSITION AND HAMPER THE SOLUTION OF THIS ACUTE PROBLEM.

THE SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL POTENTIAL MUST BE FURTHER DEVELOPED AND EFFECTIVELY UTILIZED

Comrades, the frontline of the struggle to accelerate the scientific and technological progression in the national economy advances through science. A mighty scientific and technological potential has been set up in the country. Approximately 5 percent of the national income is set aside for the development of science. Soviet scientists' successes in various areas of knowledge and technological progress are universally acknowledged. One can be proud of the pioneering achievements in space research, mathematics, mechanics, thermonuclear synthesis and quantum electronics. Good results have been achieved in areas such as nuclear power, research into the structure of the earth's crust including the world's deepest borehole, the study of the

worlds' oceans, synthesis of organic compounds and the creation of progressive materials and technological processes. There are certain achievements in genetic and cell engineering capable of revolutionizing the processes whereby new, high-yield strains of plants and animals, resistant to illnesses and unfavorable climatic conditions, are developed. We have quite a few first-class institutes, design bureaus and creative cadres. In almost any field one finds highly effective scientific and technological research developments, such as rotor-conveyor lines that increase labor productivity many times, automated welding systems, small-size ultra-high pressure presses, modern forging machines that ensure a substantial reduction in metal waste in the engineering industry, highly effective types of polymer materials and much else. At the same time, comrades, we can and should obtain incomparably greater achievements from science. We should take a new look at the tasks of science based on the requirements of our time, the requirements that science be turned decisively toward the needs of social production and that production ought to turn all its attention to and concentrate all its efforts on science. It is from these positions that all links in the chain that binds science, technology and production ought to be analyzed and strengthened.

The USSR Academy of Sciences, which concentrates the best-qualified scientific cadres, is naturally the nucleus of the homeland's scientific potential. Numerous institutes of the academy are world-class research centers. However, there is still quite a lot to be done so that the work of all institutes is on a level commensurate with the academy and so that it replenishes this treasurehouse of knowledge with new discoveries.

Development of pure science must be given priority. It is precisely this science that generates ideas, effects breakthroughs in new fields and makes it possible to attain new levels of efficiency. Pure research is a matter that is too crucial to accept weaknesses, to allow sluggishness and maladroitness in the development of such research.

Academic institutes must be turned sharply to face the direction of expanding research, which is technological in its thrust and their role and responsibility for creating theoretical foundations for fundamentally new types of equipment and technology must be enhanced. We have here abundant traditions. One has only to recall the pleiad of Soviet scientists, leaders of development of technological sciences, academicians I. P. Bardin, S. V. Lebedev, A. N. TUPOLEV, I. V. Kurchatov, AND S. P. Korolev. There is no doubt that these traditions will be multiplied.

In this connection, it would not be amiss to examine the possibility of setting up a department for engineering problems.

The organization, within the framework of the USSR Academy of Sciences, of integrated, interindustry scientific-technological centers based on the experience of the Paton Electric Welding Institute and other scientific establishments, is highly effective. Party workers, numerous scientists and specialists are in favor of this. Such centres are capable of being pilot organizations, coordinating pure research and the whole work along the most important interindustrial, scientific-technological directions.

They could be headed by the most prominent scientists and specialists who have experience in both scientific and organization work. It is evidently fitting for such centers to have design organizations and experimental enterprises. [In this way we would solve the problem of exploiting space and atomic energy. To renounce] IT WAS IN THIS WAY THAT WE SOLVED IN ITS TIME THE PROBLEM OF THE CONQUEST OF OUTER SPACE AND OF THE EXPLOITATION OF ATOMIC ENERGY. THE RENUNCIATION OF this valuable experience would be foolish. It is already time to place this work onto a practical footing. The USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium and the State Committee on Science and Technology must prepare and submit proposals.

Science in higher education establishments has great reserves at its disposal. For 2 decades, if not for longer, we have been speaking about the need for efficient use to be made of this enormous scientific potential, about eliminating bureaucratic separation between research establishments, high education establishments and production, but the situation is changing only very slowly.

According to available assessment, higher education establishments could increase by 2 to 2.5 times the volume of scientific research work. In order to achieve a decisive increase in the national economic return here, we need to change the system of planning, introduce new criteria for assessment, perfect the system of levers and incentives [and, linking all this with achieving a real effect,] AND transfer enterprises for the creation of experimental production systems to higher education establishments. We will gain a twofold advantage. On the one hand, we will multiply our scientific-technical potential and increase the efficiency of its use. On the other hand we will also create the conditions for better quality training of specialists who, from as early as their study desks, will be attracted on a wide scale to creative work on perfecting production.

But I would say particularly severe demands must be made on industrial science. The state bears enormous expenditure for the upkeep of industrial scientific and technical organizations. More than half of the country's scientists are concentrated here, and [about 90 percent] A CONSIDERABLE PART of all allocations for research and development are directed here. Hundreds of research establishments, and planning, technological and design organizations come under the authority of industrial ministries alone. UNFORTUNATELY, the final results of the activity of many of them, expressed in the industry's scientific-technical aspect, are very low. The Ministry of the Chemical Industry, for example, has literally become overgrown with a multiplicity of various scientific institutions and experimental production systems. But it is precisely in this industry that major shortcomings in development of new materials and equipment have arisen [and delays in scientific work have been allowed]. It is not only the chemists who are in this situation.

Let us take the All-Union Aluminum and Magnesium Institute of the USSR Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy. Here powerful electrolysis bars for aluminum production were constructed. Now that more than 350 of them have been produced, it turns out that as a result of construction faults their fuel

consumption greatly exceeds design specifications. [An extra 1 million rubles is] now ADDITIONAL MILLIONS OF RUBLES needed to correct these installations.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the main weakness of industrial science lies in its isolation from production. In order to overcome this, many of the industrial institutes and planning and design organizations should right now amalgamate with associations of enterprises and thereby strengthen the [scientific works sector] THE INDUSTRIAL PLANTS' SECTOR OF SCIENCE. Along with this, we need to establish in general the extent to which the existing network of industrial scientific establishments and organizations correspond to modern demands.

In the current 5-year period, the State Committee for Science and Technology undertook such an attempt, but the work was not carried through. It is very important to give new impetus to all work on developing the network of important scientific-technical progress, as are the Kriogenmash and Svetlana Scientific Production Association, the association for the production of lubricating equipment IN NIKOLAYEV and a number of others.

At the moment, insufficient attention is being paid to this important matter; in a country as huge as ours, there are just 250 of them, and the appropriate conditions have not been created for them. Raising the effectiveness of science to a great extent depends on the state of the experimental testing and planning-design base, which, it must be said frankly, because of our errors in reckoning, has lagged behind greatly in its development and hampers the introduction of scientific discoveries and developments. EVEN IN INDUSTRY, ONE-FOURTH OF ALL INSTITUTES LACK THE APPROPRIATE BASE. The problem of developing the testing base, of supplying scientific apparatus and instruments, must be solved, and this must be done as quickly as possible. Here we also await specific proposals from the USSR Academy of Sciences, the State Committee for Science and Technology and other institutions.

The technical creativity of working people must play a role of no small importance in the acceleration of the scientific and technological progress. It is essential to thoroughly improve work with inventors and rationalizers and find a form of selecting innovations and guarantee their speediest introduction. [The proposals on creating consultative and assimilatory organizations, engineering firms, and so on merit careful study. The effective protection of Soviet inventions must be guaranteed. On the example of Lenin's decree on inventors and taking into account the experience of other developed countries, we should work out and adopted a USSR law on inventions.]

The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet government expect the country's scientists and all scientific and technical intelligentsia to take to heart those tasks that are being put forward by the party, to spare no efforts for the acceleration of scientific and technological progress. [applause]

PERFECTING THE MANAGEMENT OF SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL PROGRESS

Comrades, as you well understand, the acceleration of scientific and technological progress insistently demands a profound reorganization in the system of planning and management of the entire economic mechanism. Without

this, everything that we are talking about today may remain but a fond hope. We have been going round these problems for many years now; we are sizing up how best to tackle them. But there is little real progress. What is in the way is, apparently, the fear of blundering and of going for resolute actions and, at times, patent conservatism as well.

Today also we are essentially coming up against the same problems that arose decades ago, but they have become more acute. We are becoming ever more clearly convinced that inertia and merely going through the motions in this work are no longer tolerable.

Serious political and practical conclusions must be drawn from the experience of the past and, without losing time, we must go over to creating a highly efficient system of planning and management. The main direction in the reorganization of economic management is clear in principle to us: It lies in the deeper and more all-around use of the advantages of the socialist economy. We must go along the line of the further strengthening of the development of democratic centralism: raising the efficiency of the centralizing principle in management and planning; the significant expansion of the managing independence and responsibility of enterprises and associations; the active use of more flexible forms and methods of leadership, financial autonomy and goods-money ratios; and the whole arsenal of economic levers and incentives--that is the essence in principle of the reorganization.

Unity of central and local effort, diversity and flexibility of socialist management practices, and broad development of initiative from the masses are a reliable key to success. In socialist conditions, the main criterion for evaluating the work of any link in the economy must be the achievement of the very best final results and the fullest possible satisfaction of society's requirements. The entire system of management and the entire economic machinery must be geared to this. In a nutshell, we must overcome the domination of the consumer by the producer, eradicate shortages of both production resources and objects of consumption, make the economy dynamically balanced and as receptive as possible to scientific and technical progress and ensure that all sections of the national economy have a vital interest in this and that they are unavoidably responsible for the application of the latest achievements of science and technology, for the achievement of top world standards.

You know that the Central Committee Politburo is working actively on the solution of these problems. More and more industries are joining in the large-scale economic experiment. But, as we agreed at the April Central Committee Plenum, we must move on from the experiment to the establishment of an integrated system of management and administration. Incidentally, when I was in Leningrad, my attention was drawn to one rejoinder. I have not mentioned this before, but it should be mentioned. [When we repeat that we are carrying out an experiment here or there, with this or that purpose, and then we say yet again that we are carrying out an experiment, people begin to worry. In Leningrad, they say that instead of tackling problems properly, they are hiding from us and making excuses to the effect that they are carrying out an experiment.

Years and years pass, they say. Experiments are carried out, but nothing changes. The people know how to get to the bottom of things quickly. They get the essential point quickly. If we spend a year, 2 years, 3 years going on about the experiment that we are carrying out, that we have extended to another two or three industries, and so on, but fail to devise an integrated system making it possible to unite our entire national economy in a single organism based on the application of new principles of economic management.] PEOPLE HAVE ALREADY NOTICED THAT MANY ECONOMIC EXPERIMENTS ARE BEING CONDUCTED BUT THAT NO TANGIBLE PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE METHODS THAT ARE BEING TESTED IS VISIBLE. AND HERE THE QUESTION ARISES: IS NOT SOMEONE TRYING IN THIS WAY TO EVADE THE SOLUTION OF URGENT PROBLEMS? IF WE CONTINUE REPEATING FOR A YEAR OR FOR 2 OR 3 YEARS THAT WE ARE CONDUCTING AN EXPERIMENT AND THAT WE HAVE EXTENDED IT YET TO TWO OR THREE BRANCHES BUT, AT THE SAME TIME, FAIL TO WORK OUT AN INTEGRAL SYSTEM OF ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT, NO PROGRESS WILL BE MADE.

The drawing-up of such a system must be completed in a short space of time so that all branches of the national economy can be converted to new methods of administration and management during the 12th Five-Year Plan. We must start from the top echelons.

The extremely important tasks connected with the scientific and technical revolution demand a substantial improvement in planning and a radical enhancing of the role and responsibility of the USSR Gosplan as the central body responsible for administering the planned economy. We must implement in practice Lenin's stipulation about the transformation of the Gosplan into the country's economic science organ, gathering together major scientists and leading specialists. This must be done so that we, as Lenin put it, have broad plans backed up by equipment and [trained], PREPARED BY science ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 40, p 108).

It is time, for example, to change the state of affairs in which the plan for new equipment exists in isolation, as it were, without having a decisive influence on the indicators of economic and social development.

On the contrary, it must become a kind of supporting structure of the whole plan. The leading place in the plans must be taken by the qualitative indicators, which reflect the effectiveness with which the resources are used, the scale to which the output is updated, the growth of labor productivity on the basis of the achievements of science and technology. The transfer of planning onto normative methods, both in determining expenditures and in drawing up tasks, based upon effectiveness and satisfaction of social requirements, should be completed. It is precisely that approach that creates the prerequisites for economic activity by enterprises and associations, and that gives an impulse to the initiative, to the creative activity of the labor collectives. In this way, the [changeover from] CORRECT CORRELATION BETWEEN THE administrative and economic methods of economic management will be [carried out] FOUND more quickly.

The question also arises of the place and role of the Committee for Science and Technology. The CPSU Central Committee receives many critical observations about this organization. The Council of Ministers must precisely

determine the competence of the committee. Clearly, responsibility must be placed upon the committee for the exercise of control over the scientific and technical level of the industries within the national economy and the conformity of our production with the best world achievements. Without substituting for either the planning organs or the ministries, it must concentrate its main attention upon forecasting, on choosing and justifying the priority directions for the development of science and technology and the formation of a stock of research and development work as a base for making progressive planning decisions. This must be served by an integrated program of scientific and technical progress.

EXPERIENCE HAS SHOWN THAT THE MAIN RESERVES FOR ACHIEVING GREATER EFFICIENCY ARE TO BE FOUND IN THE AREAS OF JUNCTION BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL BRANCHES. IT IS ILLUSORY TO HOPE THAT THE STATE PLANNING COMMITTEE CAN WORK OUT ALL THE CHAINS OF MUTUAL TIES BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL BRANCHES AND SELECT THE OPTIMAL VERSION. THE MINISTRIES, TOO, CANNOT DO THIS. ALL THIS PLACES ON THE AGENDA THE QUESTION OF SETTING UP THE MANAGEMENT ORGANS FOR LARGE NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMPLEXES. UNDER THE NEW CONDITIONS THE ROLE AND FUNCTIONS OF MINISTRIES MUST CHANGE. THEY WILL BE ABLE TO CONCENTRATE THEIR ATTENTION TO A MAXIMUM EXTENT ON LONG-TERM PLANNING AND LARGE-SCALE UTILIZATION OF NEW SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL ACHIEVEMENTS IN ORDER TO RAISE THE QUALITY LEVEL OF PRODUCTION OPERATIONS AND OF PRODUCTS. THIS WILL MAKE IT POSSIBLE TO ESSENTIALLY REDUCE THE ADMINISTRATIVE APPARATUS IN THE BRANCHES AND ABOLISH ITS SUPERFLUOUS LINKS. A GREAT DEAL WILL HAVE TO BE DONE TO PERFECT THE STRUCTURE OF THE ORGANS OF REPUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, IN WHICH THE NUMBER OF MINISTRIES AND DEPARTMENTS IS QUITE HIGH AND CONTINUES TO GROW. THE PROBLEM OF INTEGRATION AND CONCENTRATION OF ADMINISTRATION IS EVEN MORE URGENT IN THIS AREA THAN AT THE UNION LEVEL.

Comrades! It has to be said quite definitely that scientific and technical progress will not be speeded up if the role of the basic production link, the association and the enterprise, is not raised, if their activity is not reoriented. The center of gravity of all operational and economic work has to be removed to the localities, to the labor collectives, making the association and the enterprise directly subordinate, as a rule, to the ministries; that is to say, we have to go over to a two-link management system. The activity of every production association will have to be examined from all sides from this point of view, their structures will have to be precisely defined and leaders singled out who are up to the level of present-day requirements with a powerful scientific-technical potential. They should receive priority development and be given jurisdiction over those enterprises and organizations that are working less effectively.

Many people remember that at one time, when the associations were being organized, instructions were given that they should be set up on the basis of enterprises, irrespective of the departments and territorial units to which these belonged. However, in reality, associations were created not even within the framework of ministries for particular industries, but within the framework of all-union production associations. Under limited conditions like those, naturally it was not possible to form a rational and effective network of associations. Now the formation of interindustry associations must be

supported in every way. This is a promising thing, as is shown by the experience of the fraternal countries [and first and foremost of the GDR].

NO PALLIATIVE MEASURES OR PARTIAL CHANGES OF ANY KIND CAN SUIT US IN THE SPHERE OF PERFECTING THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF ADMINISTRATION. THE FORTHCOMING WORK IS NO "PATCHING-UP OF HOLES" AND NO SIMPLE COMBINATION OR FRAGMENTATION OF ORGANIZATION OR MOVING WORKERS FROM ONE ARMCHAIR TO ANOTHER. NO CAMOUFLAGE IS PERMISSIBLE IN THIS TASK. THE QUESTIONS OF IMPROVING THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE MUST BE SOLVED BOLDLY, IN A SUBSTANTIATED MANNER AND, WHAT IS MOST IMPORTANT, COMPREHENSIVELY AT ALL LEVELS FROM THE HIGHEST TO THE LOWEST ONES AND BOTH VERTICALLY AND HORIZONTALLY.

As you see, comrades, life itself has placed on the agenda issues involving the further improvement of the organizational structure of the management of the national economy.

[What is more, at the party Central Committee meeting this problem--unexpectedly, in our view, but that was indeed at first sight a superficial view--was raised acutely. And what was it about, particularly as regards those enterprises that had begun to go over to the new methods of economic management. However, this is what it is about, that the ministries, in their present form, in the way they function, in the way they manage the enterprises and associations subordinate to them, have no interest in the economic experiment, and in particular they have no interest in the introduction of those principles upon which we are carrying out the experiment. After all, the main idea is to extend the independence and raise the responsibility of the enterprise and achieve high end results.] THIS PROBLEM WAS RAISED WITH ALL SHARPNESS AT THE MEETING IN THE PARTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE WITH THE LEADERS OF THE ASSOCIATIONS AND ENTERPRISES. THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE MEETING SPOKE ABOUT THE FACT THAT THE TRANSITION TO THE NEW METHODS OF ECONOMIC OPERATIONS IS MAKING PROGRESS WITH DIFFICULTY AND THAT IT IS ENCOUNTERING OBSTACLES. WHAT IS INVOLVED IN THIS CONNECTION IS THE FACT THAT SOME MINISTRIES ARE NOT INTERESTED IN THE ECONOMIC EXPERIMENT AND IN THE INTRODUCTION OF THE PRINCIPLES ON THE BASIS OF WHICH IT IS PLANNED TO CARRY OUT THE REORGANIZATION OF ADMINISTRATION.

THE ENTIRE ESSENCE OF THE EXPERIMENT IS TO EXTEND THE INDEPENDENCE AND TO RAISE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF ENTERPRISES AND TO CREATE BETTER OPPORTUNITIES FOR THEM TO ACHIEVE HIGH END RESULTS.

[The ministry], HOWEVER, SOME MINISTRIES with the aid of the State Committee for Labor, of the Ministry of Finance, and in some cases of the State Planning Committee have vast experience and the ability to keep a tight rein on everybody and interpret the decisions of the Central Committee and the government in such a way that, after their application and all the recommendations, nothing is left of these principles. [applause]

If the ministers are applauding too, the ice has begun to shift. [laughter, applause]

Readjustment of the organizational structure of management will not give the desired result if it is not organically linked with a strengthening of

financial autonomy and of economic levers and incentives. We need a mechanism that really ensures advantages to labor collectives seeking success in speeding up scientific-technical progress. We need a mechanism that makes the output of obsolete and inefficient goods unprofitable [economically punishes both the management and the labor collective, and in the final analysis, leads to a deterioration in the indices of the enterprise's work.]

Social advantages should be granted to those collectives which produce the best [most competitive goods] products and successfully compete WITH LEADING FIRMS in the world market. Such [collectives] ENTERPRISES AND ASSOCIATIONS should have more funds at their disposal for production, social development and wages. It is the production of HIGH QUALITY goods [for the export market]. To this end, it is first of all necessary to adopt measures increasing the influences of the consumer on the technical level and quality of output. The consumer's opportunity to select the best goods could be extended by arranging contests between manufacturing enterprises, by development concurrent with accumulation of the resources of wholesale trade and enhancing the role of direct links and economic contracts.

Second, price setting must be fundamentally improved so that it can foster the successful implementation of economic policy and the speedier introduction of all that is new and progressive and, absolutely compel managers to constantly improve equipment and technology and resolve resource-saving tasks on a daily basis and strictly observe savings regimes. Here, things are far from being all resolved. [How often has it been said that prices for the best, highly efficient goods should guarantee higher profitability and make worse, inefficient goods unprofitable.]

Third, we must in practice transfer associations and enterprises onto complete financial autonomy and sharply reduce the number of centrally set plan assignments. Scientific-technical progress requires more freedom and flexibility in adopting decisions at the level of the association and enterprise, for the introduction of advanced technology is organically linked with the selection of options, quick reaction to new things and an interest in the end result. Thus far, associations and enterprises do not have full control over their financial resources and cannot independently choose the most rational ways of running their affairs or of heightening efficiency.

During the meeting in the CPSU Central Committee with managers of enterprises, some comrades displayed a collection of plan indices from the platform. These are thick books, comrades. Furthermore, it turned out that each ministry, and even all-union production associations, arbitrarily includes many unnecessary indices in its plans.

It is time to impose order in this area by legislative means and establish a strict list of indices built into the plan. The activities of enterprises and associations must be regulated to an ever greater extent by economic norms. In making associations and enterprises more responsible for raising the technical standard of production and the quality of output, we must give them the opportunity to earn for themselves the necessary resources for this, to manage these funds independently, by relaxing the restrictions on their right

to make use of development funds, amortization deductions, additional profit and credit.

All that is important is to ensure that modern equipment and contracts for construction and assembly work receive priority in the allocation of funds from these sources and that the established procedures for the use of foreign currency deductions derived from the delivery of export production are adhered to.

A certain amount has already been accomplished in this area during the large-scale economic experiment. The opportunities of associations and enterprises have been expanded somewhat. However, to a significant extent they still have not been able to implement their ideas because plan and finance bodies, ministries and all-union production associations have made the use of production development funds conditional on so many additional requirements that they have basically nullified the rights of enterprises.

Fourth, we must establish a close relationship between the results of a collective's work and the system for the remuneration of labor. At the moment, the level of remuneration hardly depends on efficiency at all, on whether good or bad output is produced. However, there must be a direct link here. Basically, it is a question of extending the principles of collective contracting to the activities of associations and enterprises. It is important to be more bold about the widespread creation of enlarged integrated, and financially autonomous teams in all industries, teams geared towards the final results of production. Already in the years immediately ahead, they must be turned into the main form of management at enterprises and organizations.

It has become essential to impose order in the use of funds for the payment of bonuses to work collectives and employees for successes in the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, in the rapid application of the latest achievements. Our system of material incentives is extremely confused, cumbersome and inefficient. There are dozens of different forms of incentives existing side by side; SOMETHING THAT CREATES CONFUSION. Many have already become accustomed to the fact that bonuses are frequently regarded as some kind of mechanical addition to wages paid to everybody without exception, regardless of the contribution made by a specific employee to the results achieved. Wage leveling flourishes in these circumstances. The stimulating role of the bonus is lost. The State Committee for Labor and Social Problems and the AUCCTU must investigate this matter and make well-founded recommendations.

[Proposals for the widespread application of new management methods have now been prepared. They envisage additional measures aimed at raising the efficiency of production and the quality of output and, in particular, accelerating scientific and technical progress. These measures will shortly be examined by the Politburo.]

Everything that is out of date must be boldly eliminated so that a so-to-speak cost-conscious economic mechanism can begin operating at full capacity, an economic mechanism that will stimulate economic development and literally rap

the knuckles of sloppy economic planners, of those who like to extract as large an amount of resources and capital investments from the state as possible and give as little as possible in return.

In other words, there is very serious work to be done on improving the system of management and administration. We cannot postpone the implementation of this work since we realize that unless we create new economic and organizational conditions, there cannot be a real acceleration in scientific and technical progress.

Comrades! In speaking about party work today, I address myself, first and foremost, to secretaries of Central Committees of Communist Parties of union republics, to kraykoms and obkoms, to all communists. I would like to stress yet again: Times have changed. They are making new demands on party activity, on its style, methods and results, and hence, of cadres. Party work deals with the decisive factor in all changes: the human factor. From this springs its main directive, that of bringing about a change in the minds and attitudes of cadres from top to bottom, concentrating attention on the most important thing, scientific and technical progress. The whole experience of the party says that there is little that can be changed in the economy, in management, in education if the psychological readjustment is not made, if the desire and the ability to think and work in a new way is not produced. A simple truth, it would appear, but it is one that our cadres, and not just our cadres in the economy, are still only recognizing with difficulty and with caution. But it has to be said, comrades, that in this case we are talking about a long-term, political line. And not one of the problems that we are obliged to solve today can be put off until tomorrow. One cannot linger. One cannot wait, for there is no time left for getting going, it has all been exhausted in the past. Movement must be ahead only and must build up speed.

Present-day approaches to social and economic, scientific and ideological and educational problems must be stimulated in every way. I would say that understanding of the situation must be deepened, and the spirit of self-criticism and of a business-like attitude must be strengthened. The determining factor is the attitude and atmosphere that the party organizations are capable of creating everywhere; the strength of the party barrier against all manner of backwardness, departmental and parochial distortions, against bad management and squandering.

We are all passing through an examination, the examination of life. Now, when the party has entered the pre-Congress period, the work with people assumes an even greater importance. The party raykoms, gorkoms, obkoms and kraykoms must play a key role in this connection. But unfortunately there are still such party committees which are extremely slowly reorganizing even themselves. Initiative and persistence in overcoming shortcomings are lacking some places, the level of exactingness is low, and coordination of work is lacking.

The acceleration of scientific and technical progress requires a cardinal change in the situation that has come about with engineering and technical and scientific cadres. Of late, the CPSU Central Committee has been approached on this issue by Academicians G. M. Muromtsev, A. M. Prokhorov, A. Yu. Ishlinskiy, V. M. Tuchkevich and other comrades. They express well-founded

alarm about the state of training and the new scientific shift, about the fall in the prestige of engineers, the reduction in the flow of talented young people into the field of technical and scientific activity. All this is linked in no small measure to the serious shortcomings in the training and use of specialist cadres and to the distortions in the payment for their labor. Clearly, the time has come when a serious reorganization of higher and secondary specialized education is necessary. Measures to raise the social recognition of the labor of the scientist and engineer, to intensify the creative initiatives within it, to raise the extent to which he is technically equipped and to introduce the automation of technological and planning and design work should be thought about.

What lies ahead is: raising the personal interest of scientific and engineering-technical workers in the results of labor, stimulating good quality fulfillment of jobs by fewer employees and, on this basis, raising their level of pay. As you know, the first steps in this direction have already been undertaken by the Central Committee and the government.

Taking into account the rapid renovation of the conditions of modern production, systematic work in retraining management and scientific-technical cadres acquires particular urgency. It is essential to improve the training and retraining of workers, especially in new specializations that are coming into being in the course of the implementation of scientific-technological progress.

It is essential to prepare such measures without delay. These measures must be combined with a significant expansion in the sphere of the use of qualified labor and a cutback in zones of unskilled, heavy and harmful labor. We need to strengthen party influence on the whole course of scientific-technological progress, fortify the party stratum in its key sections and pay more attention to work within the collectives of scientific-research and planning-design organizations, technological services and scientific-technological societies.

Experience shows that a successful form of party guidance of scientific-technological progress are the councils of assistance to scientific-technological progress at the central committees of the communist parties of union republics, the kraykoms, obkoms and gorkoms. I would like to speak about the party organizations of ministries. Obviously, the reasons for the many shortcomings and errors we are talking about lie hidden in the fact that the party committees of ministries have here and there lost their political acumen in perceiving and solving the most important socioeconomic issues and have backed away from their checking functions, the right to which they are endowed with by the rules of the CPSU.

It is difficult to believe that the party organizations of ministries where things are not going smoothly do not see the shortcomings and the reserves for improving matters. The party committees of ministries, being plenipotentiary representatives of the party, are obliged to sharply exert themselves, to enhance good order and responsibility in collectives, to specifically come to grips with the cardinal issues of the development of various industries from party positions.

To tell them frankly, instances do not come to mind where any party organization from any ministry has raised the question of the state of affairs in industry on a level of principle before the CPSU Central Committee. [They do not come to mind. The new technology will be dead without new attitudes toward labor and discipline and without a high level of work standards.] A decisive turnabout of the national economy toward acceleration of scientific-technological progress demands equally decisive measures in strengthening organization and order in all sections of production and management. Exactingness, and exactingness again, that is the most important thing dictated to us by the current situation.

Weightier words must also be uttered by communists working in the organs of people's control. The situation demands that the socialist system of people's control work more actively, that it tackle major socioeconomic problems, that it not allow those managers who have stopped caring about state affairs to take life easy.

A broad field of activity--specific and responsible--is also open before ideological and propaganda work. It is essential to underpin all our tasks, as Lenin taught, with a sufficiently broad and sturdy base of conviction, and to interest millions and millions of working people in it. Scientific-technological progress is a vitally important matter: it is in the interests of all, it allows everyone to broadly reveal their gifts and talent.

We are counting on a high level of creative activity and skill on the part of our working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, the engineers and scientists. We expect a particularly great deal from young people, from their energy and their inquisitive minds, from their interest in everything that is new and frontranking. Ideological and political education in all its forms must be linked as closely to life as possible, to the tasks in speeding up socioeconomic development of our homeland. Herein lies the essence of the changes that we have to make today in our ideological work. There must be more energetic action in this direction, without loss of time.

Comrades! We are faced with a mass of things to do, innovative things, things on a large scale, difficult things. Will we be able to cope with them? The Central Committee is confident that we will. We have a duty to cope. However, this will require of each of us great thought, intense labor, immense self-discipline, deliberateness and organization.

It is not part of the party's tradition and it is not in the character of the Soviet people to fear the complexity of tasks, to withdraw in the face of difficulties, to become weak and complacent, particularly at crucial and responsible moments in the life of the country.

When the republic of the Soviets was making its first steps toward socialism in an incredibly difficult situation, Lenin wrote with confidence: We will get out, for we do not embellish our situation. We know all the difficulties, we see all the sicknesses. We will treat them systematically and persistently, without panicking. Today a deep faith in the creative strength of the workers, peasants, intelligentsia, in the lofty moral spirit and will

of the people nourishes the party's optimism. However, optimism does not release anyone from work. We will have to work exhaustively.

The policy of the CPSU is actively supported by the whole of society. Soviet people link great hopes to the ideas, initiatives and plans the party is bringing to its 27th Congress. It is the duty of the party of communists to justify them, to show that we are taking up the matter in a serious way. We have sufficient strength and firmness to enable us to ensure that words and deeds do not differ, relying upon the living creativity of the people and strengthening the alliance between science and labor: and in politics and in life, that is the main thing. [sustained STORMY applause]

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

CSO: 1802/15-F

TRANSFORMATION OF NONCHERNOZEM ZONE: RESULTS, PROBLEMS, PROSPECTS

AU190501 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 85 (signed to press 19 Jun 85)
pp 34-46

[Article by V. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers]

[Text] In March 1974 the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers adopted the resolution "On Measures on Further Development of Agriculture in the RSFSR Nonchernozem Zone." This was the first comprehensive regional program envisaging the transformation of the Nonchernozem areas into a zone of modern highly productive crop agriculture and livestock breeding. The program also precisely defined the ways to radically solve the problem of social reorganization of rural areas on the basis of a steady improvement of the conditions of work and everyday life of the working people in these areas.

The party attaches extraordinarily great importance to this program and devotes constant and unremitting attention to its implementation. The resolutions adopted by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers in 1981 and in May 1985 aiming at further balanced development and greater efficiency of agriculture and other branches of the agroindustrial complex of the zone testify to this.

The economic and social renovation of the Nonchernozem Zone has been from the very beginning truly an all-state and all-people's task. It shows with new force such unremarkable features of the Soviet way of life as the indestructible friendship of the USSR peoples and real socialist internationalism. The working people of the Nonchernozem rural areas accept with deep gratitude the selfless assistance provided by representatives of all fraternal union republics and of other oblasts and krays of the Russian Federation. This assistance is embodied in major concrete tasks that are connected with the construction of housing, new production projects, and land amelioration systems. Thus, in the 4 years of the current five-year plan, labor collectives of the union republics completed contractual construction work alone valued at half a billion rubles. Many union ministries and departments are making a large contribution to the tasks of advancing the agriculture of the zone. The Leninist Komsomol devotes constant attention to the Nonchernozem areas. More than 100,000 of its emissaries work there in student teams every year.

The need for a radical improvement of the state of affairs in the Nonchernozem rural areas has been dictated first and foremost by the constantly growing concentration of urban population, that is, a high degree of urbanization. It is not superfluous to mention that today 521 cities, more than 1,000 settlements of urban type, and nearly one-fourth of the entire population and one-fourth of the industrial enterprises of the Soviet Union are concentrated in the Nonchernozem Zone.

This zone represents one of the most important production and economic, scientific-research and experimental bases that determine the rates and directions of the development of the country's unified national economic complex.

Meanwhile, as a result of a number of historical reasons and circumstances, the zone's agriculture that has a total area of 50 million hectares of arable land at its disposal, continued to develop below the available potentials and continued to lag behind the demands of industry and city population. The growth of agricultural production was also restrained by a large drain of the labor force from villages to large cities and other regions of the country.

The ever growing volume of deliveries of food supplies and agricultural raw materials to the zone's industrial centers from other, including very distant oblasts and republics, placed an increasingly great burden on the state. The delivery of perishable products that are not very suitable for transport also had an extremely unfavorable effect on the economy. The products of this kind, including primarily milk, fresh vegetables and meat products, not to mention fodder for the needs of livestock breeding, must be produced locally.

Ten years have now passed since the beginning of the implementation of the extensive and, essentially, innovative program of renovation of the Nonchernozem Zone. Extensive construction work has been accomplished during that period and, first and foremost, the material-technical basis of the zone's kolkhozes and sovkhoses has been successfully and considerably strengthened. In the 1976-84 period, capital investments for the development of the entire agricultural complex amounted to a total of more than 68 billion rubles, that is, nearly twice the amount invested for that purpose in the two preceding five-year plans. During that period, 653,000 tractors, 158,000 grain harvester combines, 353,000 trucks, and many units of other equipment were delivered to kolkhozes and sovkhoses in the Nonchernozem Zone.

During the past 10 years, the basic production assets and energy-generating capacities of kolkhozes and sovkhoses have doubled and the mechanization of labor-intensive tasks in crop growing and livestock breeding has substantially increased. Large poultry farms, livestock breeding complexes, and mechanized farms for breeding and fattening young cattle and pigs and for milk production have been built. New storage facilities for grain, potatoes, fodder, mineral fertilizers, and other products have been commissioned for regular use.

The entire vast territory of the zone has been transformed into an enormous construction site. The capacities of the building industry are increasing at an accelerated rate especially within the system of the RSFSR Ministry of

Rural Construction and the RSFSR Interkolkhoz Construction Association. The construction organizations of many union ministries and departments have also been recruited for the construction of large agricultural projects. Dozens of rural construction combines have been commissioned for regular production operations and the capacities for the production of prefabricated ferroconcrete structures have increased very considerably.

A wide complex of measures is being carried out in land amelioration to drain swamps and excessively humid land, level out uneven contours of land, and cultivate arable land. Agriculture of the Nonchernozem Zone was losing hundreds of millions of rubles every year as a result of absence of organized land amelioration alone.

Essentially, the production base of the land amelioration organizations of the RSFSR Main Administration of Land Reclamation in the Nonchernozem Zone has been built up anew. At present the construction of large interblast bases of building industry is being completed and 453 mobile mechanized teams of the administration are in operation.

In 10 years, more than 2 million hectares of drained land and 718,000 hectares of irrigated land have been handed over for agricultural exploitations, and technical land amelioration work has been carried on nearly 4 million hectares of land.

The use of chemical means in agriculture is increasing simultaneously with land amelioration projects. Last year alone the kolkhozes and sovkhoses in the zone used 1.5 times more active-agent mineral fertilizer per hectare than 10 years ago and in the same way they increased the use of organic fertilizers per hectare by 40 percent as compared with the amount they used 10 years ago. This made it possible for many rayons in the zone to stop the decline of the humus content of soil and raise the level of the soil's nutrient substance.

Extensive work has been carried out to develop the production infrastructure of the agroindustrial complex and of the industrial branches processing agriculture materials. In these years the capital investments of more than 2 billion rubles have been allotted for strengthening the technical equipment basis of the meat and milk, combined fodder, food and flax-processing industries in the autonomous republics and oblasts of the zone.

A vast road-building program has been carried out. More than 60,000 kilometers of hard-surface motor roads have been built.

As a result of the implementation of the comprehensive measures determined by the party's Central Committee, the average annual gross production of the social sector of agriculture increased by 25 percent as compared with the preceding 10-year period and, in the same relation, the production of livestock breeding increased by 40 percent. The Nonchernozem Zone with only one-fifth of the republic's agricultural land now produces one-third of its milk, meat and vegetables, and more than 40 percent of its eggs. It is important to emphasize that in the current five-year plan the average annual output and state purchases of products of the fields and farms of the Nonchernozem Zone have been characterized by a stable growth.

The economic situation in a Nonchernozem villages has substantially improved and the financial position of kolkhozes and sovkhoses is being strengthened. The measures designed to strengthen the economy of the individual kolkhozes and sovkhoses and, first and foremost, the increased purchase prices have created favorable conditions for expanded production and the prosperity of kolkhoz members and sovkhos workers. Many kolkhozes and sovkhoses have noticeably raised their level of profitability and the expenditure of labor in the production of products of crop growing and livestock breeding is being reduced.

The rates of social reconstruction have been considerably accelerated. The housing built for the rural working people of the zone in the last 10 years amounts to a total living space that is equal to the space provided by the buildings of nearly three cities with a population of 1 million people each. Great and rapid progress has been made in the construction of schools, vocational technical schools, preschool care centers, clubs and cultural halls, hospitals and clinics. The trade, everyday living, and transport services for rural population have substantially improved.

A general picture of the growth of the sociocultural construction in the Nonchernozem Zone with the resources allotted for the development of agriculture can be drawn on the basis of data listed in the following table:

	<u>1965-</u> <u>1984</u>	<u>1975-</u> <u>1984</u>	<u>Increase From</u> <u>1965-1974 to</u> <u>1975-1984</u>
Total living space of residential housing commissioned for use, in millions of square meters	10.6	47.9	by 4.5 times
General education schools, in thousands of pupil spaces	289.9	402.4	by 1.4 times
Preschool institutions, in thousands of spaces	136.3	354.1	by 2.6 times

Briefly, the results of the socioeconomic development of the zone show that, as a result of extensive and intensive work of the local party, soviet, agricultural and planning organs, kolkhoz and sovkhos collectives, and construction and water resources organizations, a considerable production potential has been created in the zone which provides a reliable basis for further progress of the agroindustrial complex. The people have become deeply convinced that the transformation of the villages which our party and all Soviet people have taken up in such a scope represents an irreversible process that promises bright and interesting life and work on renovated land.

There is no doubt that successes have been achieved, but much more will have to be done in the future than has been done to date. And this is precisely defined in the new resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR

Council of Ministers which further develops, deepens and concretizes the previously adopted program of transformation of the Russian Nonchernozem Zone.

A significant acceleration of this process on the basis of production intensification represents the key, the cardinal task to which the decisions of the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum devote foremost attention. A comprehensive mechanization of labor, especially in livestock breeding, and a wide introduction of intensive technology in crop growing represent the core of this task under the rural conditions.

As a result of the increasing supply of machines for agriculture, it is the tasks of highly productive and efficient utilization of the available production systems; of timely and good quality repairs of technical equipment; and of maintaining this equipment in constant readiness for use that become extraordinarily important. The ideas and proposals expressed by the participants of the meeting held at the CPSU Central Committee in April this year are deserving of attention in this connection. It was said at the meeting in particular that those who directly use agricultural machines and are directly interested in the final results of work can assume a considerable share of repair work on these machines. Provided, of course, that they have the necessary spare parts and materials at their disposal.

There is a problem in perfecting the mutual relations between kolkhozes and sovkhoses, on the one hand, and the Selkhoztekhnika organizations servicing them, on the other, and this problem must be solved more actively both locally and at the center. The enterprises manufacturing agricultural machines obviously must also be included in this task. The tasks of further raising the level of supply of machines for agriculture and of more completely equipping kolkhozes and sovkhoses with high-quality modern technical equipment were sharply raised at the recent meeting at the CPSU Central Committee on questions of acceleration of scientific-technical progress. The discussion at the meeting centered on producing reliable, powerful, and comfortable machines and the necessary sets of these machines both for crop growing and livestock breeding.

In view of the specific conditions of various agricultural zones, including the Nonchernozem Zone, it is necessary to finally organize the production of different machines designed for individual regions. This problem is still being solved slowly, and in this connection, the rural working people are right to make serious complaints against scientists and designers and the ministries of machine building who should participate more actively in the advancement of the Nonchernozem rural areas.

The enormous social and moral-educational purpose of the technical reequipping of agriculture must be especially stressed. A comprehensive mechanization of production processes in the village radically changes the nature and conditions of work and moves it closer to the nature and conditions of industrial work by intensifying its creative aspects and spiritual stimuli. The task of constantly reducing the proportion of heavy and unattractive tasks can only be solved on this basis.

The new five-year plan opens up wide prospects for the further intensification of agriculture in the Nonchernozem Zone. By 1990 the comprehensive mechanization of work must be completed in no less than 70 percent in cattle farms and by 80 percent in pig breeding and, by the same time, it must be fully completed in the growing and harvesting of potatoes, fiber flax, sugar beets and fodder crops. The achievement of these indicators will quite understandably require intensive, coordinated and truly creative work in all production links. It is necessary to raise to a new and higher level the professional training of mechanizer cadres, especially those among the young people, who are entrusted with the complex modern technical equipment.

Another set of problems--the state of affairs in rural construction--is closely connected with the accelerated development of the zone's agriculture and the further consolidation of its material and technical basis.

First and foremost, it is the low rates of growth of the volume of construction work for rural areas that cannot but be a cause for concern. During the past 10 years, the builders failed to complete the delivery of millions of square meters of housing, thousands of kilometers of roads, and a considerable number of production installations. The progressive forms of work organizations are being introduced slowly and there are continued interruptions in the material-technical supply of construction sites.

The following law-governed rule--if one may call it so--has manifested itself in the process of transformation of the Nonchernozem Zone: until now most of the ministries and departments engaged in the construction work, including the construction of nonproduction projects, have mainly concerned themselves with construction in the kolkhozes and sovkhoses situated on land adjacent to cities or rayon centers.

Of course, especially in the initial stages, it was possible to understand this approach of builders. The territories adjacent to cities usually have a developed network of roads that facilitates the transport of workers, necessary technical equipment and materials to the construction projects. But, as a result of this situation, the solution of the acute problem of the rural "depth" and of advancement of economically weak and distant kolkhozes and sovkhoses has been delayed from year to year.

The tendencies of rushing ahead or of launching projects that had not been well thought out have also been encountered in rural construction. For instance, quite a number of large livestock breeding complexes have been built. These complexes have recommended themselves in the best possible way wherever everything had been calculated and balanced as it should be. However, in some autonomous republics and oblasts it became clear in time that not all of these complexes have sufficient fodder supplies available, that some of them are surrounded by poorly productive meadows and pastures, and that some others have no grazing land at all. Consequently it became necessary to transport large quantities of fodder to them.

All this does not imply at all that fewer livestock breeding complexes should be built. What is involved in this connection is the need to choose optimal

and carefully economically substantiated and to ensure that all the necessary conditions for such complexes are created beforehand.

The problem of roads and of radical improvement of their quality continues to represent one of the most urgent tasks in the intensification of agriculture and of the restructuring of living conditions in the Nonchernozem Zone. The transport network in the zone is above the average RSFSR indicators in this connection but, at the same time, one-fifth of all general-purpose roads, especially in distant rayons, do not have hard surfaces. And as far as good roads within kolkhozes or sovkhoses are concerned, far fewer of them than needed have been built so far. The lack of these roads slows down the development of agricultural production; prevents the active use of lands that are located at great distances from the central establishments of a kolkhoz or sovkhos; causes large losses of ready products; and results in premature wear and tear of technical equipment and excessive use of fuel and lubricating materials. At times it compels the leaders of some individual kolkhozes or sovkhoses to accumulate, so to speak, for safety; excessive reserves of fuel, machinery and various materials, and creates many difficulties in providing everyday living, trade and cultural services for the population of distant villages.

A new step must now be made in road construction and especially in the construction of internal kolkhoz and sovkhos roads. For that purpose it will be necessary to mobilize additional reserves and resources, including those of sovkhoses and other state agricultural enterprises in the zone. Organizations of the union ministries and departments could also participate more actively in road construction together with the RSFSR Ministry of Highways and RSFSR interkolkhoz Construction Administration.

The new resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers envisages the construction of more than 45,000 kilometers of new motor roads, including nearly 25,000 internal kolkhoz and sovkhos roads, in the territory of the Nonchernozem Zone in the 12th Five-Year Plan. The resolution also provides for a practical solution for such an important problem as that of the organization of a special service for the utilization of internal kolkhoz and sovkhos motor roads.

Certain problems have become apparent in the course of land amelioration projects. During the initial stage, the main attention was devoted to expanding the land acreage and, as has been noted above, the achieved results were impressive. But the further the amelioration process moved, the more the fact became a cause of concern that the productivity of reclaimed land per hectare increased slowly and failed to meet the projected norms and correspond to the resources invested per hectare.

There were quite a few reasons for that. First and foremost, for a long time the land reclamation organizations failed to pay enough attention to the quality of their work and kolkhozes and sovkhoses were receiving from them land areas in which many projects were left uncompleted. And in their turn, kolkhozes and sovkhoses did not manage to reorganize themselves immediately, train skilled cadres, and master the necessary work experience on reclaimed land.

The need for developing and implementing a comprehensive regional scientific-technical program of more effective utilization of reclaimed lands has now become obvious. The lagging of the level of exploitation of the reclaimed land areas behind the scope of the land amelioration projects is producing an increasingly negative effect. The problem of carrying out the cropland technical improvement projects continues to be a serious problem and, until quite recently, these projects have not been really developed.

The clue to this situation is simple: These projects are far less advantageous for the land amelioration organizations, but they are exceptionally important for kolkhozes and sovkhoses.

The returns per hectare of the reclaimed land are still small also because until now fertilizers have not been used effectively by farms. The use of chemical means in the fields is still insufficiently comprehensive. The quantities of peat-based compost fertilizers and organic fertilizers used on soil are still small. The rate and quality of liming of acidic soil--and there are many millions of hectares of such a soil in the zone--cannot be considered satisfactory. A majority of kolkhozes and sovkhoses are experiencing a serious shortage of lime-based materials.

Briefly, the agrochemical service still has not fully become a tool of rapid advancement of the standards of land cultivation. It appears that it is expedient to set up specialized agrochemical centers that perform the entire cycle of tasks connected with the introduction of chemical means into the soil on orders from kolkhozes and sovkhoses. Incidentally, Moscow Oblast and the Mari ASSR have already accumulated a certain experience in this respect.

In the coming five-year plan the main attention will be devoted to a significant improvement of the quality of land amelioration construction projects and of the exploitation of reclaimed land. It is planned, in particular, to change over the construction of land amelioration systems on large land areas in combination with the construction of the necessary production projects, housing, social, cultural and everyday service establishments, and internal kolkhoz and sovkhos roads according to a general plan and a unified itemized list. Rapid progress will be made in the cropland technical improvement projects that will be carried out on over 2 million hectares of acid soil in 5 years. It is anticipated that 1.2 million hectares of drained land will be commissioned for exploitation. All these measures, ensured by the appropriate financial and material resources, will undoubtedly promote the cause of intensification of agriculture of the Nonchernozem Zone.

In connection with the further advancement of the construction of land amelioration projects it is appropriate to especially emphasize the importance of preservation of a dynamic ecological balance. Powerful technical equipment in the hands of people can cause enormous damage to the environment if it is used inconsiderately, and that damage cannot be corrected easily.

The acceleration of the intensification of agricultural production and its further dynamic growth are determined in many ways by the successes of science and its increased role in the analysis and solution of currently important

problems of development of the agroindustrial complex. In view of the specific features of conditions in the Nonchernozem Zone, the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences imeni V. I. Lenin has formed a special department that includes a group of branch institutes, experimental stations, and selective centers. The scientific-production associations for plant-growing and selection, for leguminous and groats crops, and for animal breeding are making accelerated progress.

However, so far the problem has been that no success has been achieved in reducing the lapse between the time some recommendations are made by science and their application of scientifically substantiated land cultivation systems that have been worked out now in each individual autonomous republic or oblast in the zone according to the specific soil and climatic conditions. Efficient crop rotation methods are still being introduced too slowly.

Seed growing continues to represent a bottleneck. Kolkhozes and sovkhoses continue to experience shortage of seed potatoes and vegetable and perennial grass seeds that are suitable for their areas. The fiber flax seed growing has been especially neglected.

Already this year, many kolkhozes and sovkhoses in the Nonchernozem Zone are changing over to the introduction of intensive technologies of grain and fodder crop growing that will ensure the high programmed harvest yields. This task, which is not new, is responsible and difficult and will require a further increase in the level of comprehensive mechanization of production; full supply of mineral fertilizers for kolkhozes and sovkhoses; perfecting of the organization of work; and a wide introduction of the economic accountability system.

Quite a few problems will have to be solved in livestock breeding, including first and foremost in connection with the introduction of highly productive breeds and hybrid breeds of large horned livestock and poultry and the improvement of veterinary services. It is also time for more active efforts to increase the number of sheep and to devote special attention to restoring the flocks of the Romanovskaya breed that has been traditional for the Nonchernozem Zone.

Speaking about the advancement of livestock breeding, it is necessary to stress that the main level in this connection is provided by a greater efficiency of fodder production that has now become a most important specialized branch of agriculture and which is developing on an industrial basis. The task has been set to increase the procurement of coarse and succulent fodder to a total of 90 million metric tons by 1990, and this will provide the guarantee for a significant increase in the productivity of social livestock.

As the production of the products of crop growing and livestock breeding continues to increase, a dynamic development of the production infrastructure of the agroindustrial complex becomes more and more urgent, including primarily the enterprises processing agricultural raw materials. The lagging of this sector and insufficient attention devoted to it, result in many losses and incomplete utilization of the products grown and procured. It is

necessary to speed up the construction of new facilities for storage and processing of agricultural raw materials as well as the technical reequipping of branches of the food industry.

The question of economical distribution of storage and processing facilities deserves special attention. They are now mainly built in the locations of concentrated demand, that is, in cities. But in "peak" seasons it is impossible to deliver the products of fields and farms there quickly and without losses. It is obvious that it would be more economical to build a considerable number of storage facilities and processing enterprises closer to the place of production and subsequently to deliver products gradually and without any rushing, to consumers or for further processing and to use the product waste for livestock fodder.

The perfecting of economic tasks in all links of the agroindustrial complex is an indispensable condition for the successful implementation of the program of transformation of the Nonchernozem Zone, and the importance of this condition is constantly increasing.

The party sees the ways to solving this task in a general introduction of the economic accountability system and of progressive forms of work organization and remuneration, including primarily, the system of collective contracts, the intensification of the system of economizing, a steady growth of labor productivity and the reduction of production costs. Today the successful advancement depends more and more on the perfecting of the management of agriculture and other branches of the agroindustrial complex, on the strengthening of mutual relations between partners and on a higher level of economic thinking by cadres.

The rayon agroindustrial associations, organs of management of agriculture and other branches of the agroindustrial complex, are gathering their strength in the Nonchernozem Zone just as in other regions of the republic. The new system of management provides great opportunities for uniting the efforts and coordinating the actions of enterprises and organizations for their common interests in the end results of work.

The vital necessity of the rayon agroindustrial associations has been proven in practice. But perhaps it would be more correct to say that the idea inherent in them is not yet fully realized. In particular, the problems of the structure of the agroindustrial associations have not been resolved. Departmental barriers have also not been fully overcome. The rayon agroindustrial association has not yet become a truly independent organization which can itself resolve issues connected with the planning and distribution of resources and the utilization of reserves at the disposal of its partners. Members of rayon agroindustrial associations frequently spend a mass of time on coordination of every kind and engage in a great deal in office work and the compilation of various information and reports. All this is instead of creatively organizing affairs, arranging well-defined cooperation between partners and giving qualified assistance to specialists in the introduction of progressive methods of economic operations.

At present, a series of experiments are envisaged in the Russian Federation, including the Nonchernozem Zone, which are aimed at broadening the rights of kolkhozes and sovkhozes in planning, capital construction, and the production and sale of products, and also at switching some farms over to complete self-sufficiency. An internal economic accountability system, which tangibly helps to increase the labor activeness of workers and strengthen production and plan discipline, is being introduced into production on an increasingly broad scale.

However, the process of spreading progressive forms of labor organizations and incentives is progressing at a slower rate than is dictated by the vital needs of production. Some leaders of farms and the apparatus of the agroindustrial associations are in no hurry to introduce the economic accountability system, devote little attention to such important economic categories as return on funds, prime costs, profitability, and labor productivity, and do not wish and sometimes, let it be said directly, are incapable of renouncing obsolete, traditional methods and forms of leadership. Life urgently demands that conservative, sluggish attitudes toward the economic factors of management be overcome and competent, forward-looking, skilled cadres be more boldly advanced.

The patronal work of industrial enterprises, organizations and institutions in towns located in the Nonchernozem Zone is an important help in the matter of speeding up the processes of updating rural areas and strengthening their economy and culture. It is time to imbue the very concept of "patronage of the countryside" with new and deeper meaning. Present-day assistance by city dwellers is frequently expressed simply in the mobilization of people for season work, when the shortage of manpower in rural areas is most keenly felt. And so it is frequently the case that engineers, designers and scientists dig potatoes or pull flax instead of efficiently and, the main thing, constantly assisting farms under their patronage in carrying out comprehensive mechanization and working in connection with technical equipment and organization and with capital and current maintenance and repair of buildings and installations.

One would like to particularly stress once again the paramount importance of such work for economically weak farms and for maintaining and developing small villages, of which there are many thousands in the Nonchernozem Zone. All this must become the new, contemporary manifestation of true union between town and village.

In addition to the development of the economy in the oblasts and autonomous republics in the Nonchernozem Zone, social and cultural construction is also developing on an increasingly broad scale. It is planned to allocate considerable financial resources for this purpose in the 12th Five-Year Plan. The party proceeds from the fact that capital investments in production per se, and the scale of land amelioration, introduction of chemical means, and the supplying of farms with equipment do not guarantee decisive success if the activeness, responsibility and awareness of those who produce material goods do not increase at the same time.

In this respect, the success of the matter is by no means determined only by financial investments, wage increases, expansion of the domestic services sphere and development in housing construction and the network of academic and cultural institutions, although all this is exceptionally important. It is a question of an entire complex of measures bringing about the activization of the human factor in the economy, and of a sharp increase in the social orientation of our entire policy. As M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of our party's Central Committee, emphasized at the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum: "It is essential to consistently pursue a policy aimed at strengthening social justice in the distribution of material and spiritual wealth and increasing the influence of social factors on the development of the economy and the enhancing of its efficiency."

The changes that have taken place in the life of the Nonchernozem areas in the past decade are appreciable and gratifying. The trend toward the standard and quality of the life of the rural worker drawing closer to that of the city worker is becoming increasingly visible. However, there are still a considerable number of social problems. So, it was presumed that with an increase in the rate and scale of social restructuring the population flow away from rural areas would be sharply reduced. Yes, it has almost been halved. However, the undesirable process nevertheless continues, and what is more, it is chiefly young people, skilled cadres and specialists who leave the rural areas.

It seems that many farm leaders and some party and Soviet workers have not yet managed to really grasp the essence of the changes taking place in the very structure of rural life and in people's awareness and psychology. For a long time concern for the social development of the countryside was chiefly concentrated on the economic aspect of the matter and basically amounted to realizing appropriations allocated for social and cultural life. However, life has revealed the inadequacy of this approach.

Every year more and more homes are built in rural areas with all the communal conveniences: running water, gas, let alone electricity, which not a single village now has to go without. But, as has been observed in various rayons, in some villages these houses stand empty for a long time. It turns out that the key to the problem of consolidating the cadres lies not only in housing improvement, working conditions and the organization of labor are no less important.

The acuteness of the problem is also increased by the fact that, in many farms, the regime of the working day sharply interferes with home life. Let us take the example of livestock breeding, where some operations are still performed manually and work time within a 24-hour period is stretched out and broken up into several segments. On the whole, it lasts 8 hours, but if one takes into account that a worker has to make several trips to the farm, it can actually be 12 hours or more.

It can be said that this situation is not comparable to the difficulties experienced by livestock breeding 10-15 years ago.

However, today the tasks are different and the rates of transformations in rural areas have accelerated considerably and, at the same time, the needs of the workers are increasing, primarily in connection with improving working conditions. That is why it is of principled significance--in economic, social, and moral-psychological respects--to switch all livestock farms in the Nonchernozem Zone over to a two-shift work regimen in the next five-year plan period.

Or take this problem. In many oblasts a violation in the ratio of the male and female population has been observed, particularly among young people, in the direction of a reduction in the latter. Obviously the time has come to more actively engage in expanding the sphere of applying female labor in rural areas, including by means of speeding up the development of subsidiary production units and enterprises, as well as the services sphere, and forming branches of workshops in industrial enterprises. This will make it possible to increase the employment of mothers with young children and elderly women. This will also provide a solution to the "bride problem."

The problems of social planning are becoming increasingly topical today. Unfortunately, many kolkhozes and sovkhoses in the zone have only recently begun to study these problems properly. It is no accident that such important problems as selection of optimum work and leisure regimes, development of the social infrastructure and others are resolved slowly.

It is time farm leaders and soviet workers grasped the importance of directing social processes without failing to also take into account such factors as interpersonal relations, the social-psychological climate in the collectives, and the degree of work satisfaction among people in various professions and of different ages. All this is of great significance for increasing qualifications and consolidating the cadres, regulating leisure time and ensuring its diversity, increasing people's labor activeness and also increasing the culture of rural workers.

When discussing the social development of the Nonchernozem Zone and the problems arising in this sphere, one must not discount the problems of constantly strengthening the material-technical base of rural culture. And, despite significant and positive changes, these problems are being resolved more slowly than is required, lagging behind the plan tasks set each year.

During the 4 years of the current five-year plan, state capital investments in projects in the nonproduction sphere have not been made full use of and plans to build children's institutions, household service reception points, and other projects have not been fulfilled. In 2,000 farms--and primarily in remote villages--for a number of years people have received virtually no new housing at all. Last year clubs and culture centers were built in the zone, but their number was almost one-third lower than that set in plan tasks.

Considering the particular importance of social and cultural construction, the party envisages significantly increasing its rate of progress in the forthcoming five-year plan. The commissioning of housing for rural workers will grow approximately 1.5 times more rapidly. Preschool institutions with 260,000 places and clubs and culture centers with 280,000 places must be

built. The volume of domestic services provided for the rural population will be increased by 50-60 percent as compared to the current five-year plan. The plans are ambitious, but undoubtedly realistic. It is just as important that their implementation be under the unremitting control of the party, soviet and economic organs.

The discussion of social problems in Nonchernozem Zone rural areas once again brings us to a most important issue--that of organizing and consolidating qualified cadres on the land and forming stable labor collectives.

Since the very beginning of the program to transform the Nonchernozem Zone, high indexes have been reached in the training of machine-operating cadres by vocational-technical academic institutions under the system of the USSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education, more than 100,000 each year. It would seem that one could only rejoice in this. However, many of the young people who have received the appropriate training do not return to the kolkhozes and sovkhoses, but go away to the towns or to organizations providing services for agriculture.

The same thing happens with diploma specialist cadres. Every year up to 30,000 graduates from institutes of higher education and technical schools are sent to farms in the zone, but the number of diploma specialists engaged in kolkhozes and sovkhoses increases by only 19,000 per annum. Many do not stay simply because due concern is not shown for their living and working conditions. Some farm leaders watch over young specialists to excess and shift them from one duty to another without sufficient grounds for doing so.

The teacher and the agronomist, the doctor and the livestock specialist--these are the main social and cultural support in the countryside. Unfortunately, many young specialists arrive in a rural area not because they are following their vocation, but because they have been assigned there; they work off their set 3 years and then leave. Some see the solution to this problem in increasing the compulsory period of work in rural areas for young specialists. Others--and this is far more sensible--suggest increasing the number of young men and women from rural areas studying in higher education institutes and technical schools on grants from kolkhozes and sovkhoses. On the whole, the ministries of education and higher and secondary specialized education, and the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences have something to think about here.

A radical solution to the problem of training cadres for rural areas is included in the general educational and vocational school reform. The RSFSR Council of Ministers recently held the All-Russian Conference on the Problems of Implementing the School Reform. In the general opinion of workers in education, it is necessary primarily to strengthen the material-technical base of village schools and vocational-technical institutes at an increased rate.

At present, many academic institutes in rural areas do not yet have at their disposal adequate plots of land or an appropriate selection of agricultural machines which would provide students with an opportunity to master equipment and cultivate crops, rather than engage in play-like experimental activity. Under such conditions there can be no question of seriously training children for work in agriculture or of cultivating a love of the land in them.

Of course, the process of resolving these great educational tasks is by no means being started from scratch. On the contrary, a considerable number of student production brigades, which make a real contribution to the social stores, have long been working in the Nonchernozem Zone. There is also no shortage of good patriotic initiatives put forward by young people. Take, for example, the movement of Kostroma students: "To the Nonchernozem Zone With a School Certificate and a Komsomol Pass"--student production brigades and teams which perform the entire cycle of agricultural work with the use of contemporary equipment work in all rural schools of general education in the oblast. But the fact of the matter is that all this is still just individual links in the future "school-land" chain which has yet to be forged by the efforts of farms, schools, institutes and the whole of society.

Even now various complex equipment worth thousands of rubles is available to every agricultural worker. With such a degree of technical saturation, the labor process makes new demands on every participant in this process.

The kolkhozes and sovkhoses incur vast losses because expensive machines and mechanisms break down before their time due to inept and irresponsible usage, and also because they have to entrust tractors or combines to untrained people--simply because often there is no one to replace them.

When pondering on the education of the rural worker one cannot fail to recall the age-old wisdom that man cannot live by bread alone. Today cultural-sports complexes are being formed in every autonomous republic and oblast in the Nonchernozem Zone which unite the resources and efforts of various detachments of the intelligentsia and ensure the best possible conditions for rural workers to engage in leisure rich in content. Statistics attest to the fact that the theaters and concert collectives in the zone annually put on thousands of shows and concerts. Picture galleries and museums of combat and labor glory are being opened in a number of villages. Let it be said directly: At one time this was only a dream.

At the same time these impressive indicators of spiritual and aesthetic growth in the Nonchernozem Zone unfortunately coexist with alarming cases of widespread drunkenness and manifestations of indifference, irresponsibility and parasitism. In a number of areas, fine traditions of popular creativity have become almost forgotten or lost, and little is done to propagandize national music, song, dance and folklore, develop handicrafts, or adorn everyday life and leisure.

Institutions of education, culture and art have a great deal to do in order to overcome cliches and formalism in cultural-educational work and to set in motion every available reserve of spiritual growth in rural areas in the process of being updated. We are right to expect a more significant creative contribution by the republic's artistic intelligentsia as well as greater attention to rural workers on the part of the press, the cinema, television and radio.

With the rapid growth in well-being and material sufficiency, the problem has arisen--unexpected for many--of an appreciable drop in the role of pecuniary

remuneration as a labor incentive. Today a milkmaid frequently earns more than a weaver, and a machine operator more than a lathe operator with medium-level qualifications. But, at the same time, on some farms there is no one to milk the cows and no one to sit behind the levers of a tractor.

Obviously scientists and sociologists, together with the most experienced practical economic workers, must more thoroughly work on drawing up recommendations on comprehensive incentives for highly productive labor. The search for new ways and forms of mutual conditionality between individual wages and the end product, and for new stimuli for increasing personal responsibility and the concern of every worker for the success of a common task and also for increasing the prestige of work in agriculture--this is a task of great importance today.

The comprehensive transformation of the Nonchernozem countryside increases still further the role of production organizers and leading soviet and economic cadres. The success of the task depends to a decisive extent on their political maturity, efficiency, adherence to principle, and competence.

The party has educated a considerable number of energetic, knowledgeable and enterprising leaders, many of whom have been decorated with high awards of the motherland and enjoy great prestige among rural workers. They have no fear of taking full responsibility upon themselves. They have a broad economic horizon which, in conjunction with socialist initiative and pleasant sharpness of wit, yields tangible results in economic and educational activities.

They have the ability to lead people, inspire faith in them as regards the success of what has been planned, and instill in each the desire to act with awareness, actively and in a proprietary manner.

This perhaps is the main thing. The style of work characteristic of the best rural leaders organically includes the need to know everything thoroughly and to boldly look ahead and, at the same time, to constantly consult with field and farm workers, trust subordinates, not fetter their initiative, and be sensitive to the people's moods and needs, while realistically taking all this into account in one's daily practical activities. Cadres such as these have been given extensive opportunities to demonstrate their abilities precisely today, when the economic potentials for intelligent economic operations have increased and the party is breaking down the barriers of conservative patterns and traditions of deciding everything through instructions and circulars from city offices.

Nevertheless how can one explain the fact that some affairs progress successfully, while others prefer to operate in the old way even in the new, changed situation? It would seem that the answers to this question should be sought primarily in the sphere of psychology, and also in the economic qualifications of leading cadres. Not everyone has immediately proved ready for increased independence or for the restructuring proved ready for increased independence or for the restructuring of the style and methods of work and leadership.

Transforming the Nonchernozem Zone and implementing the Food Program is an inalienable component part of the party's economic strategy. Of paramount importance for putting this strategy into practice is the CPSU Central Committee conference held in June on the problems of accelerating scientific-technological progress. It is an important link in work to fulfill the decision of the April 1985 Central Committee Plenum and in preparation for the 27th CPSU Congress. The proposals drawn up at the congress will have a decisive influence on the economic and social progress of our society.

Every day that goes by changes in the face of the Nonchernozem Zone for the better and confirms the indisputable correctness of the party's planned course to comprehensively renovate this vast region in the center of the country. This course is opening up broad scopes for the manifestation of human talents, for dreams, and feats of labor. There is no doubt that pursuing this course will turn the Nonchernozem Zone into a region of intensive agricultural production in our republic and will raise to new heights the economy of the kolkhozes and sovkhoses and also the social and cultural standard of living in this glorious Russian kray.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

CSO: 1802/15-F

VERIFYING WITH LENIN, GUIDED BY PARTY DEMANDS

AU180937 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 85 (signed to press 19 Jun 85)
pp 47-58

[Article by V. Chebrikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the USSR Committee for State Security]

[Text] At the present time, preparation for the 27th CPSU Congress, which will arm communists and all the working people with a program for perfecting developed socialism and will be a landmark on our path of progress toward communism is at the center of the political and ideological life of both the party and the country.

The report given by Comrade M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum determined the main aspects of preparation for the congress and revealed the chief tasks of the party's domestic and foreign policy at the contemporary stage.

The plenum decisions were given the unanimous approval of the party and the people. Communists and all the working people in both town and countryside are conducting an exacting review of their affairs, mobilizing inner reserves and channeling their creative efforts into successfully fulfilling the plan tasks of the final year and of the five-year plan as a whole, and into worthily preparing for the 27th Congress of our glorious Leninist party.

Like all Soviet people, members of the organs of the Committee for State Security carefully collate their work with contemporary party demands while preparing for the congress, comprehensively interpret and generalize experience accumulated, and map out concrete ways to most effectively fulfill the tasks facing them.

While analyzing the results of our work and determining the directions of its further perfection, we repeatedly turn to the inexhaustible Leninist ideological legacy, which reveals the laws and directions of the class struggle and of the construction of a new society and indicates the ways and means of safeguarding the security of the socialist state in the conditions of coexistence with the world of capitalism. In the treasurehouse of Leninist creative ideas we find the key to understanding not only the past, but also the complex problems of the contemporary era. V. I. Lenin's ideas on

defending the achievements of proletarian revolution have become an invaluable ideological, theoretical and methodological weapon of our party and of revolutionaries in all countries. When putting forward these ideas, Lenin relied on the theses of K. Marx and F. Engels on defending the revolution, as well as on their analysis of the cause of the defeat of the Paris Commune, one of which was that the communards failed to adopt decisive measures to suppress bourgeois resistance.

Developing these ideas further, Lenin formulated a most important thesis: Any revolution is only worth anything if it is able to defend itself. Indeed, the course of events after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution required Soviet power to adopt the most decisive and timely measures for the struggle against counterrevolution, measures which were reflected not only in the formation of the worker-peasant Red Army, but also in the formation of a special organ of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat--the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for Combatting Counterrevolution and Sabotage.

The concrete historical conditions prevailing in Russia determined the particular acuteness of the class struggle. In an attempt to suppress Soviet power, international imperialism developed large-scale intervention against the young socialist republic.

The overthrown exploitative classes unleashed civil war in the country. Internal counterrevolution utilized every possible cruel and insidious method of struggle, including armed uprisings, terror, banditism, diversions and sabotage. It was precisely for this reason, as Lenin pointed out, that Soviet power "had to realize the dictatorship of the proletariat in its most severe form" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Completed Collected Works], vol 37, p 213).

Attempts by bourgeois ideologists to present the matter in such a way that our state of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a whole, and its All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for Combatting Counterrevolution and Sabotage in particular, are made to appear the "embodiment of violence" are a gross falsification of historical facts. For the proletariat, violence is a forced measure caused by the fact that the landowners and capitalists used it first and were reach to drown the revolutionary people in blood, if only to recover their former domination over them. Lenin emphasized that "not in violence alone lies the essence of the proletarian dictatorship, nor does it lie mainly in violence" (op. cit., vol 38, p 385). Its chief aim is creative and aimed at building socialism and establishing social equality for the working people.

Lenin did not place the dictatorship of the proletariat in opposition to democracy, as various "Sovietologists" in the West claim, but in opposition to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The appearance of the Soviet Republic signified the birth of a new type of democracy--genuine democracy for the working people who, under the bourgeois system, although formally equal by law, are in fact alienated from the resolving of state affairs and serve as an object of repression by the bourgeois state.

Leninist theses on the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist democracy provided the basis for both the organization and work of the organs of the

All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for Combatting Counterrevolution and Sabotage. It is characteristic that in addition to fulfilling the function of decisively suppressing counterrevolution, they also actively participated in resolving many serious economic and social problems--the struggle against hunger and devastation, transportation stoppages, typhus epidemics, and neglected children. This clearly demonstrated the humanist nature of the activities of the Soviet organs of state security.

With the liquidation of hostile classes within the country, the center of gravity shifted from struggling against internal class enemies to struggling against the hostile intrigues and subversive activities of imperialism. Naturally this introduced vital changes in both the nature of the state tasks of safeguarding the country's security, and in the nature of the work of the organs of the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for Combatting Counterrevolution and Sabotage.

Following a long and difficult path, adhering to Leninist behests, the organs of state security made a worthy contribution to the task of defending the achievements of the revolution, to the construction of socialism, and to the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War.

Today, when our society is at the stage of developed socialism and the Soviet all-people's state expresses the will and interests of the workers, peasants, intelligentsia, and working people of every nation and nationality in our country, and when a new, historic community of people has taken shape--the Soviet people, united by their unity of interests and aims, and by the unity of their Marxist-Leninist ideology, the spearhead of the activities of the state security organs is directed against the external danger, against the hostile plans and intentions of imperialism and the intelligence-subversive actions of its special services and of foreign anti-Soviet centers.

But even under present conditions, as life has shown, cases of antistate actions are not excluded--actions by individual elements hostile to our system, who have embarked on this path under external influences, and by renegades who do not represent any classes or strata of Soviet society and act in the interests of foreign intelligence and anti-Soviet centers. The struggle against such elements is waged firmly, in full accordance with the law, but it is not of the nature of class suppression, as was true of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, but defense of our state and social system against the criminal actions of individuals.

The development of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into an all-people's socialist state signified a new stage in resolving the tasks of safeguarding state security, which has become the cause of all the people. This has been consolidated in the USSR Constitution (Article 32), which states that safeguarding the country's security is the duty of state organs, social organizations, officials and citizens. In accordance with this constitutional clause, a state system has been developed and is implemented--a system of protective measures of an organizational-political, legal, educational and other nature aimed at guarding the Soviet state and Soviet society against the subversive activities of imperialism. In the implementation of the aforementioned measures, serious responsibilities rest with the ministries and

departments, the administration of enterprises and organizations, local organs of authority and management, and official figures and citizens invested with the appropriate rights. The national nature of safeguarding state security demonstrates its thorough democracy.

Socialist democracy is characterized by the organic unity and mutual dependency of civic rights and obligations. This reflects the tenet of Marxist-Leninist theory on the mutual relations between the individual and society under socialism. Society and the state guarantee citizens extensive socioeconomic, political and personal rights and simultaneously demand of them active participation in strengthening that social and state system which ensures the reality and stability of these rights.

Hence the fundamentally important principle that citizens' exercise of their rights and freedoms must not damage the interests of society and the state, or the rights of other citizens. Bourgeois ideologists try to criticize this principle, consolidated in our constitution, and the norms of Soviet legislation based on it, which establish a system of exercising rights while taking into account state interests, considerations of state security, and protection of public order. But Soviet people consider this both democratic and just. This approach is in line with the collectivist nature of our system and reflects the fundamental fact that in our country the vital interests of society and of the individual are organically combined. The process of developing society and strengthening the state leads not to an infringement of civic rights and freedoms, but to their being increased and filled with ever richer content.

The democracy of Soviet society's political system is also fully inherent in the activities of the state security organs. These activities have a constitutional basis and are subordinated to the tasks of defending the socialist fatherland.

The party points out that as long as there exists the danger of imperialism unleashing aggression, military conflicts and provocations, it is essential to devote unremitting attention to strengthening the defense might and security of our country. Fulfilling the tasks incumbent upon them, the Soviet armed forces and the organs of state security show a high degree of vigilance and are in a state of constant readiness to cut short any intrigues on the part of imperialism.

Party directions concerning the tasks of the state security organs in contemporary conditions represent a further development of the Leninist ideas on defending the socialist state and society against the subversive activities of imperialism. They teach members of the Committee for State Security (KGB) a class approach to the phenomena of social life and serve as a reliable political compass in the struggle against the class enemy.

The main conditions of the KGB organs successfully fulfilling the tasks incumbent on them is their strict observance and consistent application of the tried and tested Leninist principles of KGB activity and of the Leninist style of work.

A most important principle of KGB activity is that of party leadership, which reliably ensures the successful implementation of the domestic and foreign policies of the Soviet state and, in particular, the strengthening of the country's security.

The leading role of the party, which is consolidated in the USSR Constitution, is an objective law of socialist construction. CPSU policy is based on the firm foundations of Marxism-Leninism, which makes it possible for it to perceive the chief aim of activity and to correctly orient itself in the complex phenomena of social life and of the international and domestic political situation. This policy meets the vital needs of Soviet society and is in the interests of the workers class and all the working people. "The party," Comrade M. S. Gorbachev points out, "is precisely that force which is capable of taking into account the interests of every class and social group, and every nation and nationality into the country, rallying them together, and mobilizing the energy of the people in the common cause of communist construction."

At the present stage of our development the leading role of the party is increasing still further. This is caused by the objective factors of both internal and world development, including the intensified struggle bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideology and morals.

Congress resolutions and other communist party documents have worked out a precise political line of activity for the state security organs, the main substance of which is dictated in contemporary conditions by the acuteness of the class struggle in the international arena and by the necessity to reliably defend Soviet society against the subversive actions of imperialist intelligence services and various foreign anti-Soviet centers, and also to decisively suppress the antistate, hostile actions of those who encroach on the interests of Soviet society and our socialist state. These party directions are strictly carried out.

While guiding the KGB organs, the party devotes constant attention to the selection, education and placement of KGB cadres and implements strict control over their fulfillment of party directives. The Leninist principle of selecting and placing KGB cadres according to their political and practical qualities are fundamental in the spheres of cadre policy. As in the first years of Soviet power, a high degree of communist conviction and selfless loyalty to the party and the people are primarily required of them. Lenin devoted a great deal of attention to educating them in the spirit of great vigilance and irreconcilability in the struggle against class enemies. While setting the task of raising the professional level of KGB members, the party demands of them thorough competence and firm mastery of the science and art of struggling against the subversive activities of the enemy. Thanks to the constant concern of the CPSU, the state security organs are brought up to full strength with mature, well-trained members. The most important units in the KGB system are filled with workers who have passed through the school of party and Komsomol work.

Further perfecting work with cadres acquires particular significance in the light of the decisions of the March and April 1985 CPSU Central Committee

plenums. The collegium and party organizations are adopting measures to increase exactingness and also to increase the responsibility of each individual for fulfillment of the task in hand and for consistent implementation of the Leninist work style. Since the times of F. E. Dzerzhinskiy, the tradition of irreconcilability toward any manifestations of moral unscrupulousness has formed within the state security organs. This tradition is carefully preserved and developed.

Great faith in the state security organs is combined with strict party control over their activities. The leadership of the party and its control are a reliable political guarantee that these activities will also henceforth be in full accordance with Leninist directions and the Leninist work style, as well as with the requirements of socialist legality and the protection of civic rights and interests.

The Soviet state security organs have always been consistently guided in their work by the Leninist principle of links with the masses and reliance on the working people. This principle has been further developed in practice since the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat grew into an all-people's state, which is reflected in the present USSR Constitution. Regarding the links with the working people as a most important and indispensable condition of KGB members' successful fulfillment of their duty, the collegium of the committee adopts measures to constantly broaden and deepen these links.

We have accumulated a wealth of experience in involving the working people in ensuring the safety and military secrets, struggling against ideological diversions and anti-Soviet manifestations, and protecting the borders of our motherland. While taking into account the specific nature of KGB work, the principle of publicity is also implemented and the population is provided with increased information on the intrigues of the class enemy and on the main tasks and aspects of activity of the KGB organs. Practice shows that the better informed the working people are on matters of state security, the more consciously and actively they involve themselves in the task of safeguarding this security. With their assistance a number of dangerous agents of the enemy's special services have been exposed, many state crimes have been prevented or stopped, and other important tasks in this sphere have been resolved.

The numerous letters and telegrams sent to the KGB, in which communists and nonparty members, workers and employees, kolkhoz workers, representatives of the intelligentsia, and army and navy soldiers warmly support the measures implemented by the KGB to suppress the activities of foreign intelligence agents and anti-Soviet manifestations on the part of renegades still encountered in our society, attest to the increased links with the working people.

Work with citizens' letters, cultivation of a Leninist attitude toward the examination of these letters, the ability to perceive the living individual behind them, and also the ability to react to them promptly and correctly is of great significance in strengthening ties with the masses. Now, when the party is pursuing a course to further comprehensively increase the initiative of the working people in production and all social affairs, this is particularly

relevant. In accordance with party requirements the USSR KGB Collegium is adopting measures for the strict observance of the established system of examining citizens' oral and written appeals and for the prevention of elements of formalism and red tape in this responsible political matter.

KGB members actively participate in work conducted by party organs to increase the political vigilance of Soviet people, systematically deliver lectures at enterprises and institutions, hold talks in labor collectives, and make extensive use of the potentials of the press, radio and television for this purpose. In the conditions of the exacerbated international situation the significance of this work increases. Intensified class vigilance and a determined rebuff to any manifestations incompatible with communist ideology and the norms of our morals is required of every citizen. Increasing political vigilance is an important condition in safeguarding the security of our socialist state and Soviet society.

Leninist directions on the observance of socialist legality are of principled significance for the activities of the state security organs. As is well known, Lenin devoted a great deal of attention to legal issues and personally participated in drawing up many legislative and other normative acts. Such attention is understandable. The law, like the state, is an important instrument in establishing and developing new social relations.

Bourgeois ideologists allege that the dictatorship of the proletariat is at variance with the regime of law. These fabrications have nothing in common with reality. Soviet power abolished the old, bourgeois laws aimed at oppressing and suppressing the working people. Bourgeois law and order was also liquidated when the bourgeois state machine was dismantled. But Lenin was a most zealous advocate of strictly observing the new laws, which express the interests of the working people. He pointed that "it is essential to religiously observe the laws and injunctions of Soviet power...." "op. cit., vol 39, p 155) and he was irreconcilable to even the slightest deviations from them.

V. I. Lenin attached a great deal of importance to the problems of legally regulating the organization and activities of the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for Combatting Counterrevolution and Sabotage, directly participated in resolving these problems demanded its organs' observance and the law, and pointed out the necessity for the strict class nature of the repressive measures it adopted while taking into account both the domestic and foreign political situation.

Perfecting developed socialism is inconceivable without consistently strengthening the legal basis of state and social life. The importance of strictly observing socialist law and ensuring law and order is increasing still further. The state organs, the party points out, are bound to wage the most determined struggle against criminality and to do everything necessary to prevent violations of the law and the causes of these violations. The functions and tasks of the state security organs are clearly defined while taking into account these party directions and the stipulations of the USSR Constitution. The KGB has done a great deal of work to perfect the legal regulation of various aspects of KGB activity. The USSR KGB Collegium has

established strict control over observance of the requirements of legislative and other normative acts. Also in accordance with the Constitution, our work is supervised by the Procurator's Office.

The demand that socialist law be observed signifies unconditional protection of civic rights and interests, and the inadmissibility of their being violated. At the same time this means that the state security organs are bound to determinedly suppress, in strict accordance with the law, the actions of those persons who encroach on our system and commit particularly dangerous and other state crimes. We are guided totally by their requirements.

Soviet KGB members conduct their work against enemy subversive activities in close contact with security organs in other countries of the socialist community. This cooperation is one of the manifestations of socialist internationalism, which characterizes the relations between our fraternal parties and states. In the conditions where imperialism's aggressiveness has increased and the scale of the intelligence-subversive activities of U.S. special services and those of their NATO allies has also increased, this cooperation acquires even greater significance. On the basis of corresponding agreements, ties between the state security organs of our fraternal countries are becoming stronger and the forms of their cooperation in the struggle against the class enemy are being perfected.

In all of their activities the USSR KGB organs are strictly guided by the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and of subsequent Central Committee plenums. The work of the KGB is characterized by boundless loyalty to the CPSU and the socialist motherland, irreconcilability toward the class enemy, a party approach to the vital problems of safeguarding state security, consideration of the laws of development of Soviet society and the class struggle in the international arena, democracy and legality, a creative attitude toward the cause, personal responsibility for the sector with which it has been entrusted, and control and verification of fulfillment.

The KGB has developed and consistently implements a long-term, scientifically substantiated program of action to defend the Soviet state and social system against the intelligence-subversive activities of the enemy. A great contribution to the development and practical implementation of this program and to the instilling of bolshevik fervor in KGB work was made by Yu. V. Andropov, who headed the KGB for 15 years.

In the international arena the Soviet Union acts in defense of peaceful, constructive coexistence and for equal and mutually advantageous cooperation between states irrespective of their social systems. Our struggle for the people's peaceful future and for the prevention of a thermonuclear catastrophe is in the interests of the whole of mankind. The experience of the 1970s demonstrated the possibility and the necessity of reducing international tension as an important stage on the way to the reliable and comprehensive international security system.

At the same time, one has to take account of the fact that, as yet, the NATO countries do not agree to limiting the arms race or to taking joint actions to lessen the threat of a nuclear war. Imperialism, and primarily American

imperialism, has set itself the aim of gaining military-strategic superiority, pushing aside socialism, and suppressing the people's liberation movement. In an attempt to take social revenge, restore its lost positions and dictate its will to states and people, it acts roughly and without ceremony, trampling on their sovereignty and flouting the norms of international law.

While accelerating the intelligence-subversive activities of their services against the socialist countries and all progressive forces, the imperialist states strive to impart a total nature to these activities. To these ends they use various methods and the entire arsenal of "secret war" resources, from those that are concealed by the "fig leaf" of philanthropy, as is the case with the so-called Peace Corps, to those that are openly diversionary in nature with the broad participation of paid hirelings and murderers and policies of state terrorism.

The class enemy strives to influence every sphere of our social life. Foreign intelligence agents try to find out political, military, economic and scientific-technological secrets and nurture various plans for espionage and other actions. Terrorist methods are systematically applied in relation to Soviet institutions and citizens abroad.

One of the main forms of subversive activity against the USSR in contemporary conditions is ideological diversion. This is elevated to the rank of state policy by the ruling circles in imperialist countries. This primarily applies to the U.S. Administration, the representatives of which are the herald of the most frenzied anticommunists and urge a "crusade" against socialism. The organs of legislative power in this country officially allocated vast sums to support radio stations broadcasting subversive propaganda against other countries, to carry out so-called "secret operations," including the bribery of workers in the mass information media so that they assist in the disinformation of the public, and also to implement other forms of subversive activities in the sphere of ideology. A whole "intelligence association," the chief role in which is played by the CIA, engages in this.

The increased scale on which the United States and other bourgeois states use their special services in the struggle on the ideological front and, incidentally, also in other areas is by no means a chance phenomenon. It is closely bound up with the general directions and trends of development of capitalist society at its imperialist stage which, as Lenin pointed out, is characterized by a turning away from democracy toward political reaction (op. cit., vol 30, p 73), which is particularly clearly manifested today.

In conditions where the general crisis of capitalism is deepening further, its social contradictions are intensifying, and the people's anti-imperialist struggle is increasing, the ruling financial oligarchy is yielding its role in domestic and foreign policy to an increasing extent to such direct instruments of class domination as the army, the police, and also the special services. The latter are particularly convenient for this purpose because, by operating in conditions of secrecy, they are virtually beyond the control of representative organs and are not restricted in their choice of methods.

In an attempt to justify the practice of ideological diversions, some bourgeois ideologists and political figures refer to the fact that the CPSU, they say, considers ideological struggle a natural phenomenon. But ideological struggle and ideological diversion are not synonymous. Yes, ideological struggle is a natural law connected with the existence of opposite classes, world outlooks, and social systems; a struggle which, by virtue of its objective nature, one can neither end nor eliminate. This is not an obstacle to normal political relations between states with different social systems, provided there is observance of the generally recognized norms of international law, and, in particular, of such fundamental principles as respect for sovereignty and noninterference in one another's internal affairs. These norms and principles are immediately flouted when the forces of imperialist reaction resort to forms and methods of action known as ideological diversion. This is aimed at undermining the social and state system existing in socialist countries, is implemented by specially organized services, and is conducted by the most unscrupulous means. All this determines its unlawful, immoral nature.

Attempts by representatives of special services of bourgeois states and by emissaries of various "leagues," "committees," and other subversive centers abroad to illegally bring anti-Soviet literature into our country, establish conspiratorial links with hostile elements for the purpose of inciting them to antistate activities, and so forth are criminal actions, responsibility for which is stipulated by our criminal legislation. These actions are also illegal from the point of view of international law.

Attempts by bourgeois propaganda to whitewash these actions by referring to the clauses of the Helsinki Final Act which relate to cooperation in the sphere of contacts between people, information, culture and education are completely untenable. The agreements reached in Helsinki, if one is not to distort their meaning, are aimed at developing cooperation, not at subversive activity. The Final Act clearly states that the signatory states will refrain from any interference, be it direct or indirect, individual or collective, in the domestic or foreign affairs within the competence of another signatory state, irrespective of their mutual relations.

Imperialist ideological diversion serves as one of the manifestations of the crisis in bourgeois ideology. "When the ideological influence of the bourgeoisie on the workers wanes, is undermined and weakens," Lenin pointed out, "the bourgeoisie everywhere and always has resorted and will continue to resort to the most desperate lies and slander" (op. cit., vol 25, p 352). Unable to put forward any positive ideas capable of seizing the imagination of the masses, the contemporary monopolist bourgeoisie has made anticommunism its main ideological-political weapon, the chief substance of which lies in unrestrained slander against real socialists and falsification of the policies and aims of communist parties and the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. Thus it vainly strives to slow the devaluation of bourgeois ideas among the masses and to hold back the process of growth in their class consciousness and the implementation of social changes in the nonsocialist part of the world, on the one hand and, by exerting a corrosive influence on the awareness of the working people, to shake the ideological foundations of society in the

socialist countries with the aim of bringing about its internal "erosion," on the other.

As facts gleaned by us in the course of struggling against imperialist ideological diversion show, the class enemy is increasing the scale of this diversion, striving to spread its subversive activities to every form of social awareness--politics and sense of justice, philosophy, morals, science, art and religion. The method to which it resorts in this respect are becoming increasingly refined and insidious. They are differentiated so as to influence both social and individual awareness, as well as the mass psychology. Ideological diversionists try to utilize the tenacity of old views, customs, morals and so forth. They impudently speculate on the problems of our development and on certain unresolved tasks and shortcomings, giving them a distorted interpretation.

Speculation centering on the human rights theme is one of the favorite methods of ideological diversionists. The principle of respect for human rights is consolidated in the UN Charter. It has been further developed in a series of subsequent documents and resolutions adopted within the framework of the United Nations, in particular in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Pact on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the International Pact on Civic and Political Rights. Important clauses relating to this issue and considered an organic conjunction with the fundamental principles of interstate relations are contained in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Soviet Union has put its signature to all of them and strictly upholds them. It upholds them not only as a political obligation that it has taken upon itself, but also because citizens' democratic rights and the comprehensive development of the individual reflect the nature of our social system.

The very appearance of the aforementioned documents became possible in the new historical situation characterized by an increase in the influence of the forces of socialism, democracy and peace on international relations.

Democratic principles in international law, including those relating to human rights, have been established and developed primarily due to the struggle waged by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for their international recognition. As far as imperialism is concerned, it has resisted this process in every possible way. Suffice it to say that the United States, the ruling circles of which try to pass themselves off as champions of "human rights," has not yet ratified many international pacts adopted dozens of years ago. But even in those cases where, in view of the new correlation of forces in the world arena, the bourgeois states have had to make a move toward recognizing democratic norms and principles, they have often sabotaged their implementation in practice. They attempt to justify this policy with the aid of various tricks and deceptions, while distorting the real nature of international norms in defense of human rights.

This is attested to by the slanderous campaign waged by bourgeois propaganda in connection with human rights violations that allegedly occur in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Since the organizers of this variety of subversive activity against the socialist countries appeal to the norms of

international law, anyone who wishes to investigate the essence of the matter can turn to the appropriate documents and convince himself that Soviet legislation is in strict accordance with international pacts of human rights. The requirements emanating from these pacts are strictly observed by the state organs.

Which "violations" are envisaged here by bourgeois propagandists? Most frequently of all, judicial and administrative measures applied in accordance with our legislation to persons who have committed crimes or other unlawful acts are given out as just such violations. Certain requirements connected with safeguarding state security are also represented as "violations." But, one may ask, in what war are human rights involved in this connection? Such measures adopted by sovereign states in no way run counter to international legal documents on human rights, including the CSCE Final Act.

Thus it is not a matter of legal norms and principles, but a question of certain persons in the West wishing to go against these norms and principles and establish without prior arrangement, so to speak, the practice of interfering in our internal affairs and gain the opportunity to freely incite and direct the activities of hostile elements against the Soviet state and social system. In reality it is not a question of "defending human rights" or being concerned that international legal norms and principles be observed, but of undermining them. Naturally, such attempts have been exposed and suppressed, and this will continue to be the case.

While on the subject of the infamous campaign "in defense of human rights," it should be emphasized that its essence does not lie in legal phrasemongering. Its aim and main substance are determined by the fact that it is a component part of the policies of international imperialism, primarily American imperialism, directed against socialism and all forces of social progress. The garb of "defenders" of the rights and interests of the man on the street is donned by those who throw tens of millions of unemployed out on the streets, wage an offensive against the social achievements of the working people, persecute the trade unions, cultivate and defend racism and apartheid, discriminate against progressively minded people by means of public employment bans, and, finally, encroach on the basic right of every individual--his right to life--by whipping up the arms race and pushing mankind to the brink of nuclear catastrophe. It is not human rights, but the interests of the ruling elite that are looked after by bourgeois ideologists and the various hangers-on and lackeys who are fed on the leftovers from the master's table and who pontificate on subversive "radio waves." In this lies the real class essence of imperialism's infamous campaign in connection with "the defense of human rights."

As long as two world social systems--socialism and capitalism--stand in opposition to one another in the international arena, an intense class and ideological struggle will be waged. We can see that this struggle is developing across the entire front of opposition between socialism and capitalism, including problems connected with human rights. Of course, we have our own interpretation of these rights, which is based on the liberation of the working people from exploitation and establishment of the principle of social justice. But we recognize the great significance of those democratic

rights which the working people in bourgeois countries have succeeded in gaining during their stubborn struggle against the oppression of capital. We also value the democratic principles established in international law as a result of socialist countries entering the world arena and other progressive forces becoming more broadly involved in international life. Struggling against bourgeois ideology and its concepts and views, we not only refute slander against our Soviet way of life, but also to help to increasingly spread among the masses a scientific, Marxist-Leninist view of the conditions of the real liberation of the working man and the comprehensive development of the individual.

Despite all the contrivances of ideological diversionists, they cannot and will never be able to achieve their aims. Their actions are smashed against the hard granite of Soviet society's moral-political unity, the close cohesion of the Soviet people around the communist party, and the high degree of awareness and patriotism of our people. This can be said with full justification of the absolute majority of our citizens, and only some politically immature individuals swallow the bait of bourgeois misinformers and liars and believe their cunningly woven tales of the imaginary advantages of the bourgeois way of life. Sometimes these people become spreaders of imperialist slander and all kinds of rumors about the bad state of affairs in socialist society.

In the struggle against ideological diversion the organs of state security direct their blows against the organizers of this diversion--the special services and anti-Soviet centers. The subversive actions of the enemy are suppressed by KGB means. Their failure, however, must not weaken our vigilance. We cannot underestimate the fact that foreign emissaries sometimes also find such people who, falling under their influence, embark on the path of direct anti-Soviet activities. We regard as our main task preventing cases such as these. In this respect the KGB organs give maximum attention to those who have accidentally stumbled and lost their way, by applying preventive, educational measures and thereby preventing the very possibility of their committing state crimes.

The problems of the prerequisites and causes of various antisocial actions are the subject of careful study. Under the leadership of the party organs, KGB members find answer to these problems in conjunction with other state organs and ideological institutions in the country, and develop the necessary measures together with them.

While conducting the ideological and educational work, the party emphasizes the necessity to decisively rebuff any intrigues on the part of imperialist reaction and to conduct offensive foreign policy propaganda and counterpropaganda. Soviet KGB members make their own contribution to this important party task.

In the light of tasks set by the party in the struggle for peace and social progress, workers in the state security organs are even more deeply aware of the necessity to further improve the standard of their work, and they strive to keep sight of the entire complex of problems of safeguarding the country's

security, increase their vigilance, and do everything to promptly expose the aggressive plans of imperialism.

Hostile circles in the West try in every way possible to blacken and discredit the state security organs in the USSR and other socialist countries. It is clear to us, communists, that, acting thus, the enemy pursues totally definite class aims and hopes to weaken the effectiveness of our measures to protect Soviet society against its intrigues. Vladimir Ilich once responded to bourgeois cries about the "atrocities" of the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for Combatting Counterrevolution and Sabotage by saying: "Gentlemen capitalists, Russian and foreign! We know that this institution is not to your liking. How could it be! It was able to parry your intrigues and your machinations as no one else could, in a situation in which you were suffocating us, where you surrounded us with invasions, where you set up internal conspiracies and did not stop at any crime..." (op. cit., Vol 44, pp 327-328). The imperialists have been unable to change and have not changed their attitude toward the Soviet state security organs even today. For us this is an indicator that we are on the right path and are doing what is necessary for the party and the people.

Preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress is progressing in the party and the country. Workers in the state security organs are concentrating their attention on problems as yet unresolved and are outlining ways to increase the efficiency of their activities so that they fully correspond to the high demands of the contemporary stage of our social development.

Communist KGB members warmly supported the decisions of the March and April 1985 CPSU Central Committee plenums and the speeches by Comrade M. S. Gorbachev given at them, which revealed the strategic party line to accelerate the country's socioeconomic development and perfect every aspect of social life and reflected the inflexible determination of the CPSU and the Soviet state to firmly adhere to the Leninist course of peace and progress. The tasks set by the party presuppose and require an increase in the activeness of all political and social institutions, a deepening of socialist democracy and the perfection of the state apparatus and all administrative units.

Hence emanate important conclusions for the activities of the state security organs at every level. A Leninist work style, close, practical links with labor collectives and social organizations, emphasis on preventive measures, active participation in people's communist education and in raising their political and legal standard, strict fulfillment of laws and, the main thing, strict fulfillment of party directives and instructions--such are the high demands by which Soviet KGB members are guided.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985.

CSO: 1802/15-F

LENIN AND THE 'AWAKENING OF ASIA'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 85 (signed to press 19 Jun 85) pp 59-65

[Article by Nguyen Thi Thu and Nguyen Anh Thai. Slightly abridged reprint from the journal NGIEN KYU LIT SHY ("Historical Research") No 5, 1984]

[Text] Unquestionably, the Russian Revolution of 1905-1907, the first people's revolution in the epoch of imperialism, was of tremendous international significance and had a powerful revolutionizing impact on the upsurge of the national liberation struggle on the Asian and other continents. As V. I. Lenin justifiably pointed out, it "triggered a movement throughout Asia. The revolutions in Turkey, Persia and China prove that the powerful 1905 uprising left deep marks and that its influence, detected in the forward movement of hundreds and hundreds of millions of people, is ineradicable" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 30, p 326). In addressing the Stuttgart Congress of the Second International, B. R. Kama, the noted leader of the Indian national liberation movement, bluntly stated that the day was not far when the peoples of Southern Asia "would awaken and follow the example of our comrades in Russia, to whom we send our special fraternal greetings."

As we know, Lenin actively participated in the work of this congress, during which there were sharp clashes between the revolutionary and opportunistic trends in the international social democratic movement. The debates on the colonial problem were particularly irreconcilable. A number of delegates justified the enslavement of colonial peoples by imperialism, speaking of some kind of "civilizing mission" of capitalism in the colonies and arguing the possibility of having a "socialist colonial policy." With his entire typical passion Lenin attacked this erroneous and profoundly harmful view. His struggle was successful, for by majority vote the congress rejected the opportunistic viewpoint.

After the congress, the colonial problem and the problem of national liberation became targets of constant attention and research to the great leader of the proletariat. He read a number of books and other materials and used all opportunities to obtain news of events in the Orient. He asked about the situation in other countries in his meetings with revolutionaries coming to Europe. Years of difficult theoretical and practical work and struggle against hostile and erroneous views enabled Lenin to write a series of

articles on the "awakening of Asia," which were published in various bolshevik newspapers between 1908 and 1913. They became a kind of draft for the formulation of the theory of the national liberation revolution.

The first article which Lenin wrote was entitled "Flammable Material in World Politics." It was published in the 5 August 1908 issue of the newspaper PROLETARIY (see op. cit., vol 17, p 174). In this article Lenin analyzed the political situation in Asian and European countries. He paid particular attention to the situation in large Asian countries such as India, Persia, Turkey and China. In his analysis of the situation in India, Vladimir Ilich wrote that "in India as well the proletariat has already reached the stage of conscious political mass struggle" (op. cit., vol 17, p 179). Despite the scarcity of factual data on development processes in China, he was able to predict scientifically that "the transformation of the old Chinese rebellions into a conscious democratic movement is inevitable" (ibid.). In Persia, where Russia and England were helping the reaction to suppress the revolution, a complex situation had developed. However, Lenin clearly identified the forces which could prevent the imperialist division of this country. Although the revolution in Turkey had achieved no more than partial results, he expressed his confidence in its future, for the participants in the revolution had attended the "school of civil war" and their class awareness had been awakened. In analyzing and assessing the revolutionary situation in Asian and European countries, Lenin pointed out the interconnection between events in Europe and Asia. He said that they constituted the common front of the international anti-imperialist struggle. Unlike most leaders of the European social democrats, who had failed to notice the appearance of new forces in Asia, Lenin was the first to reach the wise political and theoretical conclusion that a new stage was beginning in the national liberation movement: the involvement of colonial and semicolonial peoples in the world revolutionary process. He wrote that "the European conscious worker already has Asian comrades, and the number of such comrades will be growing not by the day but by the hour" (op. cit., vol 17, p 179). Consequently, he pointed out, the internationalization of the class and national liberation struggle leads, on the one hand, to the strengthening of international reaction and, on the other, the formation of an alliance between proletarian and national liberation movements. By that time the concept of proletarian internationalism was beginning to expand. Lenin also assessed the class enemy. "The Russian Revolution," he wrote, "has a great international ally both in Europe and Asia. However, and precisely as a consequence of this, it has not only a national, not only a Russian, but an international enemy as well" (op. cit., vol 17, p 182).

Together with the struggle for social change waged by the working class in the developed capitalist countries, the revolutionary democratic struggle in Asia was joining the universal movement toward socialism. Lenin formulated a viewpoint totally different from the views held by the leaders of the Second International on the subject of colonial policy.

In October 1908 he completed his article: "Events in the Balkans and in Asia," in which he described the situation as follows: the essence of what is now taking place in the Balkans, in Turkey and in Persia may be reduced to a counterrevolutionary coalition of European countries against growing democracy

in Asia" (op. cit., vol 17, p 222). Lenin indicated the reasons for this policy: the European bourgeoisie feared that the victory of the revolution in Oriental countries would, in turn, encourage the revolutionary movement in Russia and the European countries. In particular, Lenin discussed in this article the influence of the Russian Revolution on the revolutionary movement in Asia and formulated the concept of "awakening Asia." He wrote that "the awakening of Asian peoples to political life was given particular impetus by the Russo-Japanese war and the Russian Revolution" (op. cit., vol 17, p 221).

As predicted by Lenin, the Xinhai revolution broke out in China after the revolutions in Turkey and Iran.

On 29 December 1911, the Congress of Revolutionary Representatives of 17 Chinese Provinces proclaimed the overthrow of the Manchu Dynasty and the establishment of the Republic of China and elected Sun Yat-sen its provisional president. The RSDWP immediately announced its support of the Chinese revolution. The 6th All-Russian RSDWP Conference, which was held in Prague in January 1912, passed two resolutions on Asia: one condemning the policy of the Russian government, a policy of military interference in Persia, and another on the Chinese revolution. The text of both documents had been drafted by Lenin personally. On the question of the Chinese revolution it stated that "the conference...notes the worldwide significance of the revolutionary struggle waged by the Chinese people, bringing liberation to Asia and undermining the domination of the European bourgeoisie, and welcomes the revolutionary republicans in China and testifies to the deep enthusiasm and total sympathy with which the Russian proletariat is following the successes of the revolutionary people in China and condemns the behavior of Russian liberalism, which supports a policy of tsarist conquest." Lenin paid tremendous attention to the revolutionary ideas in China. He read in a foreign newspaper the article by Sun Yat-sen in which the Chinese revolutionary expressed his views, and decided to translate it. In its 28 July 1912 issue the bolshevik newspaper NEVSKAYA ZVEZDA published Sun Yat-sen's article "The Social Significance of the Chinese Revolution," side by side with Lenin's article "Democracy and Populism in China." This article played a particular role in the process of the development of Lenin's theory of the national liberation revolution. The ideas it presented were of a fundamental nature and were developed and supplemented in a number of Lenin's subsequent works. The article emphasized, above all, respect for and a high appreciation of Sun Yat-sen's activities and his revolutionary democratic views. Vladimir Ilich wrote: "Each stroke in Sun Yat-sen's platform is imbued with militant and sincere democratism; we are presented with a truly great ideology of a truly great people" (op. cit., vol 21, p 401). At the same time, he criticized Sun Yat-sen's populist illusions and did not fail to note the contradictions in the views of this revolutionary. He pointed out that they originated from a strictly class foundation. Lenin analyzed the class nature of the democratic movement in the Asian countries. He said that while the bourgeoisie in the Western countries had become reactionary and that its gravedigger--the proletariat--had risen to its full height in front of it, the Asian bourgeoisie was heterogeneous, for which reason it was necessary accurately to assess which part of it was able to engage in revolutionary creativity and what forces were its social support. He wrote that "the main representative or main social support of this Asian bourgeoisie, which is

still capable of historically progressive action, is the peasantry" (op. cit., vol 21, p 402). In his view, the key to a successful revolution was the active efforts, decisiveness and daring of the broad peasant masses. Lenin ended his article with the optimistic assertion that with the development of capitalism in China the working class will grow and establish its own social democratic party.

In its 8 November 1912 issue, PRAVDA published another article by Lenin, "Renovated China," in which, on the basis of new data, he defined more clearly the motive forces of the revolution: "China's freedom was gained through the alliance between peasant democracy and the liberal bourgeoisie" (op. cit., vol 22, p 191). However, he was concerned by this alliance, asking "would the peasants, not led by the party of the proletariat, be able to retain their democratic position against the liberals, who are only waiting for a convenient moment to turn to the right..." (op. cit., vol 22, p 191). What is unquestionable, however, is that Lenin had faith in the power of the people's masses and the future of the Chinese revolution.

It was at that time that the leader of the world proletariat wrote the work: "The Historical Fate of Karl Marx's Doctrine," in which he bluntly raised the question of the possibility and necessity of applying Marxism in analyzing events in Asia. Lenin divided the stage of world history since the appearance of Marxism into three main periods and emphasized the significance of the third in connection with the "opening of a new source of greatest possible world tempests" (op. cit., vol 23, p 3). He also noted the tremendous impact of the revolution in Asia: "Today we are living precisely in an age of such tempests and their 'whiplash' in Europe" (op. cit., vol 23, p 3).

Lenin continued to follow closely the development of the Chinese revolution even after Yuan Shikay came to power. In his article "The Party Struggle in China," carried by PRAVDA in its 3 May 1913 issue, he pointed out that Sun Yat-sen's party had been unable to involve sufficiently in the revolution the broad masses of the Chinese people. The proletariat in China was extremely weak, for which reason there was no progressive class which could engage in a decisive and conscious struggle for carrying out a democratic revolution to the end. Without a proletarian leader the peasantry was terribly cowed, passive, ignorant and politically indifferent" (op. cit., vol 23, p 139). Lenin drew a number of important conclusions on the nature of national liberation revolutions under the conditions of absolute imperialist domination, based on the example of the Chinese revolution. He pointed out that the participation of the broad popular masses is a decisive prerequisite for the victory of the revolution, for this not only increases the power and scope of the revolution but is also a manifestation of the vital strength and solidity of the new system. However, the masses must have a firm leader--a progressive class. The proletariat alone could be such a class. Consequently, after analyzing the revolutionary events in Asia, in China in particular, Lenin gradually reached the conclusion of the need for proletarian leadership. However, he highly rated Sun Yat-sen's merits and activities: putting into motion and involving in politics increasingly broader masses of the Chinese peasantry, Sun Yat-sen's party is thus becoming (to the extent to which this involvement takes place) a great factor in the progress of Asia and mankind" (op. cit., vol 23, p 140).

Soon afterwards, in his article "Backward Europe and Progressive Asia," once again Lenin noted the mass nature of the Asian revolutionary democratic movement. "Hundreds of millions of people are awakening to life, light and freedom" (op. cit., vol 23, p 157). In emphasizing the importance of solidarity and international relations between the national liberation movement and the struggle waged by the working class in Europe, Vladimir Ilich wrote: "...All of young Asia, hundreds of millions of working people in Asia, have a reliable ally in the proletariat of all civilized countries" (op. cit., p 23, p 167). Therefore, the thesis of the international nature of the worker and national liberation movements was developed further. It was no longer a question of ties between the revolution in Russia and individual democratic revolutions, as had been the case in 1908, when Lenin wrote the article "Flammable Material in World Politics." The upsurge of the international revolutionary movement and the revolutionary consciousness of the working class in Europe and among the Asian peoples enabled him to speak of the solidarity between "the proletariat of all civilized countries" and "all of young Asia." The series of articles on the national liberation movement in Asia was completed with the article "The Awakening of Asia," which appeared in PRAVDA in May 1913. Lenin wrote this work after reading the article by the Dutch left-wing social democrat Van Ravestein on the awakening of Indonesia. The spreading of the revolutionary movement to Indonesia was clear proof of the awakening of the entire Asian continent. Admiring the spreading revolutionary movement in Asia, Lenin used the title of the article to assert his viewpoint on the subject. In his work he most clearly substantiated the place of the 1905 Russian Revolution in the "awakening of Asia." Finally, he formulated the most important theoretical thesis to the effect that "the awakening of Asia and the beginning of the struggle for power by the progressive proletariat in Europe marked a new era in world history, started at the turn of the 20th century" (op. cit., vol 23, p 146). This thesis may be considered a first step to the formulation of the theory of the two flows in the world revolutionary process: the awakening national liberation movement in Asia and the struggle waged by the working class in Europe. The merger of these two flows in the anti-imperialist struggle, which developed after the 1905 Revolution in Russia, marked the beginning of a new historical stage in the progressive development of mankind.

The series of articles on "awakening Asia," written at the time of revolutionary upsurge on the Asian continent, was Lenin's tremendous contribution to the creation and enrichment of the theory of the national liberation movement and helped the revolutionary forces in Asia, including us, the Vietnamese, to become aware of our revolutionary possibilities and to gain a certain experience in the further development of the national liberation struggle.

These works by Lenin provide a scientific analysis of the revolutionary events in Asia in the period following the 1905 Russian Revolution and point out their tremendous importance to the global revolutionary process. This was the voice of the leader of the Russian proletariat supporting the just struggle of oriental peoples.

Lenin was the first to realize that the old feudal-style mutinies in Asia had yielded to movements headed by progressive social forces and that under certain historical conditions bourgeois democracy could make a revolution and achieve progressive reforms in Asia. He reached the conclusion that this was a new force involved in the world revolutionary process and that the European proletariat had new Asian comrades.

Lenin was also the first to formulate the most important concept of the unbreakable link between the national liberation movement in Asian countries and the struggle waged by the European and North American proletariat for socialism. He pointed out that the bourgeois democratic movement of Asian peoples is anti-imperialist in nature, which makes it the ally and reserve of the proletarian movement. That is precisely why the proletarian revolutionaries standing on the grounds of political realism should support bourgeois democratic and national liberation revolutions.

Based on the scientific analysis and the existence of ties between the national liberation movements and the struggle waged by the European proletariat, Lenin drew the conclusion that a new stage had been initiated in the world revolutionary process with the 1905 Russian Revolution. He profoundly substantiated the influence of the Russian Revolution on the revolution in Asia; he pointed out that the revolution in Russia and the national liberation movement in Asia are inseparably linked, for the important problems which the Russian Revolution had to resolve were also problems facing the revolutions in Asia. Lenin emphasized that "the Russian Revolution inaugurated the age of democratic revolution throughout Asia and now 800 million people have become participants in the democratic movement of the entire civilized world (op. cit., vol 20, p 388). Therefore, the struggle waged by the proletariat in Europe and North America for socialism and the national liberation struggle form two flows in the world revolutionary process. They support each other and merge within a force which acts jointly against the common enemy--imperialism. At that time the second flow--the national liberation movement--was only beginning to take shape. The national liberation revolutions were defeated. However, they confirmed that the peoples on the Asian continent were awakening and that Asia had brought into the political arena new revolutionary forces worthy of being the allies of the European proletariat.

The "awakening of Asia," was a period of rehearsals, of preparing the forces for the national liberation movement to develop actively and achieve major victories after 1917, under the direct influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution. After World War II, the victory of the revolutions in Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, China, Korea, India, Indonesia, Afghanistan and dozens of other countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, led many new countries to the paths of socialist development and to imperialism's loss of its basic strategic positions. Today the national liberation movement has become a powerful and deep current which no reactionary forces can stop. This great stream continues to make an exceptionally important contribution to the radical changes in the appearance of the world and "mankind's shift from the capitalist to the socialist orbit" (see Le Duan, "Energetically Forward Under the Great Banner of the October Revolution." Shi That, Hanoi, 1977, p 81). This concept backs even further Lenin's epoch-making prediction of the power

of the national liberation movement which he recognized from the moment of its birth.

The leader of the Great October Revolution displayed his outstanding revolutionary genius by properly assessing the role of the peasantry in the Asian revolutionary movement. At a time when many Western Marxists considered the peasantry a "reactionary mass without revolutionary potential," Lenin's discovery was of tremendous revolutionary importance. This idea was formed on the basis of a profound understanding of the revolutionary situation in Asia. The revolutions in Persia, Turkey and China proved that by the turn of the 20th century the national liberation movement in Asia was not proletarian in nature. It was a political reality which the Marxists neither could nor had a right to ignore. Under Russian conditions, where a militant proletariat and its Marxist party had been established, Lenin claimed, "any party which would base the revolutionary nature of its movement on the revolutionary moods of the peasantry would be insane" (op. cit., vol 4, p 229). The situation was entirely different in the Asian countries: there was either no proletariat or the proletariat could not become a significant revolutionary force, for which reason the peasantry was the largest army of revolutionary forces and the foundation of the social support of the bourgeoisie. Revolutionary practice proved, Lenin pointed out, that under the leadership of the bourgeoisie the peasantry cannot become a firm revolutionary force. Therefore, in analyzing the reasons for the defeat of the Chinese revolution, on the basis of the actual events, he pointed out that the peasantry was not headed by the progressive class--the proletariat. Despite the fact that the bourgeoisie remained a progressive force, revolutionary practice had proved its limitations as a leader of the revolution. Under the conditions of colonial rule, the Asian bourgeoisie, as a progressive factor, could not be and was not consistently revolutionary. The proletariat alone could lead the national liberation revolution and take it to final and definitive victory. Proletarian leadership can raise the national liberation revolution to the level of a proletarian revolution.

The decades which separate us from the time Vladimir Ilich wrote these outstanding works do not diminish even by an iota their relevance today. Basic problems, such as the leading role of the proletariat in the national liberation revolution, and the limited nature and hesitancy of the bourgeoisie in leading the national liberation movement, as well as the important role played by the peasantry in the revolution and the close and inseparable ties between the national liberation movement and the international proletarian revolution, etc. continue to be causes of excitement and sharp debates. They are a testing stone, for their solution determines the outcome of the national liberation revolution in the individual countries and regions. From the very first days of the "awakening of Asia" to the present, the oppressed peoples are becoming increasingly grateful to the great Lenin for his historical merits. In our days the Vietnamese people are becoming increasingly aware of Lenin's tremendous exploit and the tremendous exploit of Ho Chi Minh, Lenin's outstanding student, performed for the sake of the victory of the Vietnamese revolution.

In studying Lenin's articles on the "awakening of Asia" we learn from the great leader of the proletariat the method for the study and analysis of

historical events. Lenin never separated one event from another. Whether major or minor, he always analyzed them in their interconnection with the general situation of the period, thanks to which the reader could easily find the place of such events in the general process of historical development. On the other hand, any event, significant or insignificant, or whether it developed in a simple or complex manner, the most important thing to Lenin was immediately to understand its nature at the initial stage, within the framework of the common trends and laws of historical development.... Years have passed, but the great Leninist ideas, which became a priceless legacy of mankind, live eternally. His ideas on the national liberation revolution have always been and will remain the "magic source" for the peoples fighting for liberation, for, as Comrade Ho Chi Minh wrote, to all oppressed and subjugated peoples Lenin is a turning point in the painful history of their rightless existence and a symbol of a new bright future.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/15

GREATNESS OF THE IMMORTAL LENIN

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 85 (signed to press 19 Jun 85) pp 66-68

[Article by Radjeshvar Rao, secretary general of the National Council of the Communist Party of India]

[Text] The editors asked Comrade Rao to answer questions on the role which V. I. Lenin and Leninism played in his development as a communist and on the struggle waged by the Communist Party of India for social progress, peace and socialism. Following are his answers.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to share with the readers of KOMMUNIST thoughts of the eternally living Lenin on the occasion of the 115th anniversary of his birth. I deem it an honor to express my feelings for this giant, who headed the first victorious socialist revolution in history, a revolution which inaugurated a new era for mankind.

I was born in a prosperous peasant family. My brother was several years older. From early adolescence we were concerned with two problems: first, the poverty in which the working people in our village wasted away and, secondly, the arbitrariness of the local landowner, who ordered them about with the support of the British colonizers. In 1930, Mahatma Gandhi, the leader of the Indian National Congress Party, headed the nonviolence movement of civil disobedience for Indian independence. Although we were sympathetic to this movement, it nevertheless did not answer the questions which concerned us.

It was at that time that we heard about the dedicated struggle of the Indian revolutionaries who believed that all possible means, including violence, should be used to overthrow British rule. We went to the northern part of the country, where the main center of their activities was located, and enrolled in the Hindu university in Benares (Varanasi). Here my brother and I were told about the great Lenin, the October Socialist Revolution and the Soviet Union--a country where a happy life was being built for all working people--for the first time. In 1929, after arresting all leaders of the communist party of India, the British imperialists instigated the notorious Miruti trial against them, charging them with "conspiratorial activities." We established ties with the communist party. However, it was the statement of the defendants in the Miruti trial that led us to communism once and for all. The

statement, which was nearly 400 pages thick, thoroughly explained the nature of communist ideology. It spoke of the Great October Revolution and of the manner in which the experience acquired by the communists could be applied to our country's condition. We joined the Communist Youth League, and in 1934 I became a member of the Communist Party of India. My brother as well joined the party.

I must point out that it was precisely the inspired teachings of the great Lenin, the October Revolution and the achievements of the Soviet Union which led us to the path of serving the noble communist cause.

Lenin's greatness is that he creatively developed the ideas of Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific communism. Lenin taught us, communists, that Marxism is not a dogma but a manual for action. Marx and Engels analyzed the capitalist system at its first stage of development--the stage of free competition--and formulated the strategy and tactics of the struggle waged by the proletariat for democracy and socialism, based on the experience of that period. Lenin made a profound study of the new imperialist stage of capitalism and wrote his historical work "Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism." In this classical work he depicted the nature of imperialism and proved that capitalism had reached a stage of decay and death--a stage during which it would inevitably be replaced by socialism.

This discovery guided the Marxists-Leninists of all countries, including India, in formulating the strategy and tactics of the revolution and seizing the power during the epoch of imperialism. Marx believed that the socialist revolution should occur in the first place in advanced capitalist countries such as England and France, simultaneously at that. Lenin proved that in the new epoch--the epoch of imperialism--when monopolies have become the dominant force in world economics, the territorial division of the world among the imperialist countries has been completed and the backward countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America have been definitively enslaved, all contradictions within the capitalist system would become drastically aggravated and conditions would ripen for breaking the imperialist chain initially at its weakest link. Lenin predicted that tsarist Russia, which was then known as the prison of the peoples, could be such a link.

History confirmed Lenin's accuracy. The Great October Socialist Revolution, which he headed, marked the beginning of the era of socialist revolutions. Today almost 15 countries, inhabited by more than one-third of mankind, are socialist, and are following the path indicated by Lenin. Furthermore, revolutionary democratic regimes have been established in a number of Asian, African and Latin American countries oriented toward socialism. These historical events confirm the profound accuracy of Lenin's ideas of the inevitability of the departure of imperialism from the historical arena and the assertion of socialism on our planet.

The Great October Socialist Revolution not only inaugurated the socialist era but also laid the beginning of the collapse of the imperialist colonial system. It was precisely Lenin who pointed out that the peoples fighting for independence and against the imperialist enslavers and the proletariat in the developed capitalist countries will be natural allies. It follows from this

that the proletariat should support the national liberation movement with all its forces. With the advent to power of the working class and the appearance of the Soviet Union in the world arena, the struggle of the peoples for freedom throughout the world, including India, gained powerful support.

In this connection, we must recall Lenin's statement, deeply relevant to this day, that thanks to the powerful impetus of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the struggle against imperialism will intensify and that the majority of the population on earth will become involved in the revolutionary process, which precisely will make the victory of socialism on a global scale inevitable. Lenin wrote that "the outcome of the struggle depends, in the final account, on the fact that Russia, India, China and others account for the huge majority of the population. It is precisely this population majority that in recent years has become involved with inordinate speed in the struggle for its liberation, so that in this sense there could be no question as to the definitive outcome of the global struggle. In this sense the final victory of socialism is fully and unconditionally secured" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 45, p 404).

The victory over fascism in World War II, to which the USSR made the greatest contribution and for the sake of which it suffered the heaviest casualties, weakened imperialism to such an extent that under the strikes of the national liberation movements, supported by the powerful Soviet Union, it suffered a crushing defeat. The majority of Asian, African and Latin American countries freed themselves from the political yoke of the imperialist states. However, imperialism did not lay down its arms. The imperialist countries are still trying to impose on the young liberated countries their neocolonial domination, resorting to economic and political pressure and supporting reactionary puppet regimes in a number of countries.

The imperialist warmongers, headed by U.S. President Reagan, have not abandoned their dream of world domination. For the sake of this unattainable objective, they are even willing to endanger the very existence of mankind by formulating their insane doctrine of a preventive nuclear strike aimed at destroying the world socialist community headed by the Soviet Union.

In seeking possibilities of preventing ruinous world wars, Lenin formulated the basic principles of peaceful coexistence among countries belonging to the capitalist and socialist systems, under the conditions of the continuing struggle waged by the peoples of different countries for socialism, headed by the working class. Today, when the world has entered the nuclear century, and when a nuclear mass destruction weapon has been created, the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist community spare no effort to save mankind from thermonuclear catastrophe. Here again all peace-loving countries, which recently gained their independence, the peace forces in the developed capitalist state and all honest people on earth are on their side.

The struggle for strengthening peace does not mean preserving the social status quo in the least. On the contrary, strengthening peace offers various nations the possibility of advancing on the way of social reforms without the threat of a destructive thermonuclear war. Therefore, preserving peace the world over contributes to the accelerated progress of mankind.

We are pleased that India, our great and ancient country, although having taken the capitalist way, is pursuing a progressive foreign policy, a policy of peace, anti-imperialism and friendship with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and progressive regimes the world over. We are proud of the fact that the communist movement in India has played and plays an important role in the formulation and intensification of this policy. It not only contributes to preservation of peace the world over but helps to fight for the cause of all working people and the cause of socialism in our country. The ideas of socialism have acquired great popularity in India. The majority of political parties in our country reflect these ideas in their programs although, understandably, the bourgeois and petit bourgeois parties emasculate them with a view to misleading the people's masses. We cannot fail to be satisfied that the ideal of socialism itself has been reflected in our constitution. The task which faces the communists today is to use the existing favorable conditions and to develop in the country a powerful revolutionary movement and lead it on the path of national democracy to socialism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/15

IN SEARCH OF A PATH TO THE FUTURE. LEITMOTIF OF A. I. HERZEN'S IDEOLOGICAL WORKS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 85 (signed to press 19 Jun 85) pp 69-78

[Article by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences A. Volodin]

[Text] Moscow, 150 years ago.... The prison in the Krutitskiye Barracks. The prisoner--a young member of the nobility, who recently celebrated his 23rd birthday, is writing a letter to his beloved: "Only a few hours remain to my departure, but I am still writing and writing to you.... Oh, what a heavy feeling of separation, of forced separation. However, such is my fate! It leads me and I obey. When shall we see each other? Where? All is in darkness.... Perhaps.... But I cannot finish, they have come for me."

Aleksandr Ivanovich Herzen, candidate at the Department of Physics and Mathematics, Moscow University, was sent to his first exile, in Perm. His "forced parting" with his beloved turned out to be relatively short (depending on how one looks at it...)--3 years. Actually, his entire life--a life strikingly rich in events even by the strictest contemporary standards--still lay ahead. Meanwhile, Herzen was being exiled.... He was being exiled for his socialist way of thinking, for his support of the idea of making all mankind truly happy, for the aspiration for a future in which there would be no god or slaves, but where everyone would be truly equal. "I am not a socialist since yesterday," said Herzen proudly in 1864. "Thirty years ago I was awarded the title of socialist by Nikolay Pavlovich, from high up...." He added in French: "...It is from then that the count begins" (XVIII, 277)¹

Yes, the count starts precisely from that date: 150 years ago, an idea in the service of and for the development of which they dedicated their lives was manifested for the first time in the works of two young Russian people--Herzen and his closest friend Nikolay Ogarev. One hundred and fifty years ago they laid the beginning of the socialist tradition in domestic social thought.

Naturally, under the conditions of backward Russia and through the 1880s, when the first Marxist group "Liberation of Labor" appeared, this socialism could not fail to be utopian. At the same time, the socialism originated by Herzen in the 1830s was a legitimate ideological development of the revolutionary struggle of the Russian peasantry for its liberation and a form of search of a scientific theory of society by progressive Russian philosophers.

Herzen, the outstanding personality in domestic culture and a writer who, in the words of V. I. Lenin, played a "great role in the preparations for the Russian Revolution" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 21, p 255) and loyal son of his people, was also deprived of any kind of nationalistic prejudices. "Yes, universality is part of our patriotism, and is not only part but holds a leading position..." he wrote with conviction in the mid-1840s (II, 407). He retained this conviction for the rest of his life.

Herzen's outlook was shaped and developed above all under the determining influence of the vital requirements of national development. The basic content of his theoretical searches was to answer questions related to the problems of the Russian liberation movement. Herzen's mastery of the richest possible experience of the creators of Russian culture, both before and during his lifetime, played a tremendous role in such searches.

However, the nature of Herzen's theoretical creativity cannot be understood at all without taking into consideration the tremendous role which problems of the Western European social and spiritual developments played in his time.

This is not merely a question of the fact that fate placed Herzen face to face with the Western European world. He spent half his conscious life, from 1847 to 1870, away from the homeland, in France, Italy, England, Switzerland.... The point is, rather, that as a theoretician, something which became entirely clear in his works written in the 1830s and 1840s, actually, from the very beginning, he was a thinker on a European scale.

Herzen's study of the lessons of Western social and spiritual development in formulating and considering most important political, moral and philosophical problems, was equally important to Russia and the West by its general theoretical nature. Herzen fiercely looked for the solution of problems such as the unity and multiple variants in the historical process, the dialectics of free human activities and objective circumstances, the nature and role of contradictions in social development, the essence and fate of bourgeois civilization, the socioethical nature of the petite bourgeoisie, the role of the conscious factor in history, the dialectics of objectives and means in the political struggle, the interrelationship between evolution and revolution in history, the individual and "herd" principles in social life, knowledge and morality, revolution and morality, and others.

Let us immediately point out that Herzen was unable to provide a consistently scientific solution to many of these problems. As a rule, his answers to the vital problems raised by the practice of the sharp class and political struggle waged under his own eyes and the nature of the theoretical thinking of the times, were imbued with contradictions. "Adam Smith's contradictions," Marx once noted, "are important in the sense that they contain problems which he, it is true, does not resolve, but which he raises by the very fact of his self-contradictions" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 26, part I, p 132). This statement fully applies to Herzen, with the stipulation that,

unlike Adam Smith, the Russian philosopher usually tried to deliberately emphasize the contradictions he discovered.

A peculiar dialectical and antinomial nature of Herzen's ideological creativity, which shows not only the weaknesses, as this may seem on the surface, but also the power of the philosopher and the perspicacity and daring of his thinking, have been frequent topics of antiscientific speculations on the part of bourgeois authors. In juggling with the contradictions found in Herzen's sociophilosophical concepts, some of them (such as I. Berlin, for example) have tried to interpret the "contribution of the West" to the spiritual world of these outstanding Russian philosophers in such a way that as a result of a vulgar updating of extremely one-sided concepts, they were able to describe him as a fierce denunciator of the ideas of the revolution and socialism. Naturally, this could not fail to trigger a corresponding reaction among Soviet scientists, who proved the prejudiced and unobjective nature of this approach to Herzen's legacy. However, we must acknowledge that some of the real problems, the formulation and original interpretation of which were attained by Herzen as a result of the profound interpretation of Western European reality, have been considered in our publications by no means sufficiently.

To this day we do not have an entirely clear idea, for example, of the manner in which the Western European revolutionary (and counterrevolutionary) movements, the events of 1848-1849 above all, which took place during Herzen's time, influenced his understanding and interpretations of revolutions and socialism. Before discussing this question, however, let us draw attention to the following:

One of the central problems in Herzen's works was the correlation between the national and the universal, usually combined with his philosophical-historical considerations in a more specific particular form, i.e., as a problem of Russia's attitude toward the West. The reasons for this were profound.

The relatively weak development of bourgeois relations in the Russian reality of 1830-1860 was the objective foundation for the following questions: Could Russia bypass the path covered by the Western European countries, saturated with bloody conflicts? Was repeating their sad experience worth it (the "sadnesses" of capitalism were becoming increasingly obvious in the West)? Were there other, separate ways to the future, more consistent with national traditions? The Russian philosophers of all persuasions, yet united by a common concern for the future of their country, were becoming extremely active precisely at that time in their interpretation of the problem of "Russia and the West." The range of solutions was huge. Suffice it merely to list the names of some philosophers to understand the extent of their variety: Chaadayev, Gogol, Belinskiy, Khomyakov, Dostoyevskiy, Saltykov-Shchedrin, Tyutchev, Chernyshevskiy, Pisarev, Chicherin.... Herzen was one of the most important personalities in their ranks.

The originality of Herzen's approach to the solution of this problem is found in the concept of so-called "Russian" socialism, which he formulated and, to a certain extent, substantiated, a concept which became a starting point in the formulation of one of the most important trends in social philosophy and the

liberation movement in 19th century Russia--populism.² We find, turning to it, that the basic "integrating" concept, which blended together the future of Russia and the result of the development and the main legacy of the Western European world (as well as, incidentally, the main content of the spiritual searches of Herzen himself) is socialism.

The idea of the socialist future of mankind was one of the highest accomplishments of European social science in Herzen's time. It was precisely this idea which appeared chimerical to even many representatives of the "enlightened West," that Herzen tried to "apply" to backward, semi-Asiatic peasant Russia. Not only to apply it, but to customize it for Russia, to "enact it" in Russia.

The 1848-1849 revolution in Europe played a tremendous role in the development of Herzen's socialist concept (as well as, in general, in the history of utopian socialism in Russia).

2

Witness, observer, eyewitness.... It is with these words that we usually describe Herzen's attitude toward this revolution. Indeed, he was able personally to see and hear a great deal in the turbulent Europe of the end of the 1840s, when "finally the old woman awakened and started writing" (XXIII, 65). Some of Herzen's works are a characteristic chronicle of the revolution; they, as well as Herzen's letters and memoirs, present a gallery of vivid canvases of the events, portraits of participants in the movement and political figures, many of whom Herzen knew closely. Neither the concepts of "eyewitness," "witness" or "chronicler" nor the indication of involvement in the revolutionary process by the end of the 1840s suffice to understand the characteristic role which Herzen played in this process. However, it would hardly be accurate to list Herzen, who "girded himself" with the Marseillaise, in the ranks of the direct participants in the revolution (as is sometimes being done). It is far more appropriate to speak of his empathy with and compassion for the main political traumas of the revolution as a particular form of extremely active spiritual participation in the events.

Herzen's empathy with the revolution (in particular with the June defeat of the Paris proletariat) was inseparably linked with a profound interpretation of the revolutionary experience of 1848, which affected him deeply. "...To me all of this is no joke but the final essence, the brain matter, the heart, and even the hands and feet" (XXIII, 97). These were the words with which Herzen defined his attitude toward revolutionary events. Let us also consider his admission that "the blood which was shed in June went to my brain and nerves...." (XIV, 243). This revolution, which immediately turned into a counterrevolution, made a tremendous contribution to the spiritual world of the Russian thinker.

Naturally, even without Herzen the revolution would have taken the same course. Unlike a number of other personalities of the epoch, Herzen left no mark whatsoever on the events. However, without Herzen the very understanding of this revolution and its meaning, consequences and lessons would have remained incomplete. It is this that should be considered as Herzen's real

contribution to the overall revolutionary process of the 19th century, for a revolution is not a direct struggle between classes for state power or a historically short, chronologically set change in socioeconomic structures and political institutions in one country or another; a revolution also means tremendous and usually heterogeneous changes in the spiritual area, in the individual and mass consciousness and culture, changes which have a major impact on the preparations for and nature itself of revolutionary acts and on the course of history as a whole. Herzen's spiritual drama and the skepticism of the Russian philosopher, inseparably related to it, were a manifestation of a most profound, although extremely contradictory emotional reaction to an interpretation of the 1848 revolution. With all its faults, this skepticism, a profound scientific-class-oriented analysis of which Lenin provided in his article "In Memory of Herzen" (see op. cit., vol 21, pp 255-262), was not a nihilistic surrender to reality, which had failed to justify great hopes. This was not an individualistic "existentialist" self-isolation from the world, as some bourgeois authors claim, but a characteristic form of intensive ideological search which lead (and led!) to discoveries of not only theoretical but highly moral import.

In Lenin's definition, "Herzen's spiritual drama was the creation and reflection of a universal-historical age when the revolutionism of bourgeois democracy was already dying (in Europe) while the revolutionism of the socialist proletariat had not matured yet" (op. cit., vol 21, p 256).

Although ignorant of the method of class analysis, Herzen nevertheless established with the perspicacity of a good diagnostician, the fact that bourgeois revolutionism in Europe was withering away and that the bourgeoisie was turning from a struggle for social progress to political conservatism. He justifiably and maliciously mocked those republicans who wished to apply to the 1848 events the yardstick of the revolution of the end of the 18th century. "To be now a revolutionary in the sense of the Convention, would be almost the same as a Huguenot to be present at the Convention. In the 18th century it sufficed to be a republican to be a revolutionary; now one can very easily be both a republicans and a hopeless conservative" (V, 178).

During and under the influence of the revolution, Herzen realized the deceptive, illusory and fictitiously popular nature of bourgeois political freedoms, which merely concealed new forms of oppression of the toiling masses. Hence his brilliant criticism of the faults of capitalist civilization, something which we value so much in him. "Bourgeois liberalism," he wrote, in particular, "is merely the liberation of the owner; democracy is merely superficial egalitarianism: it acknowledges the right of the proletariat to ownership without giving it the means; it proclaims the equality of criminals in court, letting the innocents settle their lives as they wish" (XII, 473).

Also strikingly topical is Herzen's qualification of the capitalist system as the civilization of a minority, his definition of the way of life of bourgeois society as philistine, as well as his indication of the tremendous danger to the proletariat of falling under the influence of the extremely contagious petit bourgeois spirit (see in particular XII, 472; XVI, 140-141).

In defining the June days of 1841, when the "assembly of angry storekeepers" shot the mutinying workers to death as the opening of the "Great Struggle," the halting of which was impossible (VI, 43, 47), Herzen reflected in his works another thing which makes him one of the greatest social philosophers of the 19th century, another universal historical fact: the immaturity of the revolutionism of the proletariat of his time. This was manifested, on the one hand, in Herzen's realization and advocacy of the idea that the popular masses of that time were unable to set up a socialist society and, on the other, his sharp criticism of the groundlessness, utopianism and even reactionary nature of a number of theories of the "liberation" of the people, embodied in a variety of revolutionary and socialist doctrines.

3

In noting the legitimacy of the bloody nature of past revolutions and occasionally allowing for the possibility of "communist" revolution-revenge, Herzen rejected in principle the idea of a terrorist revolution as a means of establishing a socialist society. This is one of the most important conclusions he drew from the "lessons" of 1848. No, Herzen did not become an opponent of the revolution after the 1848-1849 events, as is sometimes written. He became an essential opponent of the revolutions of the past, of a bourgeois type revolution, in which the masses blindly participate in a political coup d'etat, consisting only of its "material," playing the role of a battering ram, with the help of which the new clans of the future oppressors of the people acceded to state power.

In Herzen's belief, as long as "the masses are not truly involved in a movement, they sway, like a grain field under the wind, in one direction or another, without, however, leaving the grounds" (XII, 472). A true revolution, a revolution for the sake of socialism, should be the act of the people themselves, people who know and understand what they are fighting for. In the article "The Meat of Liberation," Herzen attacked the revolutionary doctrinaires who, in their desire to give freedom to the people, turn to them as "material for well-being, as the meat of liberation,...something in the nature of Napoleon's cannon fodder" (XVI, 28). "Methods of enlightenment and liberation, invented behind the back of the people and instilling in the people their inalienable rights and well-being with the help of the ax and the whip," Herzen writes, "were exhausted by Peter the Great and the French Terror" (ibid., 27).

In addition to the overt reactionaries and bourgeois counterrevolutionaries, who had donned liberal cloaks and whom Herzen hated so much, his enemies included the revolutionary demagogues, adventurists and political extremists, who were extremely harmful to the destiny and interests of the people. During and after the 1848-1849 Revolution, Herzen was able to observe many of them. He was convinced that irresponsible calls for a still-immature revolution would turn "not into action but into blood" (XX, 554).

At this point let us recall an important historical fact.

An event which shook up all of Russia took place in Petersburg on 4 (16) April 1866: guided by the loftiest possible civic motivations--to hasten the

freedom of the people in the homeland, Dmitriy Karakozov, an ex-student, a tall sullen man, made an attempt on the life of Tsar Alexander II. The attempt failed and the emperor accidentally escaped. However, the shot which rang out on 4 April openly indicated the rejection by the democratic Russian youth of the activities of the tsar-reformer. It proved to the entire Russian society that there were people in its midst ready to sacrifice their own life for the sake of the interests of the people.

This, however, was only one side of the coin. The other was that, objectively, Karakozov's shot also played a negative role. It was not only that the attempt was not understood by the popular masses and that the reactionary forces used it to mount an unrestrained "White terror," which led to a drastic decline in revolutionary-democratic pressure. It was also that Karakozov's shot compromised the very idea of revolution: as the first serious practical step, after so many sharp words written in SOVREMENNİK and RUSSKOYE SLOVO, it seemed to say: Look what nihilism turns into and what becomes in reality of the sermons preached by Herzen, Chernyshevskiy and Pisarev. Conspiracy, individual terrorism, murder and bloodshed: Such is the social revolution urged by immoral radicals....

Let us give Herzen his due: He published in KOLOKOL article after article, the main idea of which was to prove that murder or terrorism are not means of struggle waged by true revolutionaries, that there was no "conspiracy" whatsoever in Russia and that actions such as Karakozov's benefitted no one more than the powers in official Petersburg. The reaction, Herzen wrote, is using Karakozov to link to the method he had chosen the struggle "of all free thinkers in Russia, from the nihilists to Chernyshevskiy and from Chernyshevskiy to Petrashevskiy, up to Belinskiy and others" (XIX, 87). In these articles Herzen raised an angry voice against the liberal-reactionary identification of a social change with a "universal conspiracy" (ibid.)....

What we have stated here is quite well known. But here is something that was learned quite recently. It turns out that at the beginning of June 1966 Herzen published a "Letter to Emperor Alexander II" and the article "From Petersburg," in which he developed the ideas we mentioned earlier, published in a separate pamphlet in French (see Ye. L. Rudnitskaya. "Russkaya Revolyutsionnaya Mysl. Demokraticheskaya Pechat. 1864-1873 Gody" [Russian Revolutionary Thinking. The Democratic Press, 1864-1873]. Moscow, 1984, pp 43, 64). The inscription in one of the three copies of this pamphlet discovered by M. D. Dvorkina, chief librarian, in the stock of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism library, states that this pamphlet was printed in 6,000 copies and distributed throughout Europe. What does this prove? It proves that unlike the pseudorevolutionary actions, Herzen tried to instill his concepts of the revolution in the minds not only of the Russian but the Western European reader as well.

Having drawn the conclusion of the hopelessness and even harm of unprepared and premature actions from the defeats of the proletariat in June 1848, Herzen sought the least painful ways leading to revolutionary changes. His rejection of "bloody progress" (XVIII, 276) was a manifestation of his aspiration to separate the revolution, as a profoundly creative and, in the final account, humane process, from the historically "bloody" forms which it had assumed

until then and which, in Herzen's opinion, were not in the least mandatory in the future. Herzen believed that there was no fatal necessary whatsoever for each step forward taken by the people to be marked by a pile of corpses. In his article "Russian Germans and German Russians" (1859) Herzen wrote that "we are not Westerners. We do not believe that nations cannot advance by any other means than stepping in blood up to their knees; we bow in reverence to the marchers but wish with all our hearts that they did not exist" (XIV, 186).

Sometimes such and similar statements made by Herzen are interpreted as doubts of the expediency of revolutions. This is not so. All that Herzen questioned was the need for bloody revolutions with the swinging of "hatchets" as the symbol of raging elements. When Herzen saw the revolutionary people in Russia itself in the 1860s, Lenin pointed out, "he fearlessly took the side of revolutionary democracy against liberalism. He fought for the victory of the people over tsarism and not for a deal between the liberal bourgeoisie and the landowning tsar. He foisted the revolutionary banner" (op. cit., vol 21, p 261).

When we study Herzen's works, we occasionally blend together closely related yet by no means coinciding components of his outlook, such as the idea of a bloodless peaceful revolution, general democratic enlightenment illusions and leanings on the side of liberalism. Their identification or reciprocal substitution is hardly accurate.

No liberalism whatsoever exists in the theoretical formulation itself of the question of the possibility and preference of a peaceful development of the revolution. The question of a peaceful social revolution excited philosophers such as Saint-Simon and Fourier already by the turn of the 19th century. Fifty years later, Herzen persistently pursued their search for arguments in favor of a bloodless revolution; he sought such arguments not only in the realm of theory but in reality itself.

We know that the question of the peaceful seizure of power by the proletariat in England was raised by the Chartists. Marx and Engels, who frequently wrote of the desirability of the elimination of the system of exploitation and domination of private ownership over means of production peacefully, in turn, acknowledged the possibility of a bloodless revolution in England. Herzen as well sought arguments in contemporary Western European life which would back his idea of a possible "way of peaceful, human development" toward socialism in his polemics with the "artists-revolutionaries," who were unwilling even to consider the inevitable and high costs of a fight with the "ax."

We must admit that Herzen was not strict and precise in his use of concepts. Occasionally he ascribed excessive similarity to the concepts of "revolution" and "progress." For example, he did not fully understand that the reforms of Peel in England in the 1840s and those of Cavour in Italy in the 1850s were perhaps in the interests of the bourgeoisie and that these reforms were indirect, a side product of preceding revolutionary movements. By believing a peaceful revolution to be a forced concession granted on the part of the government to public opinion and the demands of the masses, Herzen was still far from realizing the real correlation among social forces which could ensure the development of the socialist revolution without blood and barricades.

Nevertheless, ignoring some terminological inaccuracies, unwitting errors and naive illusions, we cannot fail to see Herzen's formulation of the most important problem of revolutionary theory--the possibility of a peaceful way to socialism.

4

Herzen wrote a great deal and on various occasions of the dying of the "Western old man," the "agony" and "death" of Europe and his disappointment with it. These words are an indication of the abatement of the revolutionary wave in the West, the growth of political and ideological reaction and the sharp rejection of the increasingly spreading bourgeois way of life and philistinism, which infected even the proletarian strata with a spirit of philistinism and depersonalization.

However, Herzen's "disappointment" with the West did not mean a disappointment with the socialist ideal or its rejection: Herzen never stopped being a socialist. In his "Letters to the Enemy," emphasizing this fact ("I did not become a socialist yesterday..."), Herzen claimed that "...I decisively failed to see a solution to the general impasse (dead end--editor) of the educated world other than dying of old age or social change--sharp or surreptitiously developing, regardless of whether it is born of the life of the people or as a result of a theory introduced within it. This question cannot be bypassed. It can neither become obsolete nor be deleted. It may be withdrawn and replaced by others. However, like a hidden illness, when it knocks at the door, while no one is even thinking about it, the patient dies" (XVIII, 277).

In assessing the revolutionary potential of the West with no exaggerated expectations and hopes, Herzen was concerned most of all with how to strengthen the socialist ideal, this "new beginning" which did not leave in peace the "world of contemporary civilization" (XVI, 175). An excerpt from his letter to V. S. Pecherin is characteristic in this respect: "Do not think that I have slipped by describing phalanstery as a barracks; no, all previous socialist doctrines and schools, from Saint-Simon to Prudhon, who merely advocates rejection, are poor; they are babbles, halting prime readers, healers and Essenes of the ancient East. But who can fail to see, who can fail to hear the heart of the tremendous content which shines through simple efforts, or else who can punish children for cutting their teeth or growing up improperly?" (XV, 54).

It was the search for ways and means of attaining socialism under conditions in which the counterrevolution was triumphing in the West that led Herzen to the concept of "Russian" socialism.

Postponing the establishment of a socialist society in Western Europe to an indefinite future, Herzen assumed that "if Europe is unable to rise through social reorganization, other countries will change" (VI, 190). Herzen found the country which was most able to carry out a social change by turning his thoughts to the homeland. He saw in the patriarchal community (which had been preserved by the Russian and some other nations) a means of radical social change, a real element of socialism: "...We have in the hut of the Russian peasant the embryo of economic and administrative concepts based on common

land ownership and an agrarian and instinctive communism" (XIII, 179). Although emphasizing the negative aspects of the peasant community, where the individual is absorbed by the "community," Herzen emphasized as the most important component of "Russian" socialism the concept of the need to "fructify" the Russian "community" with Western science, i.e., specifically, with the idea of socialism.

Herzen's "Russian" socialism was a manifestation (naturally, illusory and utopian under the circumstances) of a daring theoretical search: the search for an alternate accelerated advancement of Russia toward a socialist reorganization through the intermediary of the spiritual experience of Western Europe embodied, according to Herzen, in its science of socialism.

In emphasizing that the problem of socialism is still far from its practical solution in the West and that the Russian community by itself does not and cannot resolve it, and by bringing the Russian peasants closer to the poor European workers, Herzen said, addressing himself to the Western democrats: "We are going in your direction in terms of the future change.... Your efforts, your sufferings are instructive to us.... Kingdoms and kings will pass but socialism will not. Have you not realized that this is the young heir of a retiring old man?" (XII, 263-264).

But let us not simplify Herzen's views or smooth and conceal the contradictions within his theory of "Russian" socialism. In frequent cases the history of pre-Marxist social thinking in general and social philosophy in particular one theory or another has been expressed in a form unsuitable to its content. The proper presentation by a theoretician of the true nature and true significance of his ideas has been even less frequent. As Marx once aptly remarked (in connection with assessing in "Das Kapital" the views of 18th century French economist F. Quesnay) the description which one or another scientist or theoretician makes of his own views--described by Marx as a "shingle" or "system of labels"--"is distinguished from the labels of other commodities, among others, also by the fact that it misleads not only the customer but, quite frequently, the seller as well" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 24, p 405). To a certain extent, this also applies to Herzen.

Lenin proved that, essentially, Herzen's "Russian" and populist socialism was a reflection and manifestation of the "revolutionism of bourgeois peasant democracy in Russia," for which reason neither it nor populism as a whole "contain even a grain of socialism" (op. cit., vol 21, p 258), for "to the Marxist the peasant movement is, precisely, not socialist but democratic" (op. cit., vol 12, p 41). In other words, Herzen's "socialism" (here as well we put, like Lenin, the word "socialism" in quotes) was an inadequate theoretical form of class-defined aspirations.

Western revolutionaries, scientists and writers, shocked by Herzen's idea of a possible vanguard role to be played by Russia on the way of mankind to socialism, frequently described him as "Russophile," "messianic" and "pan-Slavic." Nevertheless, Herzen's "Russian" socialism offers no reason to interpret his views in a spirit of pan-Slavism or nationalism. The fact that Herzen was not indifferent to the idea of the vanguard role which one nation

or another could play during a specific historical time is an entirely different matter.

In itself, however, is this idea all that faulty? Does it not imply--not in general but as specifically interpreted by Herzen--the extent to which one nation or another has mastered world culture? Did not Herzen thirst in formulating it for ensuring progress most painlessly and for easing the birth pains of socialism?

The study and identification of the strong as well as, naturally, weak sides of Herzen's creativity in general and his social theory in particular are not only important scientifically but also useful practically. Naturally, Soviet researchers--historians, literary experts and philosophers--are making great effort in this respect. Let us mention the fact alone that a special volume of "Literary Legacy" devoted to Herzen will be published in the immediate future. It will be focused on previously unknown data about Herzen's relations with Western leaders of the revolutionary movement and culture who were his contemporaries. The authors of this publication include some foreign researchers as well.

In general, Herzen is little and poorly known in the West. The symposium on "Alexander Herzen and European Culture," which was held in the English city of Nottingham in September 1982, sponsored by the International Association for the Study and Dissemination of Slavic Cultures, brought to light the unquestionably major impact which Herzen's works and activities had on the 19th century European democratic movement and cultural process. According to the Soviet scientists who attended it, this symposium emphasized even further the fact that Herzen's legacy is virtually unknown in the contemporary West.

This is not the place to study the reasons for this situation or to seek means of changing it for the better. Let us merely note that in the way that there would have been no Herzen without Western European revolutionism and culture, modern universal culture and revolutionism would have been incomplete and weakened without Herzen.

Familiarity with Herzen can help any person, regardless of his country, nation, class or social group, better to understand that mankind is divided not by meridians and parallels, such as West-East or South-North.... The division is based on the degree of responsibility felt by individuals, parties, classes and nations for the fate of mankind.

FOOTNOTES

1. Here and subsequently A. I. Herzen's works are quoted from "Sobr. Soch." [Collected Works], in 30 volumes, by A. I. Herzen. Moscow, 1954-1966. The Roman figures indicate the volume and the Arab numerals the page. The source of the earlier quotation is XXI, 39.

2. "Herzen Is the Founder of 'Russian' Socialism and 'Populism'," Lenin repeatedly pointed out (op. cit., vol 21, p 257; see also V. I. Lenin, "Tetrady po Agrarnomu Voprosu. 1900-1916" [Notebooks on the Agrarian Problem, 1900-1916]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1969, p 21.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/15

PATH OF TRIALS AND VICTORIES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 85 (signed to press 19 Jun 85) pp 79-83

[Article by Hero of Socialist Labor Irakliy Abashidze]

[Text] For many years a unique museum has existed in Tbilisi: the Museum of Friendship Among the Peoples, of the Georgian SSR Academy of Sciences. Photographs, historical relics, books and letters--the most valuable human documents--annually attract thousands of visitors from all nations and nationalities. People are coming to the Georgian capital from everywhere, including foreign countries. For centuries peoples have been divided by linguistic and cultural differences. Today the close and fraternal unity among the peoples of the multinational family of the land of the Soviets has become a powerful force of progress. This is what the museum exhibits teach the visitors.

Our friendship does not consist merely of history and memories. Friendship is alive when every single day we live, when our present accomplishments enrich it with something new, making it deeper, wiser and more comprehensive. I have lived a long life and I am grateful to fate for having been able to see with my own eyes and feel with my own heart the way in which the age-old friendship between the Georgian and Russian peoples, like the friendship among the other peoples in the land of the Soviets, has assumed a new quality in the joint building of socialism and the fierce battles in defense of our common fatherland.

All progressive mankind celebrated the great 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism, won thanks to the heroism and historically unparalleled unity among the peoples of the Soviet Union. Our heroes fought and died side by side. Georgia sent to the front hundreds of thousands of its best sons and daughters. More than one-third of them did not return from the battlefields.

In the same way that two mothers who have lost their sons shed the same tears, the poets of the two fraternal countries were inspired by the same models during the period of common trials. Captain Bukhaidze, who died at the foothills of the Caucasus and came back to life in the folk song and in my poetry, resembles the lyrical character in Aleksandr Tvardovskiy's poem "I Was Killed at Rzhev," the defender of the Russian land, who fell in battle. The

two poems were created separately. The fact that they are imbued with the same spirit, however, is no accident. No, it is not....

The pain and suffering of the two fraternal peoples are the same pain and the same suffering. I cannot recall without emotion the letter which Nikolay Tikhonov wrote in 1942 from blockaded Leningrad to the Georgian poets: "Leningrad is still blockaded. You cannot even imagine the way the people in Leningrad lived that winter.... God forbid, dear friends, for you to see or experience even a tenth of it...." Then, speaking of the friendship between us, he wrote: "No enemy attack or blockade can destroy it."

During the first hard months of the war, when the wave of enemy hordes rolled deep inside our country, when the Hitlerites had reached the approaches to Moscow, the capital became the center of gravity of all our feelings, thoughts and hopes. We believed that it would be here that the fascist force would be routed. Together with the Russian soldiers and the soldiers of other nationalities, it was firmly opposed by my fellow countrymen as well in the historical battle for Moscow.

I recall my wartime encounter with Moscow in January 1942. Together with Georgiy Leonidze and Alio Mirtskhulava, I participated in the expanded session of the presidium of the Soviet Writers' Union, at which our creative organization formulated its "strategy and tactics" for the duration of the enemy's invasion. At that time, the Writers' Union became the battle headquarters of Soviet literature. Prose and poetry writers, essayists and publicists, such as Aleksandr Fadeyev, Vladimir Stavskiy, Yevgeniy Petrov, Petr Pavlenko and others had come here, on Vorovskiy Street, in their greatcoats and sheepskin coats, smelling of gunpowder and battle, with kitbags on their shoulders and manuscripts in field pouches, straight from the front. The short but meaningful thought which imbued all speeches was "Everything for the front and everything for victory over the enemy!"

During that trip I met my fellow countrymen, the soldiers of the armored train which had been equipped by the boys of Tbilisi. It was commanded by Major Dzhakhiyev. The troops of the armored train had been fighting in the front lines since the beginning of the war. They had taken part in the fierce battles for Smolensk. In one of the battles against fascist tanks, in the Klin area, the armored train had been hit and pulled back for repairs. That is why its personnel happened to be in Moscow while we were there. Moscow, at that time, was gripped by ice. It was stern and lean. The famous battle at its walls had taken place only 1.5 months earlier. The streets, familiar from prewar times, were deserted and quiet. Only tanks and other military equipment being transferred from one sector of the front to another rolled along. Slogans such as "Death to the Fascist Occupation" and "Not a Step Back!" had been written on the walls in huge letters. Huge balloons, resembling tired oxen after hard work, were resting at the Kremlin, on Manezhnaya Square.

Having heard on the radio that three Georgian poets were among the writers who had come to Moscow, troops and commanders of the Tbilisi armored train were quite pleased, and invited us to visit them. Naturally, during the meeting with our countrymen we heard our native Georgian speech and poetry. We

recalled those dear to us who were in our distant native land. It was as though our beloved Tbilisi was lighting up this alarming night from afar. A feeling of unity with each corner of our huge fighting fatherland and its heart--Moscow--was bright and splendid and needed no words.

In war fate offers us sometimes amazing examples of happenstance, coincidence and unexpected and sometimes unexplainable turns. It is as though life likes symbolism no less than we, poets, do. I remember Aleksii Mnatobishvili, one of the troops of the armored train. In the battle of Klin, a fragment of a fascist shell, which had pierced the train's armor, had hit him in the chest. It so happened that he had put in the inside pocket of his padded jacket a book he had borrowed on the eve from the Klin City Library. It was the famous novel by Anna Antonovskaya: "Velikiy Mouravi" [The Great Mouravi], about Georgiy Saakadze, the noted Georgian military leader.

The book stopped the piece of metal and protected the human heart. Failing to pierce the thick volume, the fragment ricocheted. On that day, the soldier wrote in the book: "Georgiy Saakadze saved me, Aleksii Mnatobishvili, from death in the fierce battle for Klin."

"Take it," he said to me, offering the book which had become a priceless relic. "Take it. Another time it may not save me...."

May Klin City Library forgive me! Impressed by the story, I accepted the gift of this soldier and carefully preserved it for many long years. Today this book is one of the items exhibited at the Tbilisi Museum of Friendship Among the Peoples.

Learning about this incident, the poet Yevgeniy Yevtushenko responded to it with the following verses:

Therefore, the epochs can merge,
If the son of the Georgian land was saved from death in 1941
By Antonovskaya and Saakadze.

It is thus that life rushes into poetry and literature becomes the maker of human destinies. Who knows if the young Georgian reader, the defender of Moscow, would have seen the light of victory if the character of the great son of the Georgian people had not inspired a Russian writer to write a book about him?

The major and complex phenomena of life have their inner laws which are not always immediately understood. In the course of learning we find ever new facets in them, strikingly inexhaustible. It is thus that the poets of different generations, who deal with the topic of the international exploit in the Great Patriotic War, discover for themselves the inexhaustible sources of our friendship which comes from the depth of centuries.

Let us recall a great event in Russian history, the 1812 Patriotic War. Bagration, one of the heroes of the battle of Borodino, has remained forever part of the people's memory. A Georgian by origin, he courageously fought and gave his life for Russia, which had become his second homeland. There is

strict historical logic in the fact that the monument to Bagration, sculpted by M. Merabishvili and designed by architect N. Mgaloblishvili, was recently erected on the site of the Krtsanisskiy battlefield, where the defenders of Tbilisi courageously and repeatedly fought foreign aggressors.

Ever since Georgian freedom was hammered out in Moscow and the Georgian Treaty concluded, Russia has played a special role in Georgia's historical destinies. We, literary workers, have no doubt about the great role which the Russian language and Russian culture played in multiplying the cultural values of the Georgian people.

Firm personalities have linked Russian writers and poets with Georgia since prerevolutionary times. The very air of the Georgian gardens, forests and mountains is filled with poetry. Who knows, that is perhaps why the Caucasus has inspired the works of great masters such as Pushkin, Lermontov, Griboyedov and Mayakovskiy.

In Soviet times, the First All-Union Writers Congress meant to the multimillion strong audience a discovery of a large number of previously virtually unknown national literatures, including the Georgian, beyond their own republics.

The 1920s and 1930s will be remembered by my generation as a time of young, happy reciprocal acquaintanceship among national literatures. I recall, for example, the way many of us were enamored, with a youthful lack of discrimination, of the outstanding Russian Soviet poets Aleksandr Blok and, particularly, Vladimir Mayakovskiy.

Quite recently, now at the sunset of my years, I have turned once again back to the works of my great fellow countryman who was born under the skies of Baghdad. I translated his "Conversation With a Financial Inspector About Poetry," and, as before, I was seized by a pleasant feeling of involvement with the great accomplishments of the age, which imbued our entire outlook. I recall how, as a member of the young writers' circle, I was traveling at that time with my friends to the rural rayons where collectivization was in full swing, and to Kolkhida, where huge areas of swampland were being drained, a time when we wrote and wrote essays, articles, stories, verses and poems....

At that time, the entire huge land of the soviets was pulsing under the rhythm of a single gigantic construction site, where something new, unknown and unparalleled in the history of mankind was taking place. That is why we had no particular difficulty in finding a common language with our fellow writers in Russia and the other union republics. All of us lived with thoughts of the future and the wind of great change blew on our young faces!

Once I imagined a picture which a historian might have considered fantastic but which was entirely real to a poet. Poets had gathered at the Krestoviy Pass, at the highest point of the road from Vladikavkaz to Tiflis. Pushkin and Lermontov met Ilya Chavchavadze and Vazha Pshavel. Blok, Mayakovskiy, Yesenin and Tikhonov were conversing with their Georgian comrades and friends. Ever new generations of poets were marching to meet one another at the foothills of the Kazbek, and it was as though this march would never cease....

Actually, historians are familiar with such a literary encounter. One year before the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers, on A. M. Gorkiy's initiative, brigades of noted Russian writers and poets traveled to Georgia and other republics. They translated and, with the help of Russian language periodicals, acquainted the unionwide readership with the best writings of the fraternal peoples.

Since then, the creative biographies of many noted Russian and Georgian talents have been closely interwoven: Nikolay Tikhonov, Paolo Yashvili, Georgiy Leonidze, Boris Pasternak, Titsian Tabidze and many, many others.

The traditions of the poetic translation of Georgian authors was continued by Nikolay Zabolotskiy, Aleksandr Mezhirov, Pavel Antokolskiy, Arseniy Tarkovskiy, Yevgeniy Yevtushenko, Bella Akhmadulina and others.

As a structural component of Soviet literature, Georgian literature has gone beyond the boundaries not of our republic alone. It has become known far beyond the USSR. Over the past 50 years, there have been more than 140 editions in our country of "The Knight in the Panther's Skin." Works by Georgian authors have been published in more than 40 languages of the peoples of the Soviet Union and abroad. The 800th anniversary of Shota Rustaveli was widely noted by the international public. It already seems strange to us that at the turn of the century Ilya Chavchavadze dreamed of having perhaps two or three Georgian classical works translated into other languages.

We gained ever new experience as we followed our common path. The publication of KAVKASIONI, a new literary collection, a first periodical collection in union republics, opening to the Russian-speaking public the treasury of national cultures, with which our fatherland is so rich, became a noteworthy event in the history of our cultural relations. Created in the spirit of existing traditions of friendship between Russia and Georgia, this collection has become a kind of ambassador of Georgian culture--poetry, prose, publicism and criticism--showing their best samples and reflecting the trend of our spiritual searches.

The range of topics which excites today poets and writers of different generations and of different creative talents, is inexhaustible. However, there is one topic which encompasses within itself all others and which synthesizes with particular strength the historical and artistic memory of our peoples who have undergone severe trials: the topic of peace.

This topic affects not only those who experienced the war and lost friends and relatives, but the young as well. This is because 4 decades ago we hoped that, by breaking the spine of Hitlerism, we would put an end to wars and violence once and for all, and that the loss of life of millions of people and the horrors of Buchenwald, Auschwitz, Khatyn and Oradour and Hiroshima and Nagasaki will no longer allow anyone's hand to unsheath the sword.

Alas, to this day, in the mid-1980s, we are living in restless times: the weapons hammered out at the other side of the ocean are not becoming rusty but even more refined and destructive and the line of chance which separates us from nuclear death is becoming increasingly thinner. More than ever before,

the topic of peace is closely interwoven today with that of beauty, justice and victory of good over evil for any one of us, whether in Georgia, Moscow, Siberia, the Ukraine, the Kazakh steppes, the forests of Belorussia or the mountains of the Caucasus....

Through songs and words, strength and power
We shall struggle for peaceful happiness.
Our banner of great freedom,
The possession of our nations,
Is the steel of Rustavi and the fortress of Mtsyri....
"Peace in the whole world! Peace in the whole world!"

Even before the revolution, Akakiy Tsereteli wrote of the fraternity, unity and friendship between the peoples of Georgia and young Russia "with which we want to march hand in hand not only for the reaching of national but human ideals...." The greatest events of the 20th century radically changed the image of the world. In the past decades several generations have changed but the alliance between our peoples is stronger than time. Our fraternity, inspired by the aspirations for good, justice and peaceful construction, has become even stronger and more mature.

The sources of friendship will not dry out!

Those who died, defending it, will be remembered forever.

In the spring, when the glaciers on the passes begin to melt, to this day the Caucasus returns to us the bodies of dead Soviet soldiers, extracted from the depths of their prison of ice. Struck by a fascist bullet and frozen in the snows, buried under avalanches, they stood to death in the great defense of the friendship among the peoples. Forty years later they are still with us and will remain with us forever.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/15

WAR VETERANS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 85 (signed to press 19 Jun 85) pp 84-93

[Article by Colonel General Hero of the Soviet Union A. Zheltov, chairman of the Soviet War Veterans Committee]

[Text]

1

As more time passes since the war, we not only do not lose our spiritual ties with the memory of those events but realize increasingly the heroism of those harsh days and the significance to the fate of the homeland and mankind of the victory we won. The 40th anniversary of the victory inspires us yet once again to turn again to our war experiences and to what happened after that, and to the prospects which are opening to the world today.

War is alien to the working people. It goes against the very nature of man. That is why the soldier dreams of his blood on the battlefield to be the last blood shed on earth. This age-old dream appeared to have become reality during the victorious 1945. The Soviet soldiers signed on the Reichstag the sentence not only of Hitler and his Nazi clique but of all militarists. "Peace henceforth and forever!" was a shout heard over the Elbe and thundered in the foothills of the Austrian Alps and wherever the soldiers of the allied armies of the anti-Hitlerite coalition met and exchanged fraternal hugs. And when the aggressor in the Far East surrendered, the hope that World War II was the last and that no third world war would take place became even stronger! This thought was shared by millions and millions of people in our country and throughout the earth.

The ruling Western circles, who were annoyed by the failure of their hope to see the Soviet Union bled white by the war and unconditionally agree to the conditions of postwar peace which they hoped to dictate to it, thought otherwise.

Our military allies began to "forget" quite soon who had made a decisive contribution to the defeat of German fascism. I recall the following occasion: toward the end of 1946, General Mark Clark, the commander in chief of the American occupation forces in Austria, invited to Salzburg Marshal I. S. Konev, informing him that the meeting would be attended also by the British and French high commissioners. Pleading indisposition, Ivan Stepanovich

assigned this mission to me, as his deputy in the allied commission. And so, the "protocole" began: the encounter at the airport, seeing the highlights of Salzburg and talks on various practical matters. No less than 100 people attended the luncheon. The Americans noisily praised their "chief," extolling Clark's merits in leading the allied forces in North Africa and Italy. The English general R. L. McCreary did not fail to point out that the British "Tommies" had also contributed to the common victory. General M. E. Betouar referred to the French in the same spirit. However, no one mentioned even in passing the outstanding victory of the Soviet army and the immortal exploits of the Russian soldier!

In my speech I said: "Gentlemen, we treasure the word 'ally.' When Hitler, after having enslaved almost all of Europe, attacked my homeland, he thought that it would find no allies in the West. The Nazi Fuehrer erred! In the final account, he was forced to wage war on two fronts. After 3 years of fierce single combat with the fascist Wehrmacht, covering the huge path from the walls of Moscow and Stalingrad to Berlin and Vienna, finally the Soviet forces met with the allies and shared with them the joy of common victory. The main thing now is to preserve and strengthen the unity among all countries, peoples and armies of the anti-Hitlerite coalition. In remembering the past war, we shall think of peace, the prerequisite of which was, is and, I hope, will remain our frontline friendship sealed in blood."

Many people welcomed my words which triggered quite unanimous applause, particularly in that section of the hall where junior-rank officers were seated. I noticed, however, the displeasure with which superiors looked at their subordinates. To the generals, the "cold war" against their recent allies had already started....

The CPSU Central Committee decree "On the 40th Anniversary of the Victory of the Soviet People in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945" emphasizes that one of its main and durable lessons is that one must struggle against war before it has started. In order to defend peace we must increase the vigilance of the peoples. We must preserve and multiply the gains of socialism and counter the aggressive and adventuristic course of imperialism through the united, coordinated and active efforts of all peace-loving forces. Both historical experience and the reality of our days teach us to do this.

All secrets eventually become known one way or another. Today we know quite well the purpose for which the atom bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, under the pretext of the war, the way the North Atlantic bloc was put together, the way plans were formulated for attacking the USSR, military conflicts were provoked in various parts of the globe and the flywheel of the arms race was set free. Why was and will imperialism be unable to implement its aggressive plans? Because of the steady growth of the power of our homeland and the entire socialist community and because millions and millions of people of good will are blocking the way of the arsonists to a nuclear conflagration, above all those who went through the flames of the war and experienced its horrors.

Let us point out that Soviet war veterans have actively participated in the contemporary antiwar movement from its very beginning. They could be found in

the first world peace congresses and antiwar fora of scientists, writers, journalists and students. The worse the international situation became and the more obvious became the intentions of the NATO bosses to revive criminal German militarism, the more urgent became the need for the creation of a social organization of Soviet veterans. In the postwar years, they deemed it their sacred duty to struggle for the implementation of CPSU plans and decisions aimed at strengthening the power of the Soviet state and preserving peace on earth.

The organization of Soviet war veterans has served these great objectives for nearly 30 years, ever since it was created, in September 1956. It rallies Soviet citizens who actively participated in the defense of the homeland in the ranks of the armed forces, partisan formations, clandestine groups, fighters in the antifascist resistance movement abroad and those who continued the struggle in the Nazi concentration camps. These people are no longer young. However, they are well-tempered. Suffice it to say that approximately one-half of the more than 6 million current Great Patriotic War veterans in good health are continuing to work in material production, science, culture, education and health care. The veterans include communist labor shock workers and talented youth tutors. They are sharing with the young generation their very rich practical experience and promoting love for work, high conscious discipline, loyalty to the party and the people and readiness dedicatedly to defend the gains of socialism. The homeland properly values the constructive work of frontline veterans. It is rare not to come across a veteran who would show up at a holiday wearing not only combat but labor medals.

In his address at the meeting with Great Patriotic War veterans, which took place in the premises of the CPSU Central Committee, on 5 May, Comrade M. S. Gorbachev stressed that their main civic duty is to share their priceless experience and great traditions with the new Soviet generations. The meeting indicated that the veterans are fully aware of this duty. They are ready to help the party and the people to raise the type of growing generation which could assume in the very next years concern for the country, its defense and economic power, and to take over from the senior generations.

The structure of the veteran's organization and the direction of its activities within the country and in the international arena, as well as the content, means and methods of its work have been quite clearly defined over the past years. The All-Union Conference is its supreme authority. It elects a Soviet War Veteran's Committee (SKVV) for a five-year term, assigning it to lead the organization until the next conference.

Let us point out that the veteran movement has been headed by military commanders well known to the people. Thus, the first SKVV chairman was Marshal of the Soviet Union A. M. Vasilevskiy, the outstanding military leader. This position has also been held by marshals of the Soviet Union K. A. Meretskov and S. K. Timoshenko. For more than 10 years it was headed by Twice Hero of the Soviet Union Army General P. I. Batov. Hero of the Soviet Union A. P. Maresyev was its responsible secretary for about a quarter of a century. Today he is SKVV first deputy chairman.

The first committee consisted of 75 members; today it has 200. The number of presidium members and other working bodies has increased as well. In its work the committee relies on voluntary activists. The presidium has the following commissions: international, propaganda, liaison with schools and school organizations, commemorating the memory of the fallen soldiers, war invalids, awards and organizational. The committee is guided in its activities by the resolutions of the communist party and closely cooperates with trade unions, the Komsomol, DOSAAF, the Znaniye Society and other public organizations.

It is through its sections that the SKVD maintains contact with the veteran public. Subsections have been set up in the capitals of union republics, hero cities and some oblast and kray centers. The number of fellow-servicemen councils has increased substantially in recent years. They are headed by section presidiums or bureaus or, wherever sections have not been set up, by military commissariats. Hundreds of thousands of war veterans are actively working in the sections. As loyal representatives of the party, they share with the young people their richest possible practical experience and our great combat traditions.

The purpose of the veteran movement is depicted in the SKVV seal: the figure of a Soviet soldier-liberator, striking with his sword the fascist swastika and hugging a child. The war veterans, who remember the battle with fascism and their fallen comrades, actively work for peace. The Soviet War Veterans Committee works for eliminating the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe hanging over mankind and developing cooperation and friendship among nations.

2

Four-fifths of the earth's population were involved in World War II. The armed struggle was waged on the territory of 40 countries in Europe, Asia and Africa and numerous islands in Oceania. The postwar years became the period of liberation from colonial yoke and of struggle for independence for many peoples. It is entirely natural that today organizations which rally the people who fought, who were prisoners of war or who lost relatives in the war may be found in most countries.

Their objectives, structure and type of activities may differ. Some deal with problems related to social insurance of veterans and war victims. Others set themselves a broader range of problems by actively participating in political life. However, they all share the desire to preserve peace and prevent a new world war. It is precisely on this noble basis that the largest international war veterans' associations were formed and function.

Let me name a few of them. They include the International Federation of Resistance Fighters (FIR), which was set up on 3 July 1951 in Vienna and today rallies more than 60 national associations from 26 countries (mainly European) and West Berlin; the World War Veterans Federation (FMAC), which was found in 1950 in Paris and includes more than 150 national organizations; the International Federation of Former Prisoners of War (CIAPG); the European

Federation of War Veterans (CEAC). These associations steadily cooperate with each other and jointly organize peace actions.

The Soviet War Veterans Committee is a member of FIR and is represented in its leading bodies. Here we have many fellow workers and like-minded people, for communists were in the leading ranks of the antifascist resistance--people loyal to the interests of their nations and fiery internationalists. The federation includes veterans organizations of all members of the socialist community.

As early as the end of the 1960s the view was expressed by a number of veterans organizations of the expediency to hold a European meeting of war veterans and fighters in the antifascist resistance, including those who had fought on Germany's side but who, after its defeat, were ready to cooperate for the sake of preserving peace in Europe and preventing a new world war. After extensive preparatory work, in which SKVV representatives actively participated, such a meeting was held in Rome in the autumn of 1971, under the slogan "For Peace, Security and Friendship!"

At the final session of the Rome meeting, an address to all war veterans, participants in the resistance and victims of fascism was solemnly read in five languages. They were called upon to dedicate themselves to the struggle for peace and detente, to support the holding of a conference on security and cooperation in Europe, to raise the growing generation in a spirit of friendship and reciprocal understanding with all nations on the continent, to condemn any doctrine promoting racial, national or religious hatred and to energize their efforts in establishing an atmosphere of confidence and cooperation in Europe.

The ties between the SKVV and national and international veterans organizations were broadened even further at the World Peace Congress, which was held in Moscow in October 1973, attended by delegations from 143 countries.

Also memorable was the 8th FIR Congress, which was held in Minsk, the Belorussian capital, in May 1978. Forty-four delegations of national war veteran organizations and resistance fighters from 22 European countries attended. Also attending were observers from other international related associations of veterans cooperating with the FIR. An essentially new feature was a delegation of representatives of fighters against neofascism, racism and aggression from the non-European countries--Vietnam, Chile, Angola, Mozambique and Uruguay.

The 8th FIR Congress, at which a number of topical problems of the struggle for peace and disarmament, the unification of all antifascist forces and the intensification of detente were discussed, and which adopted constructive and mobilizing resolutions and documents, further strengthened the international ties of the federation and helped in the preparations for a World War veterans meeting.

The first world encounter took place in Rome in 1979. Its organizers were the FIR, FMAC, CIAPG and CEAC. Delegations representing countries from all five continents--Europe, Asia, America, Africa and Australia--came to the Italian

capital. Disarmament became the main topic. The Soviet delegation suggested that this topical subject be concretized, focusing the attention of the debates on NATO's intention of deploying nearly 600 new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe. The declaration of the Soviet delegation emphasized that it was precisely the war veterans, who had been burned by the fire, who could assess better than others the full danger of the implementation of NATO's plans aimed at undermining detente and intensifying the arms race. Citing specific cases, aviation Colonel General N. P. Dagayev, SKVV deputy chairman, convincingly proved the groundlessness of the stir caused by the fictitious NATO "lag" in medium-range nuclear missiles, proving that this was Washington's latest attempt to disturb the existing military-strategic balance on the European continent and to tie Western Europe to American nuclear doctrines.

The Soviet view on this problem and the new Soviet peace initiatives were supported in the speeches by representatives of veterans organizations from a number of countries, including the GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Vietnam and France, Belgium, the FRG (Association of Individuals Persecuted Under Nazism) and Madagascar. It is true that at the meetings of the editorial commission some people tried to distort the sense of our suggestions and to formulate the statements borrowed from the bourgeois press. Without compromising their principles, the members of the Soviet delegation tried to bring the various viewpoints closer to each others. As a result, a unanimous final document was adopted--a message to the governments and peoples of all countries, in which the war veterans called for putting an end to the arms race and proclaimed their resolve to wage an active struggle against the intrigues of the enemies of peace and detente. The conference set up a coordination committee in charge of continuing the work of the World War veterans meeting, which included the representatives of the four international federations which had organized the meeting. The committee holds periodical sessions at which problems of joint antiwar actions are discussed and preparations made for future international encounters.

The peace program for the 1980s, which was formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress, defined the main trend of international activities of the Soviet War Veterans Committee. We know that with the advent to power of the Reagan administration in the United States, the threat of war increased sharply and the international situation worsened. Imperialist propaganda mounted a fierce campaign of lies and slanders, charging the Soviet Union with responsibility for virtually all conflict situations in the world. The surviving fascists raised their heads in a number of European countries on the wave of anti-Sovietism, and revanchist and neo-Nazi organizations became energized. However, the reactionary forces were unable to split the antiwar front of the peoples and to promote discord in the ranks of the international veterans movement.

The 9th FIR Congress, which was held in Berlin in September 1982, was a major landmark in the unification of war veterans and resistance fighters and their major contribution to the common cause of the struggle waged by peace-loving forces against the threat of war and for detente and disarmament. It was attended by 300 delegates from national associations of 23 European countries and West Berlin, as well as guest representatives of the World War Veterans

Federation, the international committees of fascist concentration camp inmates, the World Peace Council and other progressive antiwar organizations. The welcoming address by Comrade Erich Honecker, who announced the decision of the GDR government to award the FIR the order of the "Great Star of Friendship Among the Peoples," received a warm welcome.

The task of the congress was to formulate more accurately the political line of the federation and its general orientation. After rather heated discussions, thanks to the efforts, above all, of the delegations from the socialist countries, priority was given not to the discussion of social problems but to the political struggle for peace and against militarism, neofascism and revanchism.

On the initiative of the Soviet delegation, the program document adopted at the congress included a special item which instructed the federation and its national organizations to undertake mass actions dedicated to the 40th anniversary of the battle for Stalingrad and other noteworthy victories over Hitlerite fascism. In the same way that during the war the very word "Stalingrad" inspired and rallied the participants in the anti-Hitlerite coalition, the same word today remains a symbol of their unity in the struggle against the plans for a new and even more fierce and destructive war.

An expanded session of the FIR presidium was held in Volgograd in February 1983 to discuss the course of the preparations for the international conference on security, disarmament and cooperation in Europe, which was to take place in Belgrade. The numerous foreign guests visited with a feeling of deep emotion the sites of former battles and the impressive memorial on Mamayev Kurgan and laid a wreath at the eternal flame. They admired the city--this monument of combat and labor glory--reborn from the ruins.

The regular session of the coordination committee for the organization of the future conference was held in Moscow in March 1984. This enabled the Soviet War Veterans Committee to hold a number of bilateral meetings and to gain a clearer idea of the approach taken by our Western partners to problems of European security, disarmament and development of cooperation among countries and nations.

The conference was held in Belgrade on 18-20 October 1984. It involved the participation of delegations representing a total of more than 25 million veterans and war victims not only from Europe but from America, Asia and Africa as well.

To me, attending this forum was memorable above all because it meant a new meeting with Yugoslavia, for the freedom of which had fought the troops of the Third Ukrainian Front, a member of whose military council I had been. Obelisks crowned by a red star may be seen throughout the country. A green grove of 441 birches whispers at the Pozarevac settlement. They were brought here from the legendary Dubosekovo station near Moscow; roses have been planted next to them. It was here that 441 Soviet soldiers died, side by side with Yugoslav patriots, in uneven battle. The memory of the Soviet heroes remains eternally alive in the names of Belgrade streets: Marshal Biryuzov, General Zhdanov....

The remembrance of the war, its victims and the desire to protect Europe from the threat of nuclear catastrophe hanging over it were what set the atmosphere of the conference and the mood of its participants. No one repeated the claims of Washington's politicians that the foundations of European security were strengthened after American Pershing and Tomahawk missiles were deployed in the FRG, England and Italy. No one questioned the fact that Reagan's "Star Wars" plans are fraught with most horrible consequences for mankind. Nor did individual efforts to galvanize in the course of the discussion of European problems the notorious thesis of "shared responsibility" by the United States and the USSR for the aggravation of the situation on the continent and the increased arms race, meet with support.

The Soviet delegation actively participated in the work of the conference. Our arguments were based on the documents of the 26th CPSU Congress and the subsequent party and government decisions aimed at halting the arms race, strengthening confidence among countries and peoples, and returning to a policy of detente, the positive results of which all Europeans had already been able to experience. Incidentally, many of the debates broke out exclusively because of the total lack of information shown by some delegates concerning the important peaceful initiatives of the Soviet Union, which are either ignored or distorted by the bourgeois mass information organs.

Occasionally, ideas were raised in a spirit of abstract humanism and pacifism in discussing the role of war veterans and victims in the antiwar movement and in normalizing the situation on the European continent. Thus, one woman delegate called for putting an end to all talks about World War II, no longer referring to its lessons or "tearing the soul" with the horrors of the events of 40 years ago, but instead proclaiming a "universal fraternity among nations." She referred to the example of France and the FRG which had allegedly totally forgotten old quarrels. If everyone would live "by the laws of good rather than evil," she said, wars would "vanish by themselves."

Such appeals met with no support. The war veterans, including those from the FRG and France, sensibly pointed out that the purpose of fraternizing under the "Atlantic" flag is to divide the peoples of Europe, to pit West against East and to favor preparations for a military campaign mounted by today's "crusaders" against the Soviet Union, which Reagan described as the "focus of evil." We recall that something similar had already taken place under Hitler. That is why it is criminal to forget the lessons of history. The remembrance of the last war and the suffering experienced is a powerful spiritual weapon of the veterans in their struggle against an even greater threat of war hanging over mankind.

In this connection, the question of revanchism--this malignant illness of the 20th century--was raised once again. Characteristically, there are those who consider this problem no longer so topical since, they claim, "the virus of revanchism" has been made harmless by the European conference in Helsinki, which had confirmed the inviolability of postwar boundaries in Europe. However, the voice of the veterans from the Soviet Union, Poland, the GDR and Czechoslovakia was heard firmly and loudly. The facts they cited proved the energizing of various types of revanchist "land associations" in West Germany, openly supported by the Bonn authorities. The Bundeswehr soldiers are being

raised in the ideas of revanchism. The same ideas imbue even textbooks. This was mentioned at the conference by members of a number of antifascist organizations in Western Europe.

Let us point out that in virtually all meetings held in recent years the progressive veteran public has raised the question of ties with young people. In the final account, the fate of the world depends on the choice which the young will make: will they favor the opponents or the proponents of war. The participants in the Belgrade forum positively rated measures such as the international symposium, which took place in Austria in April 1984, on passing on to young people the antifascist ideals and experience of resistance fighters. At that symposium, held by the FIR on the initiative of the Soviet committee, our representatives described a great deal of interesting activities related to their participation in the patriotic and internationalist upbringing of the growing generation.

The delegates to the Belgrade conference expressed their concern and worry on the subject of the energizing of neo-Nazi groups in a number of countries and the various terrorist actions, particularly in Italy. The Soviet delegation drew attention to the inadmissibility of confusing the just liberation struggle waged by the peoples with terrorism, conducted not only on different scales by individual adventurist groups, but also acts which take the nature of state terrorism, as was the case with Grenada and Lebanon or, presently, Nicaragua.

The European meeting in Belgrade convincingly proved the futility of the attempts made by imperialist reaction to weaken unity within the ranks of war veterans, dull their vigilance and exclude them from participating in the active struggle for peace and security of the peoples. The participants in the conference demonstrated their firm desire for peace and unanimously supported a program of measures aimed at defeating the aggressive plans of militaristic forces and strengthening European and universal security. They passed a resolution calling for holding a world conference of world veterans for disarmament in 1986, which the United Nations has proclaimed a Year of Peace.

The Soviet delegation made a major positive contribution to the drafting and formulation of the concluding document of the meeting: "Veterans and War Victims for Security, Disarmament and Cooperation in Europe." The document included a number of basic stipulations. Thus, the conference deemed it necessary to ensure the balance of forces and identical security on the lowest possible level of armaments and the prevention of the militarization of outer space. It condemned acts of terrorism. It expressed the confidence that war is not inevitable, for all conflicts can be settled by talks or other peaceful means. The conference spoke out for a return to the process of detente, strengthening confidence-building measures and supporting "the activities of the United Nations and its institutions in establishing international order based on true peace, right and solidarity."

The veterans, who unanimously approved this document, agreed with the recommendation of submitting it to the heads of governments of their countries and the United Nations secretary general.

The participants in the Belgrade meeting were informed of the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the 40th Anniversary of the Victory of the Soviet People in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945." Its stipulations met with a lively response among our interlocutors. The announcement that the SKVV intended to hold an international meeting of war veterans on the occasion of this noted anniversary, in Moscow in May 1985, was welcomed enthusiastically. Naturally, discussions were held also on how to note this great anniversary by the other members of the anti-Hitlerite coalition.

Back from Belgrade, the delegation of the Soviet War Veterans Committee was received by N. A. Tikhonov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Council of Ministers chairman, in the Kremlin on 11 December 1984, at which meeting he was presented with the final document drafted at the conference. In the course of the talk it was pointed out that Soviet peace initiatives are meeting with increasing support on the part of the world's public. It must not be allowed for the world, already once saved from fascist slavery, be destroyed recklessly. We, N. A. Tikhonov said, highly value the antiwar activities of the Soviet War Veterans Committee and of the international veterans public actively opposing the threat of war hanging over mankind.

3

The interest shown by the foreign public in the history and lessons of the last war has increased sharply in the year of the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism. The SKVV willingly responds to the numerous requests from mass information organs in socialist, developing and capitalist countries to organize meetings between their correspondents and noted Soviet military commanders, participants in the historical battles of the Great Patriotic War and Soviet military historians. Committee members are always granting interviews and participating in publications distributed abroad. We consider it exceptionally important to identify the sources of the victories achieved by our people and their armed forces and to show the greatness of the liberation mission in Europe and the antifascist nature of the last war.

World War II, which was unleashed by the most reactionary detachments of imperialism, clearly proved the nature of the "new order" and the results of the practical application of fascist ideology. Eleven of the 50 million dead were destroyed in Nazi concentration camps. As a rule, however, this is not known by the young people in Western European countries and North America, stupefied by anti-Soviet propaganda according to which gas chambers and camp crematoria are nothing but "Red" fabrications. The visit which President Reagan paid to the military cemetery in Bitburg, where SS troops are buried, was a deliberate insult to the memory of the victims of Nazism and synonymous of the fraternization between the U.S. administration and the Nazi degenerates and their "Fuehrer." The Soviet war veterans, who participate in the mass demonstrations on the grounds of the former death camps, such as Auschwitz, Matthausen, Buchenwald and others, angrily condemn Hitler's spiritual heirs and demand that the Nazi executioners, who escaped just retribution for their bloody crimes be held accountable, and that neofascist organizations be placed outside the law.

The Western reactionary circles were unable to prevent the nations from properly marking the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism. Thus, under the pressure of the progressive public and the war veterans, the conservative government was voiced to void its initial decision of British nonparticipation in the anniversary celebrations. Despite official Washington's counteraction, a group of American war veterans met with their Soviet comrades-in-arms in Torgau (GDR) on 25 April. They expressed their warm interest in reviving the "spirit of Elbe" and reasserted their loyalty to the oath made 40 years: to prevent a new war and to do everything possible for the peoples to live in peace.

As planned, an international meeting of war veterans and resistance fighters from the countries of the anti-Hitlerite coalition was held in Moscow in May. On the invitation of our committee, about 200 foreign delegates representing 10 international and 89 national organizations from all continents attended. The participants in the meeting enthusiastically responded to the warm greetings of the Soviet government, at which the international activities of the veterans, who are making a great contribution to preventing the danger of nuclear catastrophe, were rated highly.

This was an active meeting. In their addresses, A. Lot (France), R. Tomlins (Great Britain), W. Robertson (United States), S. Koday (Czechoslovakia) and representatives of other countries emphasized the decisive role which the Soviet Union played in the defeat of fascism, noted the tremendous casualties suffered by our people in World War II and paid their respects to those who contributed to the victory and ensured favorable conditions for the development of countries and peoples under conditions of peace and freedom. The veterans confirmed their loyalty to the ideals of the antifascist liberation struggle and their cohesion in the struggle for peace.

The participants in the meeting, concerned with the worsening of the international situation, pointed out the danger of the continuing unrestrained arms race and condemned President Reagan's intention to militarize space. They proclaimed their readiness to do everything they can to contribute to halting the arms race and to strengthening peace.

Soviet foreign policy and diplomacy can do a great deal but not everything in the struggle for peace and the security of nations. We frequently face in the world arena political forces to whom good will, dictated by reason, is alien. Here the power of our defense potential plays an invaluable role. Today it not only guarantees the constructive toil of the Soviet people but universal peace as well.

The Soviet war veterans actively participate in military patriotic work, developing in young people feelings of love for their homeland and hatred for its enemies, high political and class vigilance and constant readiness for exploit. Grey-haired people may be seen today everywhere, at enterprises, schools and military units. Side by side with the young people, the veterans are standing labor watch in honor of the forthcoming 27th CPSU Congress, setting examples of conscientious and efficient work. The veterans acquaint the young people with the circumstances in the world and talk about vigilance and the duty of every patriot to be ready to defend the homeland. They tell

the young of the heroism of our people in the struggle against fascism, teach them courage and expose them to the exploits of their fathers and grandfathers.

In doing military patriotic work, our veterans try not to omit the main things: to encourage the development in young people of clear conceptual views, ideological convictions, love for the homeland and their people and loyalty to the cause of the Leninist party.

There is something deeply symbolic in the fact that it is precisely in our country that the 12th World Youth and Student Festival will be held in the year of the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism. Its slogan "For Anti-Imperialist Solidarity, Peace and Friendship!" expresses also the feelings of last wars' veterans. They will be alongside the young people during the festival and will do everything possible for the young people on earth to consider themselves the legitimate heirs of the Great Victory and to be prepared to accept and carry on its flag--the flag of combat unity, peace and friendship among peoples.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/15

TOPICAL PROBLEMS OF THE ANTIWAR MOVEMENT AND THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 85 (signed to press 19 Jun 85) pp 94-103

[Review by V. Bushuyev, candidate of historical sciences, of the yearbook "Problemy Mirovogo Revolyutsionnogo Protsessa" [Problems of the World Revolutionary Process]]

[Text] Every party member is familiar with the feelings of admiration and pride in the great common cause, born of the successes of like-minded people in one country or another, and the victories of revolutionary and democratic forces in the struggle for social and national liberation. We are also familiar with the bitter feelings caused by temporary failures and defeats suffered by the working class in foreign countries and the death of fighters who gave their lives in the battles for the socialist renovation of the world and the triumph of the ideals of communism.

The profound interest shown by Soviet communists in the successful development of the world revolutionary process is as profound and firm as our solidarity with the struggle of the working class and progressive and democratic forces throughout the world. "The CPSU is an international party by nature," the March 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum stipulated. "Our confederates abroad may be confident that in the struggle for peace and social progress, as always, Lenin's party will cooperate closely with the fraternal communist, worker and revolutionary democratic parties and promote the unity and active interaction among all revolutionary forces."

Interest in the activities of the international revolutionary movement is natural and legitimate. This is understandable, for the masses are increasingly realizing the existence of an inseparable dialectical interconnection between the struggle for social progress and in defense of the rights of the working people and the battle for the prevention of a nuclear war and for safeguarding peace, a battle which has assumed unparalleled scope today. It is entirely obvious that the unification of peace-loving forces within a universal antiwar coalition can become a major obstacle on the path to thermonuclear war. It would also contribute to surmounting anticommunist prejudices which still prevail in some segments of the labor movement and the numerous political forces and social groups which, like the communists, are for peace and the security and cooperation among nations. In the final account, it is only the decisive superiority of peace-loving and democratic

forces and the removal from power of aggressive militaristic circles of the monopoly bourgeoisie and making profound antimonopoly changes in the capitalist countries that could put an end to the arms race, improve the international situation and ensure a peaceful life for the peoples.

What are the prospects for the development of the global revolutionary process? What are the factors contributing to its further development or, conversely, restraining its advance? What are the topical problems of the theoretical and practical activities of the fraternal parties marching in the vanguard of the revolutionary forces of our time, and how are they resolved? The curious reader will find answers to these and many other problems in our periodical and scientific press and the numerous books and pamphlets on the extremely broad topics of the international revolutionary movement. Noteworthy among the scientific publications on this topic in terms of formulating sharp problems and providing a deep Marxist-Leninist analysis of the vital problems of the struggle for peace and social progress is the yearbook "Problemy Mirovogo Revolyutsionnogo Protsessa" published by the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences (editors: Yu. A. Krasin (responsible editor) et al., Nos 1-4. Mysl, Moscow, 1981-1984).

The authors of the four yearbooks published so far, who include B. Ponomarev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, and the noted party personalities and scientists V. Zagladin, R. Ulyanovskiy, Yu. Krasin, G. Vodolazov, V. Rakhmanin, I. Frolov, A. Galkin, Yu. Gavrilov, V. Aleksandrov, M. Basmanov, G. Diligenskiy and many others, study the fundamental problems set by the 26th CPSU Congress to Soviet social scientists in the areas of the theory and practice of the revolutionary process. In bringing to light the common basic concepts of Marxist-Leninist theory of the revolution and their significance to the present, the authors and editors set as their objective the study of the trends of development of the global revolutionary process between the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s and the basic trends of the current stage in the struggle waged by the CPSU and the Soviet state for peace and social progress. Each issue contains a thorough scientific analysis of the sociopsychological problems of the revolutionary struggle and major problems of the history and theory of the communist, worker and national-liberation movements; the main trends of the ideological and political evolution of contemporary revolutionary democracy are considered and bourgeois, reformist and opportunist theories of the socialist revolution and concepts of the labor movement are critically analyzed.

Despite the variety and wealth of topics covered by the yearbook, the authors have given priority, with full justification, to contemporary problems of the significance and practical activities of communist and worker parties in the socialist and nonsocialist parts of the planet.

The authors, who draw attention to the increasingly assertive vanguard role of real socialism advancing along the main trends in the development of human society, emphasize the tremendous importance of the fact that at the present stage of the world revolution, "under complex and dangerous international circumstances, once again Lenin's party has proved its collective wisdom and comprehensive experience and its ability to structure its work on a long-term

basis, single out the main features of each historical stage and show its ability to answer accurately the most vital and urgent problems of domestic and international development" (No 1, p 4).

Thanks to the decisive, balanced and constructive program for restraining the arms race and preventing a new world war, formulated and presented by the CPSU and the Soviet state, our country and the world socialist community as a whole are increasingly becoming today, as perceived by the peoples on earth, the embodiment of their hopes for the preservation of peace and salvation of life itself and a guarantee that imperialism will be unable to implement its aggressive intents and achieve dominating positions in the world in order to dictate its will upon it.

Under contemporary conditions the progressive forces on earth have no task more important and urgent than that of safeguarding peace and preventing nuclear war. A great variety of political forces on all continents and, above all, naturally, the communists, who represent the most active, humane and creative force of mankind--the working class--are joining the struggle for this objective. It is precisely the communists who are in the leading ranks of those who condemn the adventuristic and militaristic policy of American imperialism and who participate in demonstrations and marches of protest against the intensifying arms race on earth and efforts to move it to outer space, and who are against the fanning of military hysteria and the creation of ever new hotbeds of tension in various parts of the planet. It is precisely the communists, despite the obstacles erected by the reaction, who are making a decisive contribution to the unification of peace-loving forces and to mobilizing them in the struggle for the most precious possession of every person--the right to life.

As the materials in the yearbook convincingly prove, the profound processes which determine contemporary social life and the existing ratio among economic, political and military potentials and trends in the development of the ideological struggle are such that with the proper mobilization of the will, energy and actions of all peace-loving forces and their unification, peace can be defended and strengthened. However, the problems of war and peace are not separated by some kind of wall from all other problems encountered by mankind. In particular, they are most closely related to the social contradictions which are tearing apart the capitalist countries and the course of the class struggle in the world.

In the crucial periods of development of mankind in the 20th century--today hardly anyone would question the fact that the world is experiencing precisely such a crucial period, when the fate of human civilization itself is in question--the role of the subjective factor increases sharply; particularly strict requirements are formulated concerning the political vanguard of the international working class and its ability to be on the level of the new, exceptionally difficult and steadily updated problems, and to lead the masses in battle in defense of achieved democratic gains and revolutionary change.

Noting that under contemporary conditions a great deal depends on the activeness, consciousness and initiative of revolutionary forces, the actions of which largely determined the basic trends of global developments, the

authors also point out that this trend is counteracted by the activeness of the regressive subjective factor and that counterattacks mounted by reactionary, militaristic and imperialist forces, are having a substantial restraining influence on the course and development of the revolutionary process and the efforts of subjective revolutionary factors (see No 2, p 25).

The forces of reaction are using all possible means to block a shift to the left in the political moods of the masses, to prevent the unification and consolidation of antimonopoly and democratic forces, to isolate the communist parties, to introduce discord and confusion in their ranks, including in ideology, and to undermine the internal unity among the worker, democratic and national liberation movements. The monopoly bourgeoisie hopes to lead the working class away from real and active participation in political life with the help of ideological myths, to confuse its awareness with sermons of "social partnership" with capital and to corrupt it with the false values of the "consumer society."

Global reaction is trying to mount a counteroffensive and to achieve a social revenge for defeats suffered in the past and help the capitalist system regain the historical initiative. In his April 1984 address delivered at the Center for Strategic and International Studies of Georgetown University, U.S. President Reagan openly said that the purpose of his policy, based on the use of military power, is the "restoration of the spirit of capitalism" throughout the world.

Accordingly, more than ever before the emphasis is on encouraging the industrial and financial oligarchy, particularly in the military-industrial complex, and strengthening the financial and political power of the leadership of the American bourgeoisie. Also apparent are the results of efforts to galvanize a historically obsolete system and to impose it upon the nations. On the one hand, this means an even sharper increase in imperialist aggressive foreign policy and the extreme heating up of international tension. On the other, it means an aggravation of its inherent internal contradictions, the crisis phenomena in the world capitalist economy and finances above all, the inflation of military budgets at the expense of social programs, an onslaught on the rights of trade unions, a considerable worsening of the situation of have-not population strata, a sharp increase in unemployment and a loss by the majority of the population in the capitalist countries of the hope of any kind of improvement in living conditions in the future.

However, this is not a question merely of increased unemployment or impoverishment of the masses. With the help of extensive factual data, the authors prove that even the relative material well-being of a certain highly paid segment of the working people in the developed capitalist countries, to begin with, does not provide them even the slightest confidence that their gains, acquired at the cost of tremendous efforts and after decades of stubborn struggle, will not be dispersed like a mirage tomorrow as a result of the next economic decline or the policy of the ruling circles aimed at a structural reorganization of the economy in directions advantageous to the monopolies. Secondly, any and even the most insignificant increase in nominal worker wages under capitalism is inevitably accompanied by phenomena which reduce this increase to naught and deprive it of any meaning: increasing

labor intensification and related nervous overstress, exceptionally numerous industrial accidents, and an almost panicky fear of disease and old age, created by the entire way of life, or of the possibility of losing their jobs, housing and external attributes of petit bourgeois well-being. Let us add to this the direct impact which the constant monetary fluctuations, declines and crises, inflation, increased cost of living, lifelong slavery to indebtedness brought about by the established credit system, have on the situation of the working people and their families. The consequences of a daily growing social insecurity are manifested in the moral degradation of a significant number of people, their spiritual devastation and depression and the wave of crime, suicide and drug addiction, which is assuming a catastrophic scale, that has engulfed the entire capitalist West.

The trend discovered by K. Marx himself is being clearly manifested under contemporary conditions. Marx noted that "whereas with the fast growth of capital the income of the worker rises, so does the social gap which separates the worker from the capitalist and the power of capital over labor as well as the dependence of labor on capital"; in other words, although "the material situation of the worker has improved, this has been at the expense of his social status" which, in fact, is "yet another step below the position of the capitalist" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 6, pp 450-451, 449).

The lack of confidence which is ubiquitously increasing in the capitalist world, the alienation from the existing system and the aspiration for profound social change are the result, therefore, not only of the worsened material situation of the workers and the other toiling population strata but, above all, the unavoidable contradiction between the level of satisfaction of the needs of the working people, steadily growing as a result of the objective development of material production, and the increased impossibility of satisfying such requirements while monopoly capital retains total power. "The worker opposes the social submissiveness and the trend of making him an appendage to the machine, a means of production, a machine among other machines. He opposes the social division of labor which maims the person..., and is against his transformation into a distorted one-sidedly developing being.... Above all, the working class tries to realize the need for comprehensive and universal development for every person, created as a result of the entire development of universal history and the need theoretically interpreted by Marxism, a need for a society in which 'the free development of one is a prerequisite for the free development of all'" (No 1, p 254).

The growing disappointment of the broad masses in the capitalist countries in the social policy of the ruling class has become an unquestionable fact today. Their conviction of the futureless nature of capitalism is intensifying and spontaneous protests against the policy of militarization, arms race, elimination of civil production sectors and imperialist adventuristic actions in the world arena are becoming energized; a persistent search is under way for an alternative to monopoly power and antihumane bourgeois civilization.

The social forces which opposed ulcers and faults of the capitalist system and the danger of nuclear catastrophe it creates are exceptionally heterogeneous in terms of social composition and ideological views. By joining the antiwar and antimissile struggle, which frequently takes the form of active protest

against militarism, the omnipotence of the military-industrial complex and the bourgeois establishment in general, the large nonproletarian strata frequently bring with themselves within the movement of the masses all of their inherent weaknesses, prejudices, hesitations and fantasies. Playing on the prejudices and inconsistencies of these strata, bourgeois ideology and propaganda are making particular efforts to weaken the revolutionary potential of the participants in the broad antiwar and antimonopoly coalitions, to encourage their doubts, to promote a skeptical attitude toward the revolutionary ideology of the proletariat and the practices of real socialism, to poison their minds with the drug of anticommunism and anti-Sovietism and to strengthen their conservative trends. As to the labor movement itself, the reaction is doing everything possible to encourage the shoots of the various weeds of reformism and opportunism, which are being planted in it today as they have been at all crucial and important periods in history.

Under these circumstances, as has frequently been the case in the past, the tragic results of the weaknesses, lack of initiative of the organized labor movement and the retention of the influence of bourgeois and reformist political parties and trade unions on the toiling masses, could be either the strengthening of right-wing fascist trends in society, skillfully exploiting the huge reservoir of discontent and hopelessness of the masses or the energizing of left-wing adventurism and anarchism. As we know, Lenin repeatedly warned that anarchism is a "kind of punishment for the opportunistic sins of the labor movement" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 41, p 15).

All of this faces the communist vanguard, as one of its priority tasks, with the need to use objectively existing opportunities for broadening and deepening the base of the revolution, uniting the workers, and winning over to its side the middle classes, the intelligentsia, the peasantry and the democratic military. Without such painstaking and exceptionally delicate and responsible work the very heterogeneous currents of class, social, economic and national discontent cannot be united within a powerful stream of revolutionary struggle which could sweep off the power of the monopolies and clear the way for progress toward socialism.

The communist parties in the developed capitalist countries bear tremendous responsibility for the fate of the revolutionary process. Regardless of their size and degree of influence on the masses at any given moment, as confirmed by the materials cited in the yearbook, they have been and remain irreplaceable to the labor movement, both as a motive force in the daily struggle as well as a force indicating the direction and prospects of any large-scale social battle. The experience of global revolutionary battles revealed the clear pattern that without a Marxist-Leninist party, inflexibly loyal to its ideals, ready to fight for the interests of the working people, highly organized and united and able to operate under most difficult circumstances, the working class cannot win a decisive victory and undertake the building of a new society. That is why any type of adaptation and abandonment of the revolutionary mission of the vanguard of the labor movement is incompatible with the activities of the communist party and its very existence. "If the communists are no longer distinct from other parties, without gaining anything they lose something most valuable--their uniqueness;

they will no longer be trusted and interest in them will begin to disappear" (No 3, p 65).

The materials in the yearbook convincingly prove that any effort to pit contemporaneity to the Leninist legacy, to ignore the main content of the epoch as a whole and the effective laws of the struggle for socialism, brought to light by the victorious revolutions, the Great October Revolution above all, inevitably turn into an interruption of the general line of development and conceal a major danger to the revolutionary party and the labor movement. The universal historical significance of Leninism, as the Marxism of our time, "is explained by the fact that it reflects most suitably the ripe needs of the age and the laws of the revolutionary conversion from capitalism to the new communist socioeconomic system" (No 1, p 34).

The question of the irreplaceability of the communist party as the political vanguard of the revolutionary workers movement becomes particularly relevant today, in connection with the hopes of some bourgeois-liberal and socioreformist ideologues to the effect that in the course of implementing a policy of alliances and cooperation between left-wing and democratic forces, the communists will lose their identity and revolutionism and will gradually dissolve in the mass of the nonproletarian allies of the working class. In pointing out the readiness of the communists comprehensively to promote the broadening of unity of practical actions by all forces aspiring for peace and social change, regardless of political and ideological orientation, in a number of articles the authors of the yearbook single out the idea that while making compromises with representatives of different trends, the communist parties try to protect their class characteristics and the specific nature of their own positions.

Absolutely unacceptable to the communists is the price for practical compromises in the struggle for peace and detente and against monopoly power which is demanded of them by some members of the liberal bourgeoisie and the socioreformists. Practical experience has proved that in the overwhelming majority of cases they had no intention of abandoning even the slightest of their principles or of softening or ignoring them or obediently closing their eyes when the foundations of Marxist-Leninist outlook or the countries of real socialism are attacked.

The readiness of the communists to cooperate with the social democratic trend in the labor movement, above all in the defense of peace and the security of the peoples, is combined, as a rule, with open and frank criticism of the ideology and practice of the class conciliationism of social reformism. The authors, who reject claims that opposition to the anticommunist views of right-wing social democrats and the defense of the principles of proletarian internationalism weaken the possibility of cooperation between the two trends in the labor movement, substantiatedly prove that, on the contrary, "principle-minded practical criticism of anticommunist prejudices and views, which are still quite widespread in the social democratic movement, are considered by them (the communists--the author) a structural component of the struggle for unity within the labor movement" (No 2, p 176). In their struggle for this unity, the communists realistically assess the limitations of political compromises. They proceed from the Leninist concept that

cooperation between communists and their allies should be carried out "with a view to enhancing rather than lowering the common level of proletarian consciousness, revolutionism and ability to struggle and to win" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 41, p 59).

As the yearbook shows, in aspiring to involve in the antimonopoly struggle ever new sociopolitical movements, the communists also pay great attention to preventing any disappearance of their own class-ideological identity while broadening the communist party's influence, or scorn of theory, carelessness concerning the ideological and conceptual foundations of the party and acceptance of other ideological trends.

Extending the influence of the communist parties in the capitalist countries to new participants in the struggle for democracy and socialism is, naturally, impossible without taking their interests and specific practical experience into consideration. However, this important problem cannot be resolved on the basis of a simple combination of the ideology and policies of the working class and the nonproletarian population strata or their mechanical summation. The authors emphasize entirely correctly that the experience acquired by these strata and "their interests should be refracted through the lens of the ideology and politics of the progressive class which expresses the interests of the working people most consistently. This is the only position which the communist party could and should hold. Otherwise, its revolutionary nature will be diluted in the 'pluralistic' conglomerate of petit bourgeois ideas, concepts and views" (No 3, p 245).

As a whole, at the present stage in the struggle for the revolutionary renovation of the world, the ideological confrontation between proletarian, Marxist-Leninist and bourgeois and reformist ideology becomes drastically aggravated. By virtue of the fact that monopoly capital is actively interfering in all realms of social life, mobilizing in its service legions of paid ideologues and using the tremendous power of the mass information media for the dissemination of its ideas, more than ever before ideology is becoming one of the main areas of fierce class struggle waged by the proletariat, alongside politics and economics.

It is obvious today that the communists can gain the upper hand in this stressed clash between two opposite ideologies and earn the firm support of the broadest possible masses only by outstripping their class enemy, the socioreformist circles, in the scientific study of the new social phenomena and processes steadily created by reality. Based on the fundamental principles and methodology of Marxism-Leninism, the theoretical elaboration of new phenomena and the study of situations substantially different from those in the past and of dynamically developing processes and, on this basis, the study of realistic and constructive economic and sociopolitical alternatives to the capitalist and socioreformist "models" of social development and the formulation of scientifically substantiated long-range objectives of the mass struggle, is yet another urgent task being resolved by the communists in the capitalist countries.

The primary duty of the communists has always been to prepare the working class for decisive battles against the power of monopoly capital and bourgeois dictatorship. The authors of the yearbook justifiably point out that even in historical situations in which Marxist-Leninists reach the conclusion of the impossibility of defeating the world of exploitation by virtue of their underdeveloped objective conditions or lack of readiness of the subjective factor, their duty is to formulate the corresponding slogan for the struggle, consistent with these circumstances, and for the approaching socialist future, and to influence events in a revolutionary, i.e., active-transforming spirit (see issue No 1, p 244).

The materials in the yearbook clearly indicate that, as was the case during previous stages in the history of the workers movement, today as well the question is the extent to which a given party of the working class is combat-capable and does it have the ability successfully to operate during periods of upsurge or calm of mass revolutionary actions, always raising the slogans for the struggle which are absolutely consistent with this period and offering a clear alternative; is it able, in accordance with the specifics of national conditions, to combine scientific socialism with the labor movement and the rather fluctuating and dynamic social activeness of all working people's detachments? In turn, this depends to a decisive extent on the strength, tempering and professional training and loyalty to the cause of the revolution of the vanguard itself, the closeness of its ties with the masses, the extent to which the party members feel their affiliation with a single organization based on a common outlook and guided by revolutionary theory, the creation of a sufficiently effective obstacle to the penetration of alien forces within their ranks or of hesitating in unstable elements, bearers of petit bourgeois and opportunistic ideology, which may threaten the party with erosion and breakdown.

A great deal also depends on the extent to which the party helps its aktiv to master all the ways and means of struggle. Without belittling the importance of parliamentary forms of work in the least or participation in the local power bodies for the sake of defending the interests of the working people within the framework of a bourgeois society, remembering the experience and lessons summed up by Leninism, the communists take into consideration the inevitable limitations and conventionality of bourgeois parliamentarianism. They try to use elections and the parliament itself as an arena of the class struggle, as an additional opportunity for promoting basic requirements and laying the foundations of a political outlook by the conscious proletariat, as well as for explaining, again and again, to the masses the need, the essential nature and inevitability of the revolution (see V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 37, p 255; vol 22, pp 168, 174). The communist parties aspire for the parliament itself to change from an organ serving the bourgeois order to a spokesman for the will of the working people, to an instrument of democracy for the working people based on a mass revolutionary movement and, precisely on its basis, ensuring the making of deep social changes which open the way to socialism.

However much reformists and revisionists are trying to prove the opposite, it is an insurmountable fact that "the power of the revolutionary proletariat, from the viewpoint of its influence on the masses and involving them in the

struggle, is incomparably greater in the nonparliamentary rather than the parliamentary struggle" (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 34, p 219).

The aspiration to achieve the integration of the party of the working class with the sociopolitical structure of capitalism has always been a structural component of bourgeois counterrevolutionary strategy. As pointed out in the yearbook, "The opponents of Leninism do not conceal that they are trying to convert the party of the working class into a reformist party accepting the laws and 'game rules' of the bourgeois system and bourgeois democracy and not threatening a 'break' with the capitalist system" (No 3, p 11). As to the party of a Leninist type, its main feature has always been and remains a consistent revolutionism, tireless work for the cause of the socialist revolution and firm rejection of any kind of concepts of "social partnership" with the bourgeoisie or the idea of dissolving the revolution in the sum total of partial reforms which do not exceed the framework of the capitalist system. "We," Lenin emphasized, "firmly reject any effort to weaken or suppress the revolutionism of the social democracy, which is the party of social revolution..." (op. cit., vol 4, p 330).

Lenin, who rejected all manifestations of adventurism and voluntarism, always pointed out the importance of revolutionary initiative, resolve and energy on the part of the most conscientious part of the working people. The authors of the yearbook draw attention to the fact that the history of the revolutionary struggle includes many examples in which the ability of the political vanguard to lead the masses has contributed to changing an adverse ratio of forces. "...At critical points in the life of nations," Lenin pointed out, "it has frequently been the case that even small advance elements of progressive classes have been able to lead the entire masses, fired with revolutionary enthusiasm, accomplishing the greatest historical exploits" (op. cit., vol 36, p 361). Conversely, passiveness and lack of initiative inevitably lead, as the experience acquired in the struggle waged by the international working class indicates, to missing objective opportunities, failure to use even the most favorable ratio of forces and loss of already achieved gains and, sometimes, even to the triumph of the counterrevolution.

History cruelly punishes political parties which have proved to be not on the level of the tasks facing society in periods of aggravation of the crisis, parties which have shown a passive attitude at crucial times, when the masses, frequently even without realizing it, urgently need a proper ideological and political orientation and a decisive leadership in the struggle for the overthrow of rotten foundations and for revolutionary change. It would be pertinent in this connection to recall the noteworthy statement by A. Potresov, one of the leaders of the Russian Menshevik Party, expressed in a rare moment of frankness. In an article published in the 3 August 1917 issue of the Petrograd newspaper DEN, he was forced bitterly to acknowledge that "...only the blind can fail to see that our party today is not living but vegetating and that as an integral entity does not operate on the surface of life, as a pioneer in the policy of the revolutionary democracy, as a progressive fighter for the revolution who, rushing ahead, leads the others and indicates the way to be followed and which those others indeed follow." He further reached an equally disheartening conclusion about his party sunk in the mire of opportunism: "We live in a revolutionary epoch, an epoch of

greatest upheavals and actions. Woe to any party, therefore, which finds itself outside revolutionary actions, in the back yard of history. It will leave the ranks of the living for a long time."

As far as the Menshevik Party is concerned, as we know, it did remove itself from the list of the living forever because of its conciliationist policy and open betrayal of the interests of the Russian working class. Incidentally, Potresov himself largely contributed to this. To the end of his days he was unable, as it were, to understand why the mensheviks had found themselves in the back yard of history and to admit that the party of a new, Leninist type--the Bolshevik Party--alone met the requirements of the revolutionary age. His statement has become a kind of epitaph for the opportunistic trend in the Russian social democratic movement. Today it can be considered a warning to those who, ignoring the lessons of history, scorn revolutionary practice, try to avoid a decisive confrontation with the class enemy, fully accepting the imposed "game rules" within the framework of the institutions of bourgeois-democratic legality and the political and juridical norms created by capitalism for the sake of perpetuating its rule.

With full justification, the authors of the yearbook point out the senselessness and lack of realism of efforts by people frequently identifying themselves with the leftist movement, to remain neutral in the battle between the forces of progress and reaction, which is currently being fought in the individual capitalist countries and on an international scale, to postpone the time of definitive decision, and to assume an equidistant position from the two centers of class confrontation in the contemporary world. Such efforts are "in clear contradiction with one of the main characteristics of our century--a century of decisive social choice. Either socialism or capitalism. History offers no third choice" (No 2, p 17).

Naturally, one must not ignore the exceptionally difficult circumstances in which the communists in the capitalist countries are struggling and which demand of them not only a clear ideological and political orientation and the ability to operate under most unforeseen circumstances, but also tremendous personal courage and constant readiness for self-sacrifice for the sake of the great socialist ideals. Nor should one ignore the tremendous difficulty of the problems which must be resolved by the communist parties in these countries. These problems were the consequence of the uneven development of the global revolutionary process and the activities of hostile class forces, coordinated on an international scale. Creatively developing Marxism-Leninism and finding, with its help, proper answers to the ever new problems raised by life and strengthening their cohesion and mutual support, the fraternal parties in the capitalist countries will unquestionably continue to advance confidently and to lay a path to socialism.

The authors and editors of the yearbook have laid the beginning of a publication which, unquestionably, is making a noticeable contribution to domestic social science dealing with the problems of the world revolutionary process. The readers expect of the future issues an even more specific and profound study of the most complex problems which affect communists in all

countries and the even more current interpretation of exceptionally important and frequently conflicting processes which are developing under our very eyes in different parts of the planet and which require a clear Marxist-Leninist interpretation.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/15

PORTUGAL: ECONOMIC CRISIS AND POLITICAL STRUGGLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 85 (signed to press 19 Jun 85) pp 104-113

[Article by Alvaro Cunhal, Portuguese Communist Party secretary general]

[Text] The national conference of the Portuguese Communist Party (PCP), which was held in the city of Seixal at the end of March 1985, was an important event in Portuguese political life. The only item on the agenda was the communist program for surmounting the country's economic, social and political crisis. Comrade Alvaro Cunhal delivered the concluding speech at the conference. An abridged version of his address follows.

I

The development of the economic, financial and social situation in the country for the last 9 years, i.e., ever since big capital and the reaction mounted their extensive counteroffensive against the gains of the April 1974 revolution, was considered as a whole as well as by individual sector at the national conference of the PCP. Particular attention was paid to the current situation.

The first feature of the severe crisis experienced by the country is the decline, disorganization, destabilization and anarchy prevailing in all areas of economic activities. Gradually, important sectors, such as ship building, ferrous metallurgy, machine building and the light and food industries are gradually declining. The volume of construction dropped by 3 percent in 1983 and 11 percent in 1984. The number of merchant vessels dropped from 130 in 1975 to 80 in 1984. Gross agricultural production has dropped considerably. Thousands of small and medium-sized enterprises are declaring bankruptcy and commodity marketing is becoming increasingly dependent on the foreign market. The 1984 fish catch was 12.5 percent below the 1976 level. In a word, the entire production and distribution process has become disorganized and new life must be instilled into it.

The second main feature of the crisis is the steady growth of the trade and balance of payments deficit, the threatened condition of the financial system,

which is on the brink of collapse, and unprecedented foreign indebtedness. The condition in which the finances of the state find themselves is a reflection not only of their general crisis but also the incompetence of the leadership, which is dragging the country towards ruination. Although taxes have doubled over the past 9 years, the national debt, which amounted to 25 percent of the gross national product (GNP), reached 61.6 percent by the end of 1984, or, adding hidden charges, 80 percent of the GNP. The indebtedness of state and private enterprises, the output of which is sold on the domestic market, has reached incredible amounts. In the majority of cases, the value of the produced goods is totally absorbed by the interest rates. The banking system has reached a state of virtual collapse.

The foreign debt began to increase sharply starting with 1976. By 1984 it had quintupled in dollars and increased by a factor of 25 in escudos. The foreign debt equaled 9 percent of the GNP in 1975 and 80 percent in 1984. Forty-five percent of all exported commodities and services went to service the foreign debt in 1984.

Another consequence of the crisis is the steady worsening of the people's living conditions. The social situation in the country is steadily worsening. The number of unemployed rose from 220,000 to 600,000 (300,000 of whom are young people), or more than 13 percent of the economically active population or 20 percent of the total hired labor. Inflation is reaching the 30 percent annual margin; real wages dropped by 21.3 percent from 1977 to 1984. The purchasing power of the population is declining sharply. The situation with housing, health care and education is worsening.

The study of the social, economic and financial situation is an X-ray photograph of a truly national catastrophe which is ripening in the country.

II

What are the reasons for such a deep crisis? Unlike the claims of the government and its defenders, the PCP national conference proved that the international economic crisis alone, despite its serious consequences to our country, cannot explain the catastrophe which threatens the Portuguese economy. Another fact proved at the conference was that regardless of the claims of the government and its supporters, it was not the democratic changes in socioeconomic structures, which were made as a result of the democratic revolution, that were the main reason for the "Portuguese crisis" but the fierce and destructive counteroffensive mounted against such changes for the past 9 years.

The offensive against the nationalized enterprises and sectors, the agrarian reform and the rights of the working people, which was started in 1976 for the sake of restoring the positions held by big business, the landowners and the imperialists by alternating big capital governments, dealt a serious blow to the entire production process, the financial system and the people's living conditions and resulted in the disorganization of the main economic areas.

The pressure applied on nationalization assumed the nature of actual warfare waged for the sake of destroying the nationalized Portuguese economic sectors.

Faced with the opposition of the people and unable to deliver in one fell swoop the banks and the other nationalized sectors and enterprises into the hands of big business, the counterrevolutionary governments took systematic planned steps to undermine the profitability of state enterprises, to disorganize them and, subsequently, to turn them over to private capital. Step by step, private capital was given access to many nationalized sectors, either by allowing it to set up private enterprises within it or to invest in the statutory capital of state enterprises. By turning the nationalized banks into one of the levers in the offensive mounted against nationalization (including in the nationalized banking area itself), and for the restoration of financial capitalism and the monopolies, the counterrevolutionary policy led the entire banking and financial system in the country to a state of total breakdown.

By sabotaging the activities of the nationalized enterprises the counterrevolutionary governments caused their production decline and by systematically cancelling its orders put them in a position of debtors. The country's governments preferred to purchase goods from abroad rather than have them made by the nationalized or partly state-owned enterprises. The banned or prevented industrial capital investments in the nationalized sector. They removed from the nationalized enterprises their profitable lines by breaking them up and closed down many nationalized plants and factories for lack of profitability after they themselves had forced these enterprises to face tremendous financial difficulties.

Consequently, the current state of affairs at the nationalized enterprises is not the consequence of their previous nationalization, but the result of the offensive mounted against them for a number of years.

A similar situation, as was proved at the national conference, developed in the case of the agrarian reform. The onslaught against the agrarian reform, aimed at its liquidation and the restoration of landed estates, is a sinister story of anticonstitutional actions, violence, plunder and crimes committed by the ruling circles. All sorts of court trials were fabricated and illegalities committed to justify this pressure! All such attacks are being carried out with the extensive use of the national guard and accompanied by mass beating of men, women and children and murders.

A total of 657,000 hectares of the best land have already been taken away from the cooperatives with a view to restoring the landed estates (i.e., 58 percent of their land, along with 242,000 head of cattle, hundreds of buildings and installations, dams and social institutions, such as nurseries, clubs, etc. More than 400 estates farmed by the working people, totalling hundreds of thousands of hectares, were returned to the large land owners and then abandoned. As a result of governmental actions more than 200 cooperative farms and 50,000 jobs were eliminated.

The reactionary agrarian policy pursued to the benefit of the capitalists, estate owners and rural rich has caused agriculture a great deal of trouble. The violation of the rights of tenants, granted them after the April revolution, the restoration to power of the big landowners and the increased number of tenants expelled from the land further restricted investments and

reduced output. Lowered labor productivity, the ruination of hundreds of thousands of small farmers and land tenants and stagnation and even decline in the basic farm sectors were the results of the policy pursued by government circles in the Portuguese countryside.

The worsening of the living conditions of the working people is also a direct consequence of the largest counterrevolutionary operation aimed at restoring the positions of monopoly capital. This, on the one hand. On the other, there is the planned and deliberate policy of restoring the level of exploitation of the working class and all working people, which existed in the country during fascist times, and the abrogation of the rights gained as a result of the democratic revolution.

The facts, therefore, clearly confirm that the main and determining reason for the particular gravity of the crisis experienced by Portugal is not found in external and purely economic factors or the revolutionary democratic gains of 1974-1975 but the purposeful policy of the ruling circles.

Our 10th party congress (December 1983) emphasized that the offensive aimed at restoring the monopolies and landed estates had become a real crusade, the purpose of which was the "fast, coercive and illegal centralization in the hands of big capital of the added value created in the country, the available capital, state funds and property (nationalized and partially owned state enterprises) and the land and property of the cooperative farms in the agrarian reform zone." As was pointed out at the congress, this is a campaign to plunder the country and return to the big capitalists ownership of means of production and capital.

This crusade is a typical feature of the so-called "economic and financial policy" pursued in Portugal to this day. It is a counterrevolution in the most direct meaning of the term.

III

World imperialism is the inspirer and patron of a policy the purpose of which is the restoration of the positions of financial capital and the revival of landed estates and monopolies in Portugal. The positions of imperialism are restored along with those of the capitalists and land owners. In the majority of cases, private Portuguese capital merges with foreign capital in joint share holding companies and enterprises (as was the case during the fascist dictatorship). Let us emphasize that ever greater concessions are being made to imperialism, American above all, not only in the economic and financial, but the political, diplomatic and military areas as well, which seriously harms the country's independence and national sovereignty.

The question of the growing subordination of national to foreign interests was closely considered at the PCP conference. Portugal's increasing dependence is manifested, first of all, in the strengthening of the positions of multinational monopolies in the country's economy and their increasing influence. They not only hold a high percentage of the positions which foreign monopolies held in fascist times but are even gaining new bridgeheads in the Portuguese economy.

Two major concessions recently granted by the coalition government of the Portuguese Socialist Party (PSP) and the Social Democratic Party (SDP) were a real attempt on the national economy and the country's future and independence: the permission granted to two big American banks (Chase Manhattan and Manufacturers Hannover Trust) to open branches in Portugal, and the transfer of the Neves-Corvo copper mines, which are of inestimable value to our economic development, to the Rio Tinto Zinc multinational corporation. This corporation is famous the world over for its predatory exploitation of deposits, for which it has been condemned in the United Nations.

Prime Minister M. Soares tempts the foreign monopolies with the wages of the Portugues working people, which are lower than those in the developed capitalist countries by a factor of 3-10. He promises to pass the type of labor legislation which would guarantee multinational monopolies the right to engage in the unrestrained exploitation of our workers. He is granting various facilities for the export of added value. It is clear that the policy of restoring the positions of the local monopolies is also a policy of selling the country out to foreign capital.

Portugal's increasing dependence means, secondly, an excessive dependence on the foreign market and the one-sided orientation of foreign trade toward a limited number of developed capitalist countries. Thus, exports to the EEC and the United States jumped from 53 percent of total exports in 1976 to 67 percent in 1984.

Third, Portugal's greater dependence is manifested in the increased foreign debt, repayment of which is absorbing an increasing share of national resources. Here is a simple comparison: the amount of interest annually paid on foreign loans exceed the value of two years' production of grain, wine and olive oil. Foreign debts are literally tightening the noose around the neck of the Portuguese economy. The foreign debt is also turning into an instrument of pressure, extortion and interference in national economic policy and into a permanent means of limiting our independence and sovereignty.

Fourth, Portugal's increasing dependence is manifested in its relations and nature of deals with the International Monetary Fund (IMF), a usurious institution operating on an international scale and a tool of American imperialism. The IMF dares to formulate the main aspects of Portugal's economic, financial and social policy. The liberation of Portugal from the interference and petty supervision of the IMF is a mandatory condition for the preservation and strengthening of national independence.

Fifth, Portugal's increased dependence is confirmed by its intention to join the EEC, which would have truly fatal consequences for the Portuguese economy. Furthermore, EEC membership will open wide the path to American imperialism in the seizure of our wealth and resources. The country's integration within the EEC will be catastrophic for the ore mining industry, ferrous metallurgy, machine building, ship building, the electrical engineering and chemical industries, the production of fertilizers and petrochemicals and the food, fishing and farming industries, particularly the production of grain, fruits and vegetables, potatoes, wine, and meat and dairy farming.

Portugal's membership in the Common Market will also become a pretext for the total liquidation of the revolutionary democratic gains in the social and economic areas and the full restoration of the monopolies, the landed estates and state monopoly capital. Consequently, the plan of joining the EEC has become a structural part of the counterrevolution's restoration plans.

As was convincingly demonstrated at our party conference, it is a patriotic policy pursued in the interest of the entire nation, a policy of firm and inviolable defense of national independence, a policy which can take the country out of the crisis and resolve national problems, that must be pursued.

IV

One of the basic features of the course of restoration of the positions of capitalism, landed estates and imperialism, which has led the country to its most severe crisis, has been total disrespect for the constitution and democratic laws, i.e., the subversive and destabilizing nature of this course. Therefore, the first prerequisite for the country's economic revival and ascending development is the strict observance of the Fundamental Law and democratic legality and, on this basis, the country's economic and social stabilization. Ensuring the stability of the economic organization of society, as codified in the constitution, assumes exceptional importance at this time. This means that the policy which could take the country out of the crisis must proceed from two postulates.

The first, in our view, is putting an immediate end to the offensive mounted on nationalization, agrarian reform and the rights of the working people, and the abrogation of anticonstitutional laws and, therefore, the annulment of all anticonstitutional steps taken by the government, strengthening the nationalized enterprises and sectors, and returning to the state, the agrarian reform institutions and the working people all capital, means and rights illegally taken from them. On the other hand, no single nationalized enterprise should be transferred any longer to private ownership and no strike should be dealt at the 335 cooperative farms which still have 475,000 hectares of land at their disposal.

The communist party considers that permits for the opening of private banks and enterprises in constitutionally banned sectors should be revoked. The profitable sectors transferred to private capital should be restored to the state. Decisions calling for the closing down or dismemberment of many state enterprises should be revoked. The land, premises and other property confiscated from the cooperatives should be returned to them. Illegally laid off working people should be rehired.

The second component of a policy which could take the country out of the crisis is the dynamic development of all current economic systems, i.e., the nationalized and privately-owned enterprises, petty and medium-sized production facilities in agriculture, the cooperative farms in the agrarian reform zone and cooperatives and self-managing enterprises.

The main levers which must be applied in surmounting the crisis in the Portuguese economy and ensuring the subsequent fast upsurge of the country were justifiably named: the nationalized sector (bearing in mind the importance of banks, insurance companies, key industrial sectors, transportation and trade organizations) and the agrarian reform (increased output and labor productivity in the agrarian reform zone have already proved that all the necessary conditions for the efficient functioning of the cooperative farms and enterprises created here have been established).

Furthermore, and despite the assertions of its slanderers, the PCP also supports the private sector. We, Portuguese communists, are struggling only against the seizure by big capital and the land owners of the property of all other economic sectors, against their appropriating of all national resources and subordinating the entire national economy to multinational and local monopolies. However, as we have always emphasized, under the conditions of the country's economic system the PCP ascribes great importance to the activities of a private dynamic and efficient sector. In the interest of the progress of the national economy the state should support the other economic systems as well (unlike what the governments of the past 9 years have been doing), such as the cooperatives, self-managing enterprises, petty and medium-sized farmers and land tenants, and petty and medium-sized trade and industrial enterprises.

Naturally, the active and creative participation of the working people themselves in the production and management process is a necessary and most important condition. Production rationalization, coordination and planning, technological improvements, increasing labor productivity, conservation of energy and raw materials and the struggle against corruption and forgeries not only demand but are simply unattainable without the participation of the working people under contemporary conditions. That is why we must re-create the most important gain of the April revolution: working people's control over production management and the activities of working people's commissions in the economic life of enterprises. We must see to it that tens of managers elected by labor collectives undertake to perform their functions, so far hindered by the government; The General Confederation of Portuguese Working People--the National Intersyndicate--must be granted the full right to represent the interests of the working people; the representation of the organizations of working people in the state agencies (councils, institutions), from which they were removed, must be restored.

"Three main trends in the renaissance and development of the country" were defined at our national conference: first, increasing domestic production; second, achieving financial health; third, improving the living conditions of the working people and the nation as a whole. The problem of increasing domestic output became the cornerstone.

Under present-day conditions this can be achieved essentially by ensuring the fuller use of installed production capacities (currently substantially underutilized), increasing labor productivity, opening new jobs and ensuring the fuller use of domestic sources of raw materials and energy through their thriftier utilization.

The loading of production capacities largely depends on broadening the domestic market (in which improving the population's living conditions plays an important role) and on increasing exports and reducing imports, which can be achieved through the diversification of economic relations and the pursuit of the type of policy which will allow us, wherever deemed realistic and advantageous, to replace imported with domestic goods.

The overall and sectorial planning, conceived not as bureaucratically imposed from above but as a rational determination of basic trends and tasks in economic activities, is the most important element in streamlining relations between enterprises and sectors, determining priorities in the development of one sector or another, surmounting the severe financial crisis, eliminating disproportions and ensuring an ascending harmonious development.

In suggesting such an economic policy, our party proceeds from several starting points, such as the fact that the supreme and unquestionable objective of the economy is to serve Portugal and the Portuguese people; that Portugal cannot and must not allow the transformation of its national economy into an appendage of the economies of developed capitalist countries, accepting a role imposed upon it by the international division of labor as a producer and exporter of raw materials, parts and assemblies and provider of inexpensive manpower; that Portugal cannot and must not allow the destruction of its most progressive production sectors to please foreign interests; and that Portugal is able to surmount its backwardness and make its economy advanced and progressive.

Bearing in mind that the nationalized sector covers strategic industrial sectors and basic enterprises, it must play a decisive role in ensuring the forward thrust of our entire economy, its revival and its subsequent dynamic growth. The conference also emphasized the need to ensure the accelerated development of the private sector and cooperative and self-managing enterprises, and defined steps to achieve this objective.

A nationally oriented economic policy should consider agriculture a sector which needs priority help by the state rather than a sector doomed to stagnation and, therefore, to inevitable worsening of its lagging. A nationally oriented economic policy requires that the share of agriculture and the fishing industry, which account for 23 percent of the employed population, account for much more than the current 8.4 percent of the GNP.

The agricultural policy proposed by the CPC is, above all, a policy of stimulating the agrarian sector and increasing agricultural output. The fundamental premises to this effect are support of the agrarian reform, which could give a powerful impetus to agriculture; energizing the activities of small and medium-sized farmers and developing the cooperative movement. In this connection, it is a question of revising the land tenancy payments in order to set an equitable level of payments and make the tenants feel secure about their future; recognizing the right of the local population to cultivate abandoned land with a view to its fuller and more effective utilization.

The decisions which were made at the PCP national conference cover virtually all agricultural sectors. The question which arises in grain production, for

example, is the following: Is a situation in which Portugal averages no more than one million tons of grain crops inevitable? Is it inevitable that yields per hectare average no more than 10 quintals for wheat and 12 for corn? Is the annual imports of more than 3 million tons of grain into our country justified? Our party claims that the production of grain crops and a significant reduction in their importation are not only necessary but possible.

The anarchy and breakdown of all economic structures, caused by the policy of restoration of monopolies and landed estates, aggravated by incompetence, nepotism and corruption, are triggering a general worsening in the country's financial situation. Financial recovery requires an immediate lowering of interest rates, blocking the depreciation of the escudo and the growth of inflation and pursuing a policy of targeted crediting.

Relieving Portugal from the unbearable burden of repaying a monstrous foreign debt is a task of truly national importance. The complete solution of this problem will demand time and will depend essentially on the growth of economic rates. The situation, however, is such that urgent steps are necessary.

It is entirely clear to our party, as confirmed at the national conference, talks on lowering interest rates and rescheduling the repayment of the foreign debt must become a programmatic point of an economic policy truly consistent with the national interests.

Let us note that the problem of foreign indebtedness is not topical of Portugal alone. It is one of the most complex and painful world economic problems and one of the new methods through which imperialism (American above all) can appropriate the added value created in the world. It is a manifestation of the growing domination and control by American imperialism over the economies of many countries.

Rescheduling their foreign debt is today a question of life or death to many countries, a question of preserving their national independence. It goes far beyond the framework of economics and is becoming an urgent problem of global politics. The defense of national interests demands of Portugal to take the necessary foreign policy measures in this area in order to coordinate its activities with those of other countries experiencing the same difficulties.

The economic policy formulated at the national PCP conference is not aimed at increasing production for the sake of production or development for the sake of development. It is a policy of growth of output and development aimed at making Portugal entirely free and independent. It means production and development for the good of the person and for the sake of improving the material and cultural living conditions of the people.

The implementation of such a policy will enable us to create a material base for the solution of the most difficult social problems. It is possible only under the conditions of a democratic system and with a course aimed at preserving and strengthening national independence. This means, above all, ensuring the development and strengthening of the democratic regime and the full exercise of the citizens' constitutional rights and freedoms instead of

adopting antidemocratic measures and laws, repressions and the creation of a police and totalitarian state.

Secondly, the economic policy proposed by the PCP demands the systematic, firm and bold defense of the country's national interests, sovereignty and independence.

Before it is too late, instead of joining the Common Market we should engage in talks on signing specific agreements with the EEC members and improve and intensify relations with the EFTA, the socialist countries, the young liberated Portuguese-language countries in Africa and the Arab and other countries.

Instead of offering to the multinational corporations the key sectors and levers of the Portuguese economy, the state should assume total control over the banking system, main mineral deposits, strategic economic areas and key industrial sectors.

Rather than accepting an international division of labor which assigns Portugal the role of rearguard producer of raw materials and supplier of cheap manpower, the state should pursue a policy of harnessing and actively utilizing internal resources and possibilities of improving the well-being of the people and ensuring the general economic progress of the country. In the field of foreign relations we must not limit ourselves to following a single direction but diversify our economic, trade and technological relations.

Instead of granting increasing military concessions to the United States and NATO and subordinating Portuguese foreign policy to the strategy of American imperialism, and instead of assuming "additional risk" by "allowing national territory" to be used by NATO countries (as is declared in the "strategic doctrine of national defense") we should restrict and reduce Portugal's international obligations in the military area, and ban the transiting, storing and stockpiling of nuclear weapons on our territory. We must formulate and implement the type of foreign policy which, without harming traditional relations, would help to establish relations of friendship, cooperation and peace with all nations on earth.

The defense and strengthening of political democracy and national independence are, therefore, the fundamental prerequisites which would enable Portugal to come out of the crisis within the framework of the country's economic organization, as codified in the constitution, and to formulate and implement a policy of economic development consistent with the country's interests. The policy proposed by the PCP is consistently democratic and patriotic, a type of policy which Portugal needs.

V

We are struggling to make 1985 a year of democratic change. Our national conference convincingly proved the existence of an alternate policy which can resolve the country's problems. However, the mere formulation and proclamation of such a policy is not enough. There must also be a political

alternative, i.e., the possibility of forming a government which could implement the suggested alternate policy.

Our party claims that a legal base exists for the resignation of the present government and the formation of a democratic one. The PSP-SDP coalition government has lost all legal justifications for governing the country. It has failed to keep even a single one of its promises. It has aggravated the problems facing the country and led it into a most severe crisis. It is violating the constitution and its laws and most basic democratic principles. Its majority in the National Assembly no longer corresponds to the electoral majority. The democratic institutions have long stopped to function normally and regularly. The people, who are struggling under the banner of the constitution, demand the immediate resignation of this government.

These reasons and prerequisites are more than sufficient to justify the resignation of the government. There also are laws governing the suggested political alternative, as codified in the constitution and stipulating the possibility of dissolving the National Assembly, holding extraordinary elections and forming a democratic government of national salvation, capable of solving the country's problems.

Once again the PCP declares its readiness to discuss the legislative, political and social possibilities of forming such a government. Increasingly broader social strata are arriving at the conclusion that without the communists and the participation of the working people our national problems cannot be resolved. The influence of the PCP on a national scale, the profound ties between the communist party and the working class and people's masses, its level of organization and ability to act, profound knowledge of the country's problems and substantiation of the solutions proposed by the party, as demonstrated once again at the national PCP conference, all prove that the country needs the communist party and its participation in the government.

The PCP is ready to assume its share of responsibility in the democratic solution of the problem of surmounting the fatal economic, social and political crisis into which the policy of counterrevolution has led the country.

What are our main tasks in the light of making 1985 a year of democratic change?

The most important task is to organize, broaden, develop and energize the struggle for national salvation waged by the working class and the popular masses. The principal slogans of our struggle at the present stage are to counteract the reactionary offensive mounted against the gains of the April revolution and obtain the resignation of the government.

We must concentrate our efforts and energy on upgrading the activeness, organization and scope of the mass struggle for attaining specific objectives, whatever the situation, and meeting the demands of the various classes and social groups. Such activities should be combined with the struggle for the

implementation of the most important political objective at the present stage: the soonest possible resignation of the PSP-SDP government.

The unification of all social and political forces dissatisfied with the policies of the present government and favoring a democratic and patriotic alternative is an important task. All antimonopoly classes and strata must be united. Democrats and patriots of all political persuasions must rally around the common objective of saving Portugal from catastrophe and subordination of the country to imperialism, and in defense of democracy and the preservation and strengthening of national independence.

The immediate task of the PCP is to undertake without delay preparations for the struggle in the presidential and local elections which are demanded by the people, such elections being both necessary and possible. This refers to extraordinary elections for the National Assembly which must be held if it is dissolved.

Finally, our most topical task is to strengthen the PCP as a party needed by the people and irreplaceable in the defense of democracy and national independence and in ensuring the democratic solution of the country's problems.

Our national conference proved once again the strength, unity, collective work and internal democracy inherent in our party. It is one more proof of the profound ties of the PCP with life. It is a proof of its great influence among the working class and the people's masses. It is a proof of how necessary its contribution is in taking the country out of the crisis democratically and in the decisive struggle for taking Portugal once again on the path of freedom, democracy, progress and national independence, inaugurated with the 25 April 1974 revolution.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/15

ECONOMIC INDICATORS AND ECONOMIC PRACTICE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 85 (signed to press 19 Jun 85) pp 114-120

[Followup to report in KOMMUNIST]

[Text] One of the main trends in the comprehensive creative work of the party and of all bodies involved in planned management in perfecting the economic mechanism of developed socialist society is improving the system of economic indicators and standards. This explains the extensive reaction of the readership to D. Valovoy's article "Indicators of Socialist Economic Management: Thoughts of an Economist" (KOMMUNIST, No 15, 1984). The article was discussed by a number of institutions and organizations. Thus, an interesting discussion on the questions raised in the article took place at the beginning of this year at a seminar for directors of enterprises located in Moscow's Oktyabrskiy party raykom. Supporting or arguing against the author's views, numerous readers have presented their own concepts and shared their considerations.

In his overall assessment of the article, Academician I. Lukinov, Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences vice president, writes that although this is by no means the first time that the question of the system of indicators is being raised, the article's author deserves credit for his effort at consistent consideration of the question "from theoretical Marxist-Leninist positions, organically linked with the study of current economic practice. This approach has made it possible not only substantively to criticize the "outlay" rating method, which has become rooted in our economic life, and not only to indicate the negative consequences to which it leads. The author has also formulated the positive concept of the use in planning and managing the economic activities of socialist associations and enterprises of the sum total of value, labor and natural indicators and standards. It justifiably assumes that, while intensifying the significance of labor and natural assessments, we cannot, at the same time, belittle the role of value indicators in the study of end results of economic management."

In order to enhance the effectiveness of such indicators, I. Lukinov considers as necessary "the broadest possible development of the most advanced base of technical means of management and ways and methods for its efficient utilization."

As though pursuing the same train of thought, V. Nekhay, candidate of technical sciences and chief of the modeling sector at the Scientific Research Information Center for Management Systems (Moscow), tries to determine the reasons for which it takes such a long time for problems of improving economic indicators to be resolved properly. In his view, a very prosaic circumstance plays an important role in this connection: planned computations based on volume indicators are simple and can be made manually. Despite all obvious shortcomings of such indicators, they will be used by the economist until a new instrument and a computation method has appeared, as accessible as the current one. In order to ensure the essential improvement of the functioning of the economic system, V. Nekhay suggests the use of the method of functional duplication of enterprise activities with computers. A corresponding economic-mathematical model exists both in our country and abroad. The functional simulation method enables us to analyze more profoundly the interconnection between a planned assignment, resources and technical and economic parameters.

Considerations on the existence of a correlation between upgrading the "work" efficiency of economic indicators and strengthening the material and technical base of management and the extensive use of computers in this case are, naturally, justified. Nevertheless, the main aspect of the problem of indicators is, unquestionably, socioeconomic. It is related to the nature of socialist production relations and their advancement. That is why it is entirely natural that the majority of the participants in the discussion had a lively reaction, above all, to the formulation of the question of the correlation under socialism between consumer value and value and the need to ensure priority to the first over the second in economic management.

This need is substantiated from different positions and illustrated with numerous examples. Thus, V. Polyakov, director of the Moscow Carburetors Plant, and A. Danilov, chief engineer at the Krasnyy Oktyabr Experimental Confectionary Factory, cite the facts according to which a collective which fulfills its variety assignment, while failing to reach the volume of marketing (as a rule, steadily increased "on the basis of the level attained"), finds itself in a difficult material and moral position.

Similar situations are described also in the response by V. Zakharov, member of the collegium of the USSR Ministry of Communications and chief of the Main Administration of Industrial Enterprises, who provides specific computations and extensive factual data. He raises the question of perfecting the mechanism for observing the basic economic law on the basis of resolving the contradiction between value and consumer value. In basing his views on computations, V. Zakharov writes, in particular, that "in producing new equipment, 250 norm/hours per 1000 rubles commodity output are necessary, whereas in the case of technical facilities produced for more than 3 to 5 years, no more than 200 norm/hours are needed. The desire to reduce the production of new equipment, under such circumstances, becomes entirely natural, for the same actual labor outlays the volume of output in rubles (gross, commodity and marketed goods) in the manufacturing of new commodities turns out to be 20 percent less." In turn, this leads to a corresponding "drop" in the growth rates of output and labor productivity and a reduction in

the wage and economic incentive funds. Consequently, the conclusion is that "value indicators stimulate the production of consumer values which are advantageous to the enterprise in terms of obtaining the maximal increase in the volume of output in a monetary expression. The production of goods urgently needed by the state is frequently inconsistent with the interests of the enterprise's collective, which are related to the increased volume of output in monetary terms. The situation is further worsened by the fact that the planning of indicators is based 'on the level reached'."

The objective of the work of enterprises in our main administration, V. Zakharov goes on to say, is to satisfy the needs of society for means of communications which increase labor productivity. Taking this into consideration, the ministry should not increase volume indicators but ensure "the production of specific items with minimal costs." This, however, does not agree with the Gosplan stipulations of increasing the growth rates of commodity output. Therefore, occasionally the structure of the plan of ministries, based on the criteria of satisfying social requirements (or, in other words, the requirements of the basic economic law) "must be amended to suit existing indicators..., i.e., the nomenclature and quantity of produced items must be changed." In other words, the easiest ways to increase volume in terms of rubles must be sought.

"Gosplan requirements" are understandable. In order to maintain the volume of output reached in terms of value and to ensure a certain increase, the central economic body plans for ministries and departments (which, in turn, plan for their subordinate associations and enterprises) a corresponding increase in the volume of output in monetary terms. In a period of extensive economic development, although not contributing to the fullest extent to upgrading production efficiency and quality, this principle did not create any particularly aggravated contradictions between consumer value and necessary labor outlays. The point is that the dynamics of the latter largely coincided with that of results. Under intensification conditions when increased output not only can but must be achieved while lowering outlays, the search for the "long rubles" by economic managers becomes a factor which directly conflicts with the efficient coordination of collective with public interests.

Many readers agree with the author of the article in that "pursuit" of volume in rubles and the dominance of the "outlay" method in assessing the work of economic units are closely related to the "recomputation" of past labor, materialized in means of production and the principle of planning "on the basis of achievements." Under specialization and cooperation conditions, as the author pointed out, in the course of their utilization in the manufacturing of a finished item, raw and other materials occasionally go through five or more enterprises. Each time their cost is included in the volume of gross (commodity) and marketed output. Yet, it is a well-known fact that labor materialized in means of production is transferred to the newly created product only to the extent of its actual amount.

The "constant registration" of the repeated value of materials, goods and semifinished items at all stages of the technological chain means that the volume of output in rubles is growing like a snowball. The separation between the dynamics of the monetary volume and the dynamics of the natural-physical

form of creative consumer values and factual labor outlays for the latter increases, the more difficult it becomes to maintain the attained level and to ensure growth.

At the present time, we cannot abandon the repeated counting of the value of goods within our association, N. Chikirev, director of the Stankostroitelnyy Zavod imeni Sergo Ordzhonikidze Production Association, said at the directors' seminar. Each enterprise has its own level of volume of commodity output, which must not only be maintained but increased. Even if we implement in full the plan for variety and contractual obligations but reduce the volume of commodity and marketed output, our production growth rates and labor productivity will "decline" and the wage and economic incentive funds will be reduced. That is precisely why we are forced, above all, to ensure the implementation of the plan in rubles and constantly seek ways of raising the level reached in rubles.

N. Chikirev's were firmly supported by his colleagues. A number of answers also point out that the growing difficulty of preserving the "level reached" forces the enterprises (associations) and sectors to seek ways for increasing the volume in rubles without any growth in the production of real consumer values or improving production quality. Unquestionable "successes" have been achieved in this area. For example, in 1984 the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy failed to deliver more than 2 million tons of rolled metal and more than 300,000 tons of steel pipes contracted for. The USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification delivered electric power to many consumers with major interruptions, which led to serious breakdowns in the work of a number of sectors. Let us assume that this was due to a variety of objective reasons. Nevertheless, said ministries fulfilled their plans in rubles 102 percent! Where did such notorious rubles come from if planned goods so urgently needed by society were not supplied in full?

This is "helped" by the practice of "double bookkeeping," which offers a number of loopholes for such fabrications. This includes, above all, the increased use of "repeated counting" of the value of raw materials, materials and semifinished goods, frequently justified by references to increased specialization (incidentally, should we be amazed, in this connection, by the fact that according to some competent assessments, the total amount of "repeated computations" of labor outlays, materialized in the raw and other materials used initially far exceeds the amount of outlays themselves in the volume of our gross social product!). Let us further note the steady increase in the cost of newly mastered goods used for the same purpose as already mastered goods and classified as replacing inexpensive varieties. Thanks to this, a number of enterprises and sectors, which have failed to fulfill their assignments for the most important commodities for years on end and have failed to meet contractual deliveries, fully cover their plans in rubles and earn their entire moral and material rewards. Naturally, they are not adequately interested in the elimination of such rooted shortcomings. "We must undertake the extensive reorganization of the way of thinking of economic managers in this respect," Comrade M. S. Gorbachev emphasized in his speech at the meeting of the aktiv of the Leningrad party organization. "For they frequently consider not the national wealth and its physical expression but how to make the item more expensive so that without producing any more, the

associations may achieve their 'gross output' figure. As a result, the 'gross output' increases monetarily while commodities, goods and equipment remain scarce. We, however, need equipment and specific consumer goods."

It would be difficult to disagree with those readers who claim that giving "priority" to the monetary indicator violates the proportional development of the national economy and, in particular, leads to the imbalance between the plan and material and technical resources. After enumerating its adverse consequences at the seminar, V. Novikov, director of the Second Bearings Plant, said:

"I recently took to task procurement workers because of a major nonfulfillment of the plan and respective contractual obligations for a number of specific types of material resources...."

"What was their reaction?" his colleagues interrupted him. "Did they increase their deliveries somewhat?"

"No. 'What's with you!' they said. 'Why make noise? You have not been included in the large-scale experiment!' Obviously, the procurement workers think that if the enterprise has not become part of the experiment yet, they do not have to be concerned with assigning it resources as stipulated by the norm. What will happen when all enterprises are made part of the experiment?"

Cases of imbalance between the plan and materials resources were cited by N. Chikirev, B. Shakhnin, director of the Proletariy Association, and others.

Candidate of Economic Sciences D. Epshteyn (Leningrad), head of laboratory at the Scientific Research Institute of Economics and Organization of Agricultural Production, RSFSR Nonchernozem Zone, believes that the author of the article justifiably ascribes physical plan indicators and assignments based on material and labor balances and their mandatory implementation great significance. Management must be perfected by achieving a maximum consistency among basic socialist production laws such as the law of planned and proportional development, the basic economic law and the law of distribution according to labor. Other readers, such as V. Ageyev and S. Solodkova, doctors of economic sciences, professors and heads of political economy chairs at Moscow VUZs, and V. Chernyak, head of the sector of methodology of political economy, Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, positively rate the questions, as formulated in the article, that planned activities aimed at perfecting indicators and standards must taken into consideration the requirements of the objective economic laws of socialism.

The economic laws of socialism act not isolatedly but within a close system of interconnections. It is precisely this circumstance that objectively predetermines the topical nature of the question of developing a system of economic management indicators in which physical, labor and value indicators must organically interact. "As a practical economist," emphasizes A. Kulish, chief of the planning-production department at the Moldgiprostroy Design Institute, "I consider accurate the author's stipulation that the purpose of physical, labor and value parameters of output varies. By supplementing each other and interacting optimally and harmoniously, they must become "

counselors" in the choice of variants in resolving economic problems and assessing the actual contribution of the economic units in the implementation of the supreme objective of socialist production." P. Pryasunov (Moscow) writes that he liked the idea of "outpatient treatment" as a method for more profound study of the economic status of enterprises, based on the concept of the system of standards and indicators. From his viewpoint, the main feature here should be "to determine the amount of returns on investments, including capital outlays. What is taking place today in practical work? No force can stop the 'extractors' of capital investments! Not the least of the reasons is that occasionally no one is even interested in their result." According to him, it would be expedient to return to planning production costs and setting assignments aimed at lowering labor and material intensiveness.

This is discussed in greater detail in the response by Dr of Economic Sciences F. Moskalenko, deputy general director of the Sumy Machine-Building Production Association imeni M. V. Frunze. In recent years, he points out, the role of quality evaluation indicators and, particularly, the indicator of utilization of production capacities, has diminished. The tendency has appeared of adopting a less intensive plan in terms of variety and volume of output, for this makes meeting contractual obligations easier. That is why we must firmly support the suggestion that a differentiated system of indicators and standards must be used in assessing the work of economic units. This system, which would include practical indicators, would also take into consideration the level of utilization of basic productive capital, reduced material and labor intensiveness and the dynamics of costs and profits. His suggestion of applying "potential possibility standards (NPV)" for the volume of output and quality, growth of labor productivity, reduced production costs, utilization of basic capital and production capacities, etc., is of interest. Such standard indicators would include a value assessment and should take into consideration leading achievements in scientific and technical progress and production organization.

The readers have expressed considerable interest in the views on the need for drastically upgrading the role of physical and labor indicators, which are still being occasionally "discriminated against" in our economic management practice. Arguments in favor of this were cited by honored inventor of the Mari ASSR S. Bereslavskiy, chief of the Bureau of Standardization and Comprehensive Quality of Output Management System at the Odintsovo Experimental Plant. In particular, he supports the statement by the author of the article to the effect that "the highest priority should be given to the physical indicators of the production of consumer values and implementation of contractual obligations for deliveries to consumers." The statement by A. Golovin (Ufa), of the Bashkir Main Procurement Administration, is in the same spirit. He discusses specific ways of upgrading the role of the indicator of implementation of deliveries within the planned variety and time.

Candidate of Economic Sciences V. Ivanov (Kiev) provides an interesting formulation to the question of upgrading the quality of physical indicators themselves. In the case of many commodities yardsticks of production volume, in terms of tons, pieces, and linear and square meters, which were natural for the period of extensive development of our economy, are today quite unrelated to the actual characteristics of consumer values and, in many cases, even

contradict them. It is no accident that the value indicators based on them, frequently are "hanging in the air," and, furthermore, lead to undesirable results.

The task of ensuring the highly efficient use of physical and labor indicators raises the theoretical and practical problems of the quantitative correlation of consumer values of different qualities. This is the topic of the expanded response by Dr of Economic Sciences Ye. Mukhordykh (Moscow). He describes his experience of the formulation of specific methods for correlating a variety of heterogeneous useful labor results in a number of Aeroflot subunits and services, drafted by the State Scientific Research Institute for civil aviation. A number of polemic considerations regarding the "separation" of consumer value "for its separate expression and measurement" are expressed by Honored Worker in Sciences of the Belorussian SSR, doctor of economic sciences N. Dembinskiy (Minsk). S. Gorskiy (Moscow) makes an attempt to substantiate his own approach to the study of consumer value under socialism and its measurement.

The dependence of the wage fund on volume in terms of rubles must be abolished in order to upgrade the role of physical and labor indicators. Such is the leitmotif of a number of reactions. In the view of their authors, the wage fund should be organically linked to the volume of output in physical terms and labor intensiveness. V. Chernyak, for example, considers that planning the wage fund should be based on standards of labor-intensiveness of consumer values produced in accordance with the planned assignment. "A comparison among results," V. Ivanov states, in developing the same idea, "with their standardized values is the desired criterion for rating and materially rewarding labor collectives, a criterion which must become basic under developed socialist conditions. Soviet economic scientists can resolve this problem."

In our view, the readers formulate the question quite accurately: in accordance with the nature of socialism, the material incentive to an enterprise collective should be based not on the increased labor outlays for the production of items which are sometimes not needed by society but for reducing outlays for consumer values which satisfy specific and actual social needs. This was the urgent stipulation formulated at the March and April 1985 CPSU Central Committee plenums. The practice of current economic management occasionally reveals something else. This includes, for example, familiar cases which explain the phenomenon of "flushing out" inexpensive items greatly needed by all of us. Many types of knitwear yield substantially higher ruble earnings compared to cotton fabrics, although labor outlays are the same. A similar situation is noted in the production of simple cultural and household items of large physical dimensions, on the one hand, and inexpensive "small objectives," on the other. Therefore, if the enterprises increase the production of inexpensive goods which, as a rule, enjoy greater demand, their actual wage outlays increase sharply. Conversely, a lowering of the achieved volume in rubles lowers the planned wage fund. Naturally, under the conditions of priority enjoyed by monetary indicators, for the sake of ensuring the wages of their collective, the economic managers prefer to increase the production of expensive goods, although a considerable percentage of such items remains in the warehouses, unsold. It is no accident, as the

author of the article pointed out, that today the nature of the scarcity is different. In the past, scarcity affected items the raw materials for which were in limited supply in recent years, however, this list has increasingly included precisely inexpensive "petty objects."

"I have spent a quarter of a century," writes in this connection Candidate of Economic Sciences S. Gil (Rovno), "working in the food industry, 20 of which as chief engineer of a plant and association. We always found it more profitable to produce bigger rather than smaller items. With an identical volume of output in terms of rubles, a larger size involves one-fifth of the labor-intensiveness needed in the production of a small item. For that reason, food products in containers of 0.33 liters are such a rarity." Hence the "contradiction between labor productivity and variety and between capital returns and capital-labor ratio." The enterprises should be issued plans "based on two equal indicators--physical and value." Consumer value and value must be combined. The scientific combination of these categories would exclude the implementation of the plan in rubles while violating the assignment in physical terms. The unity and interaction between consumer value and value as "two sides of the same coin" is also discussed in the extensive response by Candidate of Economic Sciences R. Yelemesov (Karaganda). He justifiably raises the question of the unity between their respective indicators.

Consumer value is expressed by physical indicators (pieces, tons, liters) as well as quality parameters which describe the reliability, attractiveness and other actual useful features of produced items. The perfecting of such indicators under the conditions of technical progress is an exceptionally important problem which awaits its solution. Improving the outlay-value indicators, as an equally important and difficult problem, presumes, in particular, a distinction between the "full" and "newly created" value. On the enterprise level, today the former is expressed, one way or another, by the gross (commodity) output. As to the latter, its expression is related to the precise scientific definition of the nature of the net and standard net output indicators. The author of the article supports the thesis according to which the accuracy of this indicator is severely distorted by the different profitability levels. Correspondingly, he suggests that a uniform profitability standard be applied. The readers are of varying opinions on this matter. Candidate of Economic Sciences V. Kononenko (Kiev), Candidate of Technical Sciences S. Titov (Moscow) and Leningrad Financial-Economics Institute imeni N. A. Voznesenskiy Docent S. Mukhin consider this suggestion insufficiently substantiated. According to V. Chernyak, the idea of interesting economic units in the production of certain commodities rather than in increasing their profitability is, as a whole, fruitful. L. Ditman (Moscow), Candidate of Economic Sciences N. Krayev (Gorkiy) and Candidate of Economic Sciences L. Nikitin (Leningrad) point out the shortcomings of net income norm and the imperfection of the methods for its computation. They argue in favor of the thesis according to which reduced production cost must become the main evaluation indicator and an alternative to "gross output."

Dr of Economic Sciences O. Latsis (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the Economics of the World Socialist System) and Candidate of Economic Sciences L. Lopatnikov (USSR Academy of Sciences Central Economics-Mathematical

Institute) discuss in their response the physical and value indicators of socialist economic management. In sharply polemical terms they evaluate the concept of upgrading the significance of physical indicators in managing the activities of socialist enterprises and associations, believing that this necessarily lowers the role of value indicators and inevitably contributes to "excluding" the initiative of labor collectives and individual workers, turning them into "simple performers of stipulated assignments." In their view, the solution of the main problems in the area of coordinating collective with public interests is possible only on the basis of the formulation of a type of economic management system under which, 1) the enterprise "will not receive from superior bodies either a "physical" plan or a plan for volume expressed in terms of value"; 2) consumer orders "will determine the natural implementation of the plan and the sum total of contracts concluded with them will determine the value." Correspondingly, they suggest "a total end to planning 'from above' production volumes regardless of indicators" and to direct enterprise activities exclusively to profit (according to the authors, it should be a question not of a "profit indicator" but of "profit itself," of "real rubles as found in the cash register or the bank account of the enterprise"). In concretizing this suggestion, O. Latsis and L. Lopatnikov write: "One should plan 'from above' not volumes (be they in terms of value or physical terms) but efficiency."

In itself, the idea of planning efficiency could hardly be found objectionable. However, do the concepts of efficiency and profitability in enterprise functioning always coincide under socialism? It is already generally accepted today that efficiency should be judged by taking into consideration the end objective of public production. Whereas under capitalism this objective is return on capital, under socialism it is the well-being of the working people and the creation of conditions for the all-round development of the individual. This objective, Candidate of Economic Sciences O. Leonova (Moscow State University) points out, "can be achieved only through consumer value, for the latter, and the latter alone, indeed satisfies the individual needs of the members of society as well as production requirements directly or indirectly related to the manufacturing of the respective material and spiritual goods."

Could stimulating the collectives of socialist enterprises and associations through profits contribute to attaining this objective? Unquestionably it can, and it is no accident that in party and government documents, profit is one of the economic levers which makes exceptionally important finding the most efficient methods for their utilization. However, these documents invariably emphasize something else as well: the advancement and restructuring of the economic mechanism should be based on the fact that the utilization of commodity-monetary relations under socialist conditions should be subordinate to strengthening the main foundations and advantages of our system. Since these foundations include the planned direct social nature of production, which represents national ownership, Candidate of Economic Sciences S. Tolstikov (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics) writes, "the efficiency use of profit in socialist economic management presumes a number of absolutely necessary prerequisites and limitations. The most important of them are the following: the increase in profit as a source of material incentive should be exclusively the consequence of lowering

outlays of live and materialized labor by the collective and exclusively in the production of truly social consumer value, i.e., the production of consumer value which can actually satisfy specific social requirements with its qualitative and quantitative parameters."

Is such production (even more so under the conditions of the level of technological socialization and actual integration of sectors, spheres, regions and individual economic units, codified by the category of "single national economic complex") possible outside the socially centralized regulation of indicators of consumer values produced by enterprises and associations or, in other words, without "planning 'in physical terms' from above?" Naturally, it is not. It is precisely this which is qualified in the article under discussion and in the readers' answers as stemming from the nature of the public ownership of means of production, as a "priority of consumer value over value," which, in turn, determines the leading role of physical indicators in planning and evaluation.

D. Valovoy's article also developed the following thesis: essentially, centralized planning "in physical terms" does not mean in the least that a single economic center as a subject of national economic management "bureaucratically" regulates all public production, planning it "to the last nail." The article discussed the overall and structurally broken down control system, which includes "subordinating to the center the complex hierarchical pyramid of sectorial and territorial economic bodies," presuming the autonomy of and interaction among its different levels and links. A number of readers agree with the concept of the author to the effect that the development of economic contracts plays its important role in perfecting and organizing precisely this system and not in the least opposing it. Candidate of Economic Sciences V. Kholodkov (Moscow State University), for example, writes that economic contracts "should not be pitted against planned assignments or centralized economic management. On the contrary, this is a most important lever in upgrading the efficiency of the utilization of the basic economic of socialism--the law of planned development. Indeed, it is under the conditions of the large-scale economic experiment that "horizontal" ties among economic units are established in order to enable such units to perform their planned assignments and are supported materially and technologically and through price setting by centralized management bodies. In other words, the "direct" ties among enterprises and associations are actually established through the intermediary of a socioeconomic center." V. Kholodkov further points out that "D. Volovoy's article, in raising the question of the need to improve the utilization of commodity-monetary relations and indicators, is polemically addressed against efforts made in our publications to present centralized planning of nomenclature and variety as an alternative to the development of the initiative and autonomy of collectives and individual enterprise and association workers and as an alternative to rationalizing the use of value levers, profits in particular. Cases of pure administering, incompetence and bureaucratism in management, petty supervision by economic units and suppressing initiative 'from below' are known to and condemned by the party. However, can they destroy the veracity of the political-economic stipulation that the activities of collectives and workers in reducing the actual outlays of live and materialized labor per unit of actually planned (directly social) consumer value by society--a reduction of such outlays compared to standards,

as included in a scientifically substantiated planned price, is a broad field for the development of autonomy, initiative and creative activeness by the working people? Does efficient cost-accounting incentive of such reduction of profits oppose the 'priority of consumer value compared to value'?"

The materials of the All-Union Practical Science Conference on "Perfecting Developed Socialism and Party Ideological Work in the Light of the Resolutions of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum" and the meetings held by the CPSU Central Committee with the heads of industrial associations and enterprises, kolkhozes, sovkhozes and production brigades, specialists and scientists, and the documents of the March and April 1985 Central Committee Plenum focus the attention of economists and economic workers on the following basic circumstance: the intensification of adverse trends in the country's economic development by the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s, and the substantial difficulties which arose are largely related to the fact that the need to improve socialist production relations was not promptly detected and properly assessed. The indicators of the activities of the "primary units" in the production process and their planned norms and standards are major levers for the practical utilization in economic management of the objective economic laws of socialism, which express the most essential aspects and features of such relations. The article under discussion and the numerous responses cover a number of aspects of this major problem. They include the question of establishing a subordinate system of indicators, norms and standards fully consistent with the economic base of developed socialism; intensifying within this system the functional load of physical and labor indicators stemming from the socialist priority of consumer value over value; the imperfection of the main and currently virtually universal indicator of the volume of goods marketed in terms of rubles and the scientific groundlessness of the related domination of the concept of "outlays" in assessing enterprise activities and the cult of the "repeated computation" of materialized labor; the importance of organizing the work of all units within the complex hierarchical system of centralized management bodies; the impossibility to reduce the latter to the functioning of an economic center which should issue merely the basic and decisive quality-quantity parameters of consumer values produced by the single national economic complex.

"The urgency of the questions raised in this article and the urgent need for their prompt solution cannot leave the attentive reader indifferent," writes Dr of Technical Sciences P. Khalileyev (Ufa). "These problems affect everyone." Their further political and economic development and the practical implementation of corresponding theoretical conclusions are factors in the development of a new type of economic thinking and perfecting our production relations as well as making the forms of socialist economic management consistent with contemporary conditions and requirements.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/15

NEW ADDITIONS TO SCIENTIFIC LENINIANA

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 85 (signed to press 19 Jun 85) pp 120-128

[Review of the book "Vladimir Ilich Lenin. Biografiya, 1870-1924" [Vladimir Ilich Lenin. Biography, 1870-1924]. In two volumes. Volume 1, 1870-1917; Volume 2, 1917-1924. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985. Authors: A. G. Yegorov (head), L. F. Ilichev, F. V. Konstantinov, A. P. Kosulnikov, Z. A. Levin, M. P. Mchedlov, A. M. Sovokin and P. N. Fedoseyev]

[Text] Vladimir Ilich Lenin's life and activities and his works have always been and remain an inexhaustible source of inspiration to the Soviet people and a most accurate compass in their constructive work in building a socialist society and its further advancement at the present stage. The profound and comprehensive study of the biography of Lenin, this brilliant philosopher, leader of the Great October Revolution, founder of the communist party and Soviet state and teacher of the working people the world over, plays an important role in resolving a tremendously important and extensive problem of developing a Marxist-Leninist outlook and awareness among the party members and all Soviet people. Lenin's biography is a truly complex work which covers not only the landmarks in the life of the leader of the Russian and international proletariat but also the strategy and tactics of the communist party, developed by him in accordance with contemporary conditions.

A wide range of sources is used in the study of Vladimir Ilich's life and comprehensive activities. Unquestionably, Lenin's works assume priority. They constitute not only a methodological foundation for all social sciences but also a most valuable historical source which enables us to trace the activities of classes and parties at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century, the course of the three Russian revolutions and the establishment of the first proletarian state in the world. The publication of Lenin's works and their popularization have always been an exceptionally important task for the communists. This is vividly confirmed by the printing of five editions of Lenin's works, the publication of some of his works and collections in huge editions, and the 39 Leninist collections which come out as new documents surface.

The 40th Leninist collection, which will come out very soon, was compiled to coincide with the 115th anniversary of Vladimir Ilich's birth. It includes

116 different Leninist documents covering the period from 1888 to 1922. Lenin's remarks and notes relative to the first, second and third volumes of "Das Kapital," and other works by Marx and Engels, excerpts from them, and remarks and notes on the documents of their fellow workers, included in the collection, are of major importance.

The documents included in the collection confirm once again convincingly how thoroughly Lenin studied the works of Marx and Engels and "consulted" them on theoretical problems and in the formulation and implementation of the strategy and tactics of the Bolshevik Party. The collection documents will reveal even more completely Lenin's laboratory of scientific creativity and his work on various types of literary sources and intensive editorial activities.

The second edition of the book "Fond Dokumentov V. I. Lenina" [Archive of V. I. Lenin Documents] describes the complex work related to the search for, gathering and careful preservation of Lenin's manuscripts and documents.

The extensive publication of Lenin's works in separate editions, topic collections, selected works and reading selections, is continuing along with the collection and preparation of new Leninist documents for publication. The publication of Lenin's "Izbrannyye Sochineniya" [Selected Works] in 10 volumes (11 books), currently under way, is of great importance.

In recent years, Leninyana has been expanded with the addition of a new major 12-volume publication "Vladimir Ilich Lenin. Biograficheskaya Khronika" [Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biographic Chronicle]. This scientific publication of unique completeness and significance is a tremendous step forward in the study of Lenin. It is for the first time that all facts related to Lenin's life and activities, determined as a result of long years of study of press materials, memoirs and many other sources, have been collected and systematized on such a scale.

Heeding the request of the Soviet people, the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism has compiled the new, seventh edition of Lenin's scientific biography. Based on contemporary historiographic and source data, this two-volume biography is a new level in the study of Lenin's creative legacy and life.

The first volume describes Vladimir Ilich's life and activities during the pre-October Revolution period. It ends with the chapter "Inspirer and Leader of October," which sums up Lenin's gigantic struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution and the establishment of a Soviet system in our country. The second volume covers the Soviet period. The biography ends with the chapter "Leninism--A Powerful Weapon in the Revolutionary Renovation of the World." Rewritten on the basis of the latest data of the social sciences, this chapter is a major step in covering problems of the creative development of Leninism at the present stage and the significance of the Leninist doctrine in the revolutionary transformation of the world. The authors were able to introduce a great many new features in Lenin's biography, particularly in describing the contemporary stage of development of the Leninist theory of socialism and communism.

One can agree with V. Mayakovskiy, who wrote:

Brief, and known to the very end,
is Ulyanov's life to us.
However, Comrade Lenin's long life
Should be written and described anew.

Indeed, with every passing year, Leninist scientists are discovering ever new facts in Ilich's biography and adding further information on the creation and dissemination of Lenin's works and are mastering more profoundly the theoretical legacy of our great leader. That is precisely why the biography, which reflects the facts of the life and activities of creator of the communist party and Soviet state as well as his doctrine, is expanded and refined with the help of new data and concepts.

The biography thoroughly describes Lenin's struggle for the establishment of Marxism as the revolutionary ideology of the Russian social democrats and his irreconcilable struggle against the populists, legal Marxists, "economists" and Bernsteinians; it describes the significance of his fundamental works in defense and development of Marxist theory. The authors emphasize that Lenin's very first works were models of principle-minded criticism of various pseudosocialist and revisionist theories and a model of the struggle for the interests of the working class (see vol 1, p 38).

From the very first steps in his revolutionary activities, Lenin acted not only as the recognized theoretician and propagandist of Marxism but also as the organizer of Marxist circles, followed by the "Alliance in the Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class," which was the embryo of a party of a new type. As the work emphasizes, the Petersburg social democrats, headed by Lenin, established firm ties with like-minded people in Moscow, Nizhny Novgorod, Samara, Syzran, Ivanovo-Voznesensk, Kiev, Vilna and other cities (see *ibid.*, p 41). The activities of Lenin's "Alliance in the Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class" spread throughout Russia.

New factual data, discovered and described by Soviet students of Lenin, have been added to the biography. We shall cite a number of examples. We know that Lenin paid great attention to drafting materials to be used by workers and that he wrote leaflets, articles and pamphlets dealing especially with the life of the workers and the situation of the Russian proletariat. In particular, in the autumn of 1895 he wrote the pamphlet "Explanation of the Law on Fines Levied on Workers in Factories and Plants." Both the biographic chronicle and, subsequently, the biography include the response of the central organ of the German social democrats, the newspaper VORWARTS ("Forward") to this pamphlet. Such pamphlets, it stated, are of tremendous importance and "one can fully hope that such publications will develop into a significant factor in the political awakening of the Russian proletariat" (p 43).

For the first time ever, the biography describes the international response to the detention of the members of Lenin's "Alliance in the Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class" (see pp 44-45) and provides information on the first reviews of Lenin's book "Development of Capitalism in Russia" (see pp 60-61); the Biographical Chronicle contains rich data on Lenin's

comprehensive activities in ISKRA in the course of the creation and consolidation of the Bolshevik Party.

The biography presents the hitherto unknown yet very significant speech made by Lenin at a meeting on the occasion of the 70th birthday of A. Bebel, one of the most outstanding leaders of the German social democratic and the international workers movement. Together with other members of the RSDWP Central Committee and the editors of the central organ, Vladimir Ilich signed the letter of congratulations to the celebrant (see p 192).

The bibliography includes new texts of memoirs by Lenin's fellow workers. It includes the recollection by I. Belostotskiy on the activities of the party school in Longjumeau and Lenin's work with its students: "Vladimir Ilich was the most outstanding lecturer, not only because of his profound knowledge of political economy but also because of his ability to present even the most difficult material particularly simply and clearly" (p 205).

In perfecting the text of the biography, particularly in terms of theoretical problems, the authors have paid particular attention to the thoroughness of the scientific formulations and fullness of presentation of the content of Lenin's concepts and conclusions. In particular, the section on Lenin's work in support of proletarian internationalism and against bourgeois nationalism points out that in his work on the solution of the national problem, like Marx and Engels Lenin proceeded from the fundamental postulate that the elimination of social oppression is a prerequisite for the elimination of national oppression. Lenin organically related the question of the elimination of national oppression with the right of nations to self-determination, which he considered the only reliable means of ensuring their truly firm rapprochement in the struggle for social and national liberation. The right of nations to self-determination, the authors conclude, became the ideological and political foundation of the voluntary unification of all nations in the struggle for the overthrow of autocracy, the abolishment of bourgeois power and the creation of a new society (see p 292).

The new edition of the biography provides additional information on the Krakow-Poronin Archives, which significantly added to the Leninist stock in the Central Party Archives and describe Lenin's activities in leading the RSDWP Central Committee, the newspaper PRAVDA and the bolshevik faction at the Fourth State Duma. It provides greater knowledge of the content of Lenin's manifesto against the imperialist war and his views and activities in rallying internationalist forces in the struggle against the world war and its transformation into a civil war against domestic imperialist governments.

As we know, in World War I Lenin formulated the integral theory of imperialism and provided a comprehensive study of the new stage in universal history. On the eve of the overthrow of autocracy, based on the law of uneven economic and political development of capitalism he had discovered, Lenin drew the conclusion of the possibility of the victory of socialism in a single separate country and openly stated that this applies, above all, to Russia. In his article "On the Two Lines of the Revolution," he wrote that "the liberation of bourgeois Russia from tsarism and from the lands and the power of landowners will be used by the proletariat immediately not for the sake of helping the

prosperous peasantry in its struggle against the rural workers but for making a socialist revolution, allied to the European proletariat" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 27, p 81). Less than 1 month before the February revolution, in his article "A Turn in World Politics," Lenin actually predicted the structure of the future Russian government (see op. cit., vol 30, pp 339-348; vol 49, pp 399-400). He considered as the main task of the forthcoming democratic revolution in Russia the struggle for establishing a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry and its use for converting to a socialist revolution.

Data on Lenin's conclusion drawn as early as the end of 1915, according to which "an objective foundation for the full possibility of the victory of the democratic revolution" had appeared in Russia, are of considerable interest. "...Once again we are marching toward revolution. This is obvious to all" (op. cit., vol 27, p 79). Two weeks before the revolution, N. K. Krupskaya advised V. M. Kasparov: "...One should go to Russia as soon as possible or one would miss the 'start'," for letters reaching Lenin were already reporting that "our time is close" (p 298). This previously unknown document is yet another refutation of the distorting version according to which Lenin allegedly did not expect the February revolution and that the bolsheviks were uninvolved with it.

The biography provides a fuller and better documented description of Lenin's evaluations of the February revolution and the new strategy and tactics of the Bolshevik Party, developed by Lenin. In describing the tribulations of Lenin's 1917 trip from Switzerland to Russia, on the basis of new documentary data included in the Biographical Chronicle, the authors describe in greater detail the implementation of Lenin's plan for the return of the emigres to the homeland and the meeting of Vladimir Ilich at the border and in Petrograd.

In analyzing the political situation which developed after the overthrow of autocracy, the authors of the biography describe Lenin's evaluation of the twin power and the importance of his slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" as a slogan for the peaceful progress of the revolution. The biography thoroughly describes the content and significance of Lenin's programmatic documents--the April theses--as a classical creation of Lenin's genius and a brilliant model of dialectical-materialistic approach to the analysis of a specific historical situation (see p 315).

In presenting the course of the discussions and adoption of Lenin's theses by the Bolshevik Party, the authors show the way Lenin and his fellow workers had to surmount the opposition to the course toward a socialist revolution raised by Kamenev and his supporters and to struggle against the Trotskyite "theory" of permanent revolution. The position of the dissidents and capitulationists --Kamenev and Zinoviev--and Trotsky's nonbolshevism are described in the biography on the basis of the latest achievements in party history science.

The bibliography cites new data on Lenin as the leader of the Great October Revolution and his theoretical and practical activities in the preparation for and conduct of the socialist revolution. Documents published in recent years and the studies based on them have helped to refine a number of facts of Lenin's life and activities at that time. This includes his participation in

resolving the question of the June demonstration and in the all-Russian conference of front-line and rear military organizations of the RSDWP(b), the development of the July political crisis, Vladimir Ilich's role in the preparations for and holding of the 6th RSDWP(b) Congress, which approved the course to a socialist revolution and passed the resolution on preparations for an armed uprising for the overthrow of the provisional government.

The biography details Lenin's works on the peaceful and violent forms of struggle and shows their content as means of seizing the state power by the revolutionary proletariat. It notes that Lenin's understanding of the peaceful development of the revolution has nothing in common with the reformist and revisionist ideas of rejecting the violent overthrow of capitalist power. It is only the organized force of the working class and its allies that can force the bourgeoisie to abandon the use of arms and a civil war to which it usually resorts in order to preserve its domination.

The readers will learn a particularly great deal on the role of Lenin in the preparations for and holding of the 6th Bolshevik Party Congress and the struggle against the Kerenskiy regime and General Kornilov's counterrevolutionary conspiracy. The biography cites new data to the effect that Lenin was the actual leader of the congress, the ideological inspirer of the new party course. Nor could the readers fail to be interested in the additional information included in the biography on the discussion at the congress of Lenin's nonappearance in the bourgeois court under the conditions of the July counterrevolutionary outburst. The rewritten section on "Defeat of the Counterrevolutionary Mutiny" describes the way Lenin, relying on historical experience, summed up by Marx and Engels, and on the analysis of specific Russian reality, long before the mutiny proved not only the reason for the outbreak of such phenomena but also the way one should prepare to fight the rebels and described the dialectics of the revolution and counterrevolution in the circumstances of 1917. Lenin's conclusions helped the Bolshevik Party to head the popular movement against the Kornilovites and to put an end to the rebellion in a few days, bloodlessly. The bolshevik tactics of struggle against the Kornilovites resulted, in Lenin's definition, "in the most complete and as yet unparalleled in any other revolution ease of victory over the counterrevolution" (op. cit., vol 34, pp 221-222). With the defeat of the Kornilov mutiny, the revolution entered a new stage of development: a struggle began for the direct establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Soviet republic.

The biography of the leader of the revolution shows that the closer to the decisive battle with the bourgeoisie, the more energetic and fruitful became Lenin's theoretical and practical activities. On the eve of the future battles, Lenin wrote more than 60 pamphlets, articles and letters. They included programmatic works, such as "The State and Revolution," "The Threatening Catastrophe and How To Fight It," "Will the Bolsheviks Be Able To Retain State Power?" and "On the Review of the Party Program." On the basis of his theoretical study of the foreign and domestic situation in the autumn of 1917, Lenin reached the conclusion that there would be no force on earth which could prevent the bolsheviks from seizing and retaining the power and consolidating the victory of the proletariat and its allies. In developing the Marxist theory of the state, Lenin characterized the nature of the state

of proletarian dictatorship and proved its historical purpose and transitional nature. He described the developing proletarian state as "not a state in the strict meaning of the term," for its main feature was not violence but the creation of a new type of social production and labor organization higher than that under capitalism (see p 354). Lenin based his views on the essential conclusion that the working class can fulfill its historical mission providing that it is guided by a Marxist party which, following the victory of the revolution, will legitimately become ruling. "By raising a workers party," Lenin wrote in the book "The State and Revolution," "Marxism raises the vanguard of the proletariat which can seize the power and lead the entire people to socialism, direct and organize the new system and be a teacher, guide and leader of all working and exploited people in organizing their social life without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie" (op. cit., vol 33, p 26). The history of the Great October and subsequent revolutions has fully confirmed this Leninist view.

The new edition of the biography describes in greater and more vivid detail the manner in which Lenin headed the preparations for and implementation of the October armed uprising. Based on newly discovered sources and contemporary historiography of the uprising, the biography describes the historical sessions of the RSDWP(b) Central Committee on 10 and 16 October 1917, the preparations made by the Bolshevik Party for the decisive battle and the course and outcome of the victorious October Revolution. This is the first mention in the biography of the meeting of the RSDWP(b) Central Committee, which was held under Lenin's chairmanship on the night of 24 October. The course of the uprising was discussed at the meeting and a decision was made to name the Soviet government a "worker-peasant" government (see p 374).

The biography cites the words with which Lenin opened his first report at the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets, to the effect that the question of peace is the crucial, the sore problem of our time. The policy of peace and good neighborly relations among nations, proclaimed by the first Soviet government headed by Lenin, remains to this day the general line of the entire foreign policy of the CPSU and Soviet state. "In the area of foreign policy," the March 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum emphasized, "our course is clear and consistent. It is a course of peace and progress."

The second volume of the biography chronologically covers slightly over 6 years of Vladimir Ilich Lenin's life and activities. However, in the history of our country, these years are truly the equivalent of decades. Between 1917 and 1924 Lenin accomplished so much in formulating the theoretical problems of socialism and in the development of the world revolutionary movement that these years hold a special position in his biography. It is no accident that those who witnessed Lenin's activities recall that his work day at that time was between 16 and 18 hours long. Now, after the publication of the Biographical Chronicle, which traces Lenin's activities day by day and, in the post-October period, frequently hour by hour, we have learned more about the intensive work which Ilich did at that time. The description in chronological order of the familiar facts of Lenin's activities during that period alone covers eight volumes of 50 printer's sheets each. Lenin participated in five party congresses, five all-Russian party conferences and

dozens of plenums and sessions of the party's Central Committee, Politburo and Organizational Buro. This was a period of accelerated process of party construction: the establishment of communist parties in republics, and new oblast, kray, guberniya, uyezd, city and rural party organizations, which faced major problems in building the new life: the founding, establishment and strengthening of the Soviet system, implementing great economic, social and cultural changes and defending the socialist fatherland from the domestic and foreign counterrevolution. Lenin directly participated and headed this entire work of tremendous magnitude and depth.

The biography traces Lenin's work in guiding the activities of the Central Committee, showing the way in which the first proletarian state and Soviet administrative apparatus in the world were being created under his guidance and the way the strategy and tactics of socioeconomic and cultural changes were being formulated.

The establishment of the proletarian state was closely related with and based on strengthening the alliance between the proletariat and the poorest peasantry and the development of the revolutionary creativity of the masses. The Bolshevik Party, headed by Lenin, was the leading and guiding force of this process. The facts listed in the biography provide documentary proof of this and increase our knowledge of the history of the land of the soviets. The biography provides a clear idea of Lenin's activities during the period of triumphal march of the Soviet system and describes the foreign policy activities of the Bolshevik Party in the struggle against war and for peace and peaceful coexistence between the Soviet republic and the capitalist countries. The biography shows the manner in which Lenin's Decree on Peace was received in our country and the way our Soviet government fought a tremendous diplomatic battle for ending the imperialist war and concluding a universal democratic and just peace. With documentary precision the biography describes the way Lenin surmounted the capitulationist position held by Trotsky and the "left-wing" communists on the conclusion of the Brest peace. With a firm effort, the Bolshevik Party pulled the country out of the abyss of the imperialist war and gained a peaceful breathing spell. The first victory recorded in the history of Soviet diplomacy laid the foundations of the foreign policy of the Soviet state.

The authors of the biography trace the way in which, in the circumstances of a peaceful spell, in the spring of 1918, Lenin formulated a scientific plan for the building of socialism in our country. This plan, which became the foundation for all bolshevik party activities, was found in Lenin's works "The Main Task of Our Days," "The Next Tasks of the Soviet System," "On 'Leftist' Childishness and the Petit Bourgeois Spirit" and others. It was precisely these works on which Lenin relied after the end of the civil war in the formulation of the new economic policy. Lenin's plan took into consideration the experience of the expropriation of landowners and the bourgeoisie and the nationalization of means of production. The numerous summed-up facts of the comprehensive organizational activities of Lenin and Bolshevik Party provide a full description of the way the management of nationalized enterprises and production based on the principles of democratic centralism were organized.

At the very start of building socialism in our country, headed by Lenin the Bolshevik Party opposed anarcho-sindicalist trends and slackness in production and promoted the establishment and strengthening of a new socialist labor discipline, new production standards and proper combination of collective management with individual responsibility. Lenin was at the sources of the establishment of new production relations both in town and in the country where, at that time, a socialist revolution was developing and intensifying along with a struggle against the rural bourgeoisie--the kulaks--for giving bread to workers and the peasant poor and resolving the food problems during the difficult conditions in which the class enemy tried to put an end to the revolution by both military and economic means and by spreading hunger throughout Russia. The struggle against the kulaks and the intensification of the socialist revolution in the countryside were paralleled by party and governmental measures aimed at resolving the vitally important food problem, meeting the needs of the toiling peasants, the poor in particular, organizing rural socialist farms, upgrading farming standards and applying the achievements of agricultural science.

The biography describes the way Lenin and the Bolshevik Party resolved one of the basic problems--the problem of nationality--and the way the foundations were laid for friendship among all peoples favoring the Soviet system and for peace and social and national liberation. The documents convincingly prove the way Lenin and the communist party guided the creation of the Russian Soviet Socialist Federation, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Soviet republics in Belorussia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Turkestan and the Soviet republics in the Transcaucasus.

The international solidarity and friendship among the peoples of the land of the soviets, vividly manifested in the founding of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, were hammered out under the leadership of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party in the flames of the battles for a Soviet system, in the course of the civil war unleashed by the imperialists.

The efforts of our party, tremendous in scale and significance, to reorganize the country took place under the situation of a civil war and the restoration of the national economy dislocated by the imperialist war and the domination of capitalists and landowners. Under these circumstances, the military problem became the main, the basic problem of the revolution. That is why Lenin and the party subordinated all party and state work to the defense of the country. Headed by Lenin, the RKP(b) Central Committee became the true combat headquarters of the armed struggle waged by the Soviet people, and the Bolshevik Party a truly fighting party. Under Lenin's direct leadership, as the party's leader and chairman of the Sovnarkom and the Labor and Defense Council, the Central Committee resolved the most important problems of building the Red Army and supporting its combat operations against the White Guards and interventionists and formulated the military and strategic plans and ways for their implementation. The Central Committee resolutions and directives drafted the military policy of the Soviet state and the means for its implementation for the sake of defending the socialist fatherland. "At each Central Committee session," Lenin emphasized, "and on each major problem of strategy, there was no single time at which basic problems of strategy were

not discussed at Central Committee or Central Committee Buro sessions" ("Leninskiy Sbornik XXXVII" [Leninist Collection 37], p 137).

The second volume in the biography traces the entire course of the development, adoption and start of the implementation of the new economic policy, the purpose of which was to ensure the rebuilding and development of the national economy and lay the foundations of a socialist economy. The new economic policy drafted by Lenin was adopted on the eve of and during the 10th RKP(b) Congress, in the course of a sharp struggle against antiparty groups, headed by Trotskiy and Bukharin, which had assumed anti-Leninist positions on problems of the role and tasks of the trade union, production organization and management and development of party and Soviet democracy. Essentially, as Lenin proved, it was a struggle "on the methods for approaching the masses, capturing the masses and establishing relations with the masses. This was the very essence of the matter" (op. cit., vol 42, p 206). The biography shows very essentially unknown data on the role which Lenin and the RKP(b) Central Committee played in the formulation of the new economic policy and the defense of the Leninist plan for undertaking the building of socialism against various antiparty elements who tried to oppose Lenin by promoting their concept of denying the possibility of building socialism in our country.

Lenin believed that the implementation of the new economic policy will provide all basic prerequisites for strengthening the alliance between the working class and the toiling peasantry. He considered this alliance the most important source for the involvement of millions of toiling peasants in the building of socialism. As the biography notes in this connection, Lenin pointed out that the party found the true way for involving the toiling peasantry in building socialism: the decisive and daring implementation of the new economic policy, one of the most important steps in which was to replace apportionment with tax in kind. "...The essence of the new economic policy," Lenin said, "is the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry; it is the combination of the vanguard, the proletariat, with the broad peasant field" (op. cit., vol 44, p 322).

The new edition of the biography pays great attention to Lenin's theory of building the new society. In calling upon the party and the people to take into consideration and make use of the real opportunities for building socialism in our country, Lenin pointed out that this can be achieved on the basis of the heroic toil of workers and peasants and "long years of work," and that this lengthy process included stages and levels of development. He emphasized that a strict distinction must be made among the different stages and that the conditions under which they take place must be studied soberly.

Lenin considered as the first historical task the creation of the "foundations for a socialist society." He further pointed out that it was necessary to achieve a "conversion to the foundations for socialism." Bearing in mind the long period of further advancement of the new society, Lenin used the concepts of "definitively victorious and strengthened socialism," as well as "the developed socialist society" (see op. cit., vol 27, p 253; vol 36, p 139; vol 40, p 104; vol 44, p 205; and vol 45, p 413).

The formulation of the concept of developed socialism by the CPSU and the fraternal parties in the socialist community, enabled us to clarify not only its basic features but also the fact that it will undergo a historically lengthy stage of advancement, at the beginning of which our country finds itself currently. The gradual growth into a communist society will take place in the course of perfecting developed socialism.

This problem is discussed in detail in the concluding chapter of the biography. It deals with the question of contradictions under the conditions of a socialist society and cites Lenin's familiar statement that "antagonism and contradiction are quite different concepts. The former will disappear while the latter will remain under socialism" ("Leninskiy Sbornik XI," p 357). This Leninist concept is the methodological foundation and the key to the study of contemporary social relations. The development of socialism is, in its essence, a complex dialectical process in which the new is born in the struggle with the old and with sluggishness, routine, manifestations of bureaucratism, departmentalism and parochialism, and work shortcomings and omissions. In our study of the problems of socialism, we must clearly distinguish, on the one hand, between the dialectical contradictions which are inherent in the socialist society and are a source for its advancement, and difficulties and contradictions which are the result of blunders and voluntaristic and subjectivistic errors, on the other.

Nor should we ignore in our consideration of contemporary phenomena the interweaving of internal contradictions inherent in the socialist society, the class struggle in the international arena and the confrontation between the two opposite systems--socialism and capitalism. However, here again we must distinguish between the dialectical contradictions which arise in the process of the development of socialism, and external influences, such as those caused by imperialism, which is trying to undermine the foundations of socialism and socialist social relations, turn nonantagonistic contradictions within the new society into antagonistic and create situations of crisis and even deformations in the economic base and superstructure of this society.

Nonantagonistic contradictions appear objectively and are resolved under socialism with the organized will of the masses led by the communist party, in the interest of all working people, thus contributing to strengthening the principles of socialism and the successes in its development.

The biography shows the way the leader of the Bolshevik Party combined gigantic activities in leading the party and the Soviet state, immeasurable in ordinary terms, with great theoretical work. Lenin's works such as "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky," "Constituent Assembly Elections and Proletarian Dictatorship," "The 'Leftism' Infantile Disease in Communism," and "The Great Initiative," and the party program drafted by Lenin and adopted at the 8th RKP(b) Congress are all proof of his intensive work on summing up the universal historical experience, particularly that of the Bolshevik Party, in the seizure of power by the Russian working class, the building and defense of the first state of workers and peasants in the world and the building of socialism in our country. Lenin's theoretical legacy created during that period alone fills 17 volumes of his Complete Collected

Works, the thorough study of which is the base for the second biography volume.

The final period in Lenin's life, when he worked on writings which have been included in his complete collected works under the title of "Last Letters and Articles," and which constitute yet another great exploit accomplished by Ilich, is thoroughly traced in the biography.

Lenin considered the clarification of the international status of the Soviet state, the general prospects of the global liberation movement, the formulation of a program for the socialist reorganization of the country and the role of the communist party in building the new society his prime duty to the party, the Soviet people and the communists the world over. Taken as a whole, Lenin's last letters and articles constitute a single work in terms of intent and execution, which earmarked the "forthcoming tasks facing the party, the Soviet system and the Communist International," as was said at the 12th RKP(b) Congress, which Vladimir Ilich could no longer attend.

In his last letters and articles, proceeding from the study of the international and domestic circumstances, Lenin gave priority to the problem of strengthening the communist party and to elaborating a general plan for its foreign and domestic policies. His greatest concern at that time was the aspiration to safeguard the strength and resistance of the communist party and to strengthen its ideological and organizational unity. These ideas imbue his "Letter to the Congress" and the organically related articles "How To Reorganize the Rabkrin (Proposal to the 12th Party Congress)" and "Better Less But Better." These works consider most important problems of party unity and party ties with the masses, the need for collective leadership, the prestige and role of the Central Committee, and the deployment of party cadres. Lenin paid exceptional attention to the problem of cadre training, upbringing and placement. That is why this problem is covered much more extensively in the new edition of the biography.

Lenin taught that after a proper political line has been formulated and the material possibilities for resolving urgent problems defined, the proper selection of cadres and their placement, upbringing and supervision become the main feature of party and state work. "Check the people and check actual performance," Lenin wrote. "Again and again, this alone is the crux of the entire work and of all policy" (op. cit., vol 45, p 16). What great life-asserting power is contained in these Leninist words! To this day they are our manual for action.

Our party is raising work with cadres to the level of contemporary requirements, which are just yet exigent and harsh. "In all sectors, always and everywhere the communists must set the example of the implementation of civic duty, conscientious work for the good of society and comprehensive assertion of the Leninist workstyle," the March 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum pointed out. "This applies, above all, to party cadres, to party and state leaders. The CPSU will tirelessly pursue a line of increasing exigency and upgrading responsibility for assignments."

Lenin repeatedly reminded us of the need for skill to work with people and to maintain a self-critical approach in assessing the result of one's work. The promotion and upbringing of new and young cadres was considered by him one of the most important tasks. The skill of experienced party workers in the center and the local areas, Lenin pointed out, must be manifested in the "intensive utilization of new fresh party forces" (op. cit., vol 39, p 236).

The leader of our party ascribed tremendous importance to raising the cadres in a spirit of high political standards, class approach in the study of social phenomena and combination of the principle of collective leadership and personal responsibility for assignments. He pointed out the need to study the experience of the toiling masses, steadily to maintain close ties with them and learn from life and from the struggle for the cause of the party and people. Lenin's party always considered and still does that the absence of strict party exigency and display of tolerance toward those who commit unseemly actions could lead to the degeneracy of individual workers and cause tremendous harm to the social cause of the party and the people.

Lenin's ideas on preserving party unity and collective leadership as well as on its leading and directing role in building socialism and communism in our country have retained their relevance under contemporary conditions, as is pointed out in the new biography edition.

The final chapter in the biography convincingly proves that Lenin's ideas have been implemented in the life of the society of real socialism, which achieved developed and mature forms in the USSR; yet the struggle for peace, social progress and the national liberation of nations oppressed by imperialism are the extension and development of the Leninist policy of peace, friendship and solidarity among nations, the beginning of which was laid by the Great October Revolution; and that Leninism--the Marxism of our time--is a basic, steadily developing and renovating and eternally living theory, taking the new situation into consideration, a trusty ideological weapon wielded by the communists building a new society without exploiters, and by all true revolutionaries struggling for peace and social progress.

The new edition of Lenin's biography is a manifestation of the daily concern shown by the CPSU for the intensified study of Lenin's doctrine and the life of the leader of the socialist revolution and the creator of our party and Soviet state. It will contribute to the ideological and moral upbringing of the Soviet people and to the solution of the difficult problems of perfecting developed socialism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/15

END