

Air Research Division

AUG 7 1961

MAIN FILE

JPRS: 4752

5 July 1961

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

SELECTED TRANSLATIONS FROM "KOMMUNIST"

No. 2, 1961

RETURN TO MAIN FILE

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19990916 043

Photocopies of this report may be purchased from:

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
1636 CONNECTICUT AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

JPRS: 4752

CSO: 1898-S

SELECTED TRANSLATIONS FROM "KOMMUNIST"
No. 2, 1961

[This report contains the translations of two articles, titles given below, published in Kommunist (The Communist), No 2, Moscow, January 1961. Complete bibliographic information is given with each article.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Economic Work and Scientific-Technical Progress	1
The Problems of Communist Indoctrination	17

ECONOMIC WORK AND SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL PROGRESS*

[Following is the translation of an article by I. Kasitskiy; Kommunist, No 2, January 1961, pages 39-51.]

Concerning Our Reserves and Opportunities

The creation of a material-technical base for communism is the basic practical task before our people in the period of extensive construction of a communist society. The chief method for solving this historic task is through scientific-technical progress; that is to say, the perfection of all aspects of the productive process on the basis of the most recent achievements in science. We must perfect not only all of the means and articles of labor, but as well the methods of production. In the USSR, scientific-technical progress is organized in accordance to plans, it encompasses all aspects of production, is continually improving and is constantly accelerating. It is carried out through the means of mechanization and automation, electrification and the wide use of chemistry, the introduction of advanced technology, superior forms in the organization of production and labor, and the complete utilization of scientific achievements in all of the fields of the national economy. The July Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU [Communist Party of the Soviet Union] (1960) indicated that it was chiefly on this basis that it would be possible to attain an increase in every way possible of the productivity of social labor and high rates of accumulation. For this we must bring into action all of the reserves and possibilities which our economy has available.

The planned socialist economic system makes these reserves indeed inexhaustible and provides the opportunity for their fullest and broadest use. Public ownership of the means of production creates the objective conditions for the most rational direction of an economy. In this is the greatest advantage of a socialist economy over a capitalist one. Such endemic defects in capitalism as the anarchy of production, crises, the constant under-employment of the productive capacity, massive chronic unemployment, wide militarization of the economy, etc., lead to the barbarous misuse of the productive forces and to a gigantic dissipation of labor and material valuables.

* Some questions in the order of a discussion.

The advantages of a planned socialist economy have provided for rates of growth in social production which are unprecedented in history; these rates have been several times greater than those achieved under capitalism. In the shortest period of time our nation has been turned from an agrarian backward state into a great industrial power. In comparison with 1913, industrial production in the USSR has grown more than 40 times, the national income has increased almost 22 times, and the basic productive resources of the national economy by almost 9 times, etc. All of this has become possible under the conditions of new socialist production relations and under the conditions of the effect in the economic laws of socialism.

Yet it must be understood that the advantages of the socialist method of production are not realized automatically. The utilization of these advantages presupposes a strict scientific organization in social production. This organization must be based on a deep knowledge of the objective economic laws of socialism. This implies above all correct planning of production, a continuous material and technical provisioning of enterprises, an adequate system for their financing and securing of credit, the rational organization of production and labor, and the creative activity of the masses.

The practice of socialist economy is still not yet free from many serious shortcomings which hinder the fullest and most effective use of the existing capacities. For example, the development of production according to a plan necessitates the provisioning of all necessary items. This is one of the unchanging conditions for the steady output of products. In practice however, we occasionally are faced with interruptions in the supply of materials, a break in the rhythmic production, the output of products of poor quality which need immediate changes or repair. As a consequence of this, losses occur in individual enterprises which in truth are temporary and local in character and are relatively easy to correct since the reasons for them lie not in the objective conditions, but in the shortcomings of our economy and in weaknesses in economic and organizational work.

The development of a socialist economy is unthinkable without the application of definite economic levers such as "khozraschet" [cost accounting], operating at a profit, prices, profit, etc. This obliges us to better the economic work in all fields of production. However, as was shown in practice and as the June 1959 and July 1960 Plenums of the Central Committee of the CPSU have noted, the level of economic work is still short of the needs of life and the tasks for scientific and technical progress. The main reason for this is a still insufficient link between economic theory and the practical tasks of production and scientific-technical progress. "...The economic must always look ahead to the side of technical progress, or else he is immediately left behind..." The words of V. I. Lenin which were written 60 years ago sound particularly timely today.

The successes of the USSR in the development of the economy, science and technology are generally known. But they could be even

greater if the economic work at enterprises and in all of the areas of economic management helped to implement more fully all of those possibilities which a socialist economy creates and all of those reserves which lie at the heart of our production. Economic work in no way comes down to the liquidation of a particular type of loss, mismanagement or extravagance, but is concerned with finding the means for a continuous perfection in production and in the methods of economic management. To put it another way, to disclose all of the obvious as well as the hidden reserves. This will permit a sharp rise in the country's accumulation, it will disclose fully the actual and very significant sources of additional means. And they may be used for even greater rates in the construction of communist society, and for a rapid rise in the living conditions of the workers.

That the advantages of socialist economy are far from being fully used is proven by the presence of large untouched reserves in production. And the basic reason for this is found first of all in the fact that, along with a frequently encountered underestimation of the effect of economic levers on production and the habit in a number of cases of directing the economy to a significant degree by administrative methods, little has still be done in the field of introducing advanced forms and methods in economic work.

An improvement in economic work will enable us to delve more deeply and to use the reserves of scientific and technical progress. It is well known what enormous possibilities lie in the use of complex mechanization and automation. However each measure in this field must be as a preliminary economically sound; otherwise the expenses would be unjustified. Millions of people are employed in various types of auxiliary manual work, in particular in loading and unloading work and in transport work. The mechanization and automation of this work is just beginning and has still not been carried out on a mass scale which is necessary under contemporary conditions. It is enough to say that the level of mechanization in loading-unloading work in industry is only 29-31%. The same must be said about mechanization in engineering and office work. And here as well you find several million persons employed.

To a significantly large degree, it is possible and necessary to make use of the advantages of standardization and unification. Work on innovation and rationalization and the perfection of production organs, in particular specialization and cooperation, also possess exceptional, in fact, unlimited possibilities for accelerating scientific and technical progress. In the majority of fields in industry, the basic part of expenses goes to production (in the machine building industry, for example, it amounts to 70-75%); in the main this depends upon the level of technology in industry. And everywhere there is much to be done. All of this creates the conditions for freeing large reserves when not only technical but also economic means are brought to bear upon the solving of the above-mentioned (and they are still far from being mentioned in full) tasks in scientific and technical progress.

Let us give at least a few examples. It was calculated that in 1959, 13.5 billion rubles were spent on raising the efficiency of machines.¹ Along with this there are means available to any enterprise for increasing the reliability and durability of equipment which promise the greatest savings even within relatively short periods of time. For example, if the operating life of just automobiles, tractors construction and other expensive machines could be increased by 18-20% (this is completely feasible, although it of course would involve overcoming some well known problems), then the nation would realize a savings of more than 3 billion rubles per year. And in addition to these machines, the same could be done for much other equipment.

Let us take another example. Yearly we invest enormous sums in the national economy. In the Seven-Year Plan, the capital investments amount to nearly 300 billion rubles. At the present time there are more than 70 billion rubles in circulation in the national economy. But these funds are not always used rationally. Practice shows that there is the possibility of freeing a significantly large part of the fixed and circulating monetary funds and to direct them to other needs. Here are a few facts. By simply checking the plans for 57 large thermal and hydro-electric power station and by bringing in a number of proposals, it was shown possible to realize a savings of 640 million rubles. Important amounts of money which are set aside for capital investment are often wasted. Uncompleted construction within the country grows yearly by 1-1.5 billion rubles; but in the last eight years it has increased two times and greatly increases the actual costs. For example, the construction of a twine and string factory in the Krasnodar Sovnarkhoz should cost an estimated 10 million rubles, but it receives annually 100,000-150,000 rubles. Putting it another way, it has been delayed ten years.

Large amounts of money may be saved if there were a proper order for drawing up plans, a rational organization of construction production (we have rather rich experience in this field), and if construction can be sped up (and here we need to study advanced construction organization). And then what are the particular and long-range measures for this?

The turn-over of funds in circulation over the past years has sped up somewhat. But if one considers that an acceleration of monetary circulation can in only one day free 1 billion rubles for other needs, and that in a number of fields in the national economy, this acceleration can be measured in many days, then it is clear that the question is one of freeing not just one billion rubles. But what does this speed up of turnover mean specifically in practice? The condensation and shortening of the productive cycle (particularly in machine building), a reduction of inventory in warehouses, greater speed in ~~accounting~~, a shortening of time spent in transporting cargo and many

1. All prices given in the article are shown in the new ruble.

other measures (and here there is much unfinished business) can be used by any enterprise or Sovmarkhoz. It is necessary only to give attention to these questions. It was just a few years ago that the index of turnover for monetary circulation was planned and taken into consideration. This work brought about a large saving effect, but now it goes on haphazardly.

Let us give still another example related to the use of the valuable material resources. There is so much labor, money and material needed for the extraction of each ton of metal which is the basic material for industry! In 1961, according to the plan more than 55 million tons of rolled iron are to be produced. Along with this, in the machine building and metalworking industries (and this constitutes the basic demand for metal), about one-half of the metal is wasted. It has become so that tens of millions of tons of metal are used irrationally. However we know that at the advanced enterprises they have for a long time been using technological processes which provide enormous savings in metal. They are such measures as the pressing of various forms, careful pouring and casting, profile rolled iron, welding, etc. For example, in the stamping of each million tons of rolled iron, it is possible to save 250,000 tons, or about one-quarter of the metal worked; this would free about 15,000 machine tools and up to 30,000 workers. The experience of such enterprises as the Zhdanov Plant for Heavy Machine Building, the Leningrad Plant "Red Dawn" and others show a high efficiency in stamping. The method of plastic deformation (hot and cold knurling) basically alters the character of metal use. Thus, the USSR yearly manufactures more than 150 million gears; the cutting of the gears in effect turns the metal into chips, and so expends much good high-speed steel, necessitates complicated machinery, a working force, etc. A number of the nation's enterprises (the "Konotopskiy" Electromechanical Plant "Red Metal Worker", the Moscow Plant "manometer" and others) have already worked out a new production method for gears, and if all gear production was done according to the new method, this would free about 10,000 gear-cutting machines, it would save 50,000 tons of steel a year, economize production space, raise $1\frac{1}{2}$ time the durability of gears, etc. For a long time now we have been manufacturing many types of drills (one of the most widely used cutting tools) by the method of plastic deformation. It would be possible to mass-produce a number of other parts by this method, for example, grooved shafts, etc. This method should be put into wide use.

At the June Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU (1959), it was pointed out that stagnation and clinging to old methods of metal working (cutting instead of various types of pressure working) lead to enormous losses. This is all the more shameful in the light of the fact that we have developed progressive practices which are unknown abroad, and technological processes which provide large savings not only in metal but in labor. For example, at the plant "Autosteel" [Avtostal'], the rolling of steel spheres instead of stamping them shortens labor outlays from 30 to 40 times. There are many such examples.

Of course one must distinguish between those reserves which can be quickly and without special expense put to work in the national economy, and those which will require an extended period of time to realize, and which need special equipment and additional capital investment to manufacture. One must take into consideration that the expenses which are comparatively large for a given enterprise can be very effective from the point of view of the national economy. It is important to use more widely the advanced production experience. Why is it, for example, that the methods of improved technology which have been successfully applied in a number of enterprises (as was shown at the meeting in Moscow, called recently by Ekonomicheskaya gazeta), are spreading slowly? The reason is because, in the first place, that far from all of the enterprises have been informed about this experience, and in the second place, because such technology not only demands sometimes special equipment, but also increase the expenses of a given enterprise. And why is it that the planning and special technical organs are not concerned with these questions concretely and closely? It is a question of that very same "industrial virgin lands" which Comrade N. S. Khrushchev spoke about on 22 May 1957 in Leningrad. He showed that limitless prospects unfold before industry after a transformation of its management principles. And here again we return to the methods for using the reserves, and above all the necessity of improving economic work.

From the large number of questions involved in this, we shall concern ourselves in this article only with those which are directly connected to scientific and technical progress. We shall take up its planning, the perfection of the systems for material incentives [lit. stimulation], technical and economic analysis, and also some organizational measures for strengthening economic work in industry.

Planning for Scientific and Technical Progress

In order to bring about scientific and technical progress successfully, i.e., to introduce simultaneously and fully the achievements of science and technology into production, it is essential first of all to plan for this. This means that it is necessary not only to designate the definite objects for development and introduction, not only to provide all of the necessary equipment, materials, work force, etc., but as well to link organically the results accrued from introducing each measure with the general planning indices, and to define the influence of the efficiency of scientific-technical progress on a given production. For this reason namely, planning for the introduction of new technology (or, in what is the same thing, scientific-technical progress) is one of the most important tasks in economic work.

Scientific-technical progress is not an end in itself, but rather a basic means for increasing the productivity of social labor. An increase in the scope of production depends, as well we know, on the availa-

bility of power, but chiefly on the growth of labor productivity. In 1965, the last year of the Seven-Year Plan, the increase in output by $3/4$ should be provided for by the growth in the productivity of labor. This is the direct result of introducing progressive means of labor, advanced technology and production organization. In other words, this is the consequence of scientific and technical progress. It is exactly the same if one were to take the planning goals for accumulation, net price, etc., then the fulfillment of them would depend first of all upon what achievements of science and technology are to be introduced and what organizational and technical measures are to be applied in the enterprise along with an increase in the scope of production.

Our nation has had great success in the field of introducing new technology. In 1960 we designed and manufactured 2,500 new types of machines and other equipment and more than 500 different instruments; we also took out of production more than 600 designated obsolete designs. In one year alone we designed for enterprises more than 2,800 automatic, semi-automatic and mechanized continuous conveyor lines; in the machine building plants of the Sovmarkhozes we have modernized about 70,000 machines and other technological equipment. The production of the metal cutting machines in 1959 for the USSR surpassed the production level in the USA by nearly 3%, and in 1960 the production from these machines grew still 5% more over the figure for 1959. We have introduced into the national economy over the year more than 2.5 million inventions and proposals for rationalization, and this has brought about 1.4 billion rubles in savings for the year. The rapid growth of production in industrial products is the result not only of constructing new industrial objects, but as well the continual perfection of production processes.

However, it would be a mistake not to see that in many of the enterprises and in the Sovmarkhozes as well there is still much work to be done in the field of planning for the introduction of new technology. And that which is not planned, as a rule, is not given the material and financial resources, it is not taken into consideration, and not controlled; therefore it is usually not fulfilled. Moreover, it often happens that the work which may even be included in the plans for new technology if it is not coordinated with the general production plans, also does not receive the materials and therefore is not fulfilled. Finally the effectiveness of the work, even provided for in the plans for introducing new technology is often not taken into account, and there is no opportunity of determining the influence of this work on the indices of production scope, net cost, productivity of labor, etc. What an enormous effect would be felt in the national economy if these and other widely found shortcomings in planning for new technology would be corrected.

For this reason the June Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU (1959) was sharply critical of the condition of planning for the introduction of new technology in the Republics, and emphasized that "the measures mentioned in these plans are not organically connected

with the assigned tasks on increasing the production of products, improving quality and lowering their net cost, and on the growth of labor productivity." The Plenum considered as "incorrect that in the plans for the national economy that the most important measures were overlooked on the problems of solving and introducing new technology which had significance for the entire state." The July Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU (1960), having indicated the necessity of increasing the level of economic work, emphasized once again that "scholars in economics have given little attention to solving the methodology of planning." And in fact the key point in the field is a methodology for planning for new technology. How is it possible that these instructions of the Plenum up to now have not been carried out?

What should be done to liquidate this serious shortcoming in achieving scientific-technical progress? First of all, the plan for introducing new technology must be always an organic part of the general plan for the development of the national economy, worked out for the entire nation as a whole, for the economic regions [rayons], or for individual enterprises. And, on the other hand, this plan is always a part of the plan for new technology at the higher link.

Scientific-technical progress will be carried out quickly and successfully only under the condition when the basic lines of development for new technology (including technology and the organization of production) are defined beforehand for each enterprise, "rayon" and Republic. And of course in this one must as a preliminary calculate the effectiveness of all the intended work, and not only here the savings in expenses (which determines also the influence on the lowering of the net cost of the product), but as well the influence on the other indices which were given in the resolution of the June Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU. For this one may use the advanced experience which we already have.

In the enterprises, the Sovmarkhozes as well as in the Gosplans significant experience has been accumulated on the planning for new technology. However this experience is not common knowledge to everyone. Each Sovmarkhoz works out its own methodological instructions and establishes its own forms and manners for evolving the plans for organizational and technical measures. Up til now in many of the procedural as well as substantive questions there has been disagreement. Literature on this subject is extremely scarce; in the last 25 years nothing has been published aside from one book, a few pamphlets and articles, and there are few sections on this in the texts on planning.

But meanwhile there is some positive experience in this field. Thus recently the Moscow Municipal Sovmarkhoz published a work entitled Metodicheskiye ukazaniya i formy k sostavleniyu tekhpromfinplana promyshlennogo predpriyatiya /Methodological Indices and Forms for Compiling a Plan of Technology, Industry and Finance for an Industrial Enterprise/ which included a section on "The Plan for the Development and Introduction of New Technology and the Organization of Production;" in this they provided for a definition of the effect of all the work designated

in the plan and its connection with the indices of production, labor productivity, the lowering of net cost, the raising of the product's quality and the capital investments. A number of enterprises in the Urals, Leningrad and other cities and rayons have also attained definite successes in the planning for new technology. The methodological regulations which were worked out at the end of 1960 for drawing up a state plan for the development of the national economy, included provisions for realizing the directives of the June (1959) Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU. Unfortunately they could not be used for drawing up the plans for new technology for 1961 because (as it was said perfectly clearly in them), they must be worked out before drawing up the individual sections of the plan for the national economy.

If we succeed in creating the actual conditions for drawing up plans of the fundamental work on the introduction of new technology, if we can calculate their effectiveness and provide for them in the production plans, then this would be the first important step in bettering the planning for scientific-technical progress. One cannot forget that in our economic and planning organizations various proposals are constantly being introduced which disclose additional reserves, and that the solving of new measures goes on continually on the basis of the plans from scientific research, experience and other work. And if all of this work would be considered for the yearly plan as super-planned and included correspondingly in the operative plans for the quarters and months, then this would create a great interest in a still greater perfection of production and in an increase in the qualitative index of the enterprise's work.

It is also impossible to agree that some Sovmarkhozes include into the plan every reserve discovered during the year and every achievement of an enterprise, thereby adjusting their yearly tasks. This can be interpreted as an attempt to cover up the reserves. Only the basic measures which determine the technical policy of a given production and which provide for the fulfillment of the state assignments should be included in the yearly plan. All the rest may serve as an additional stimulant for encouraging the personnel of the enterprise.

At this time there is in industry an abundance of various plans for new technology: the assimilation of new and the modernization of existing types of articles, scientific research and work from experience, plans for drafting and design work, standardization and normalization, specialization and cooperation, inventions and rationalization, and various sorts of episodic plans (on shoring up "weak points", on the elimination of rejects in individual areas, etc.) various plans for the development of mass initiative (for example, the individual and collective plans for raising the productivity of labor or technical progress, the disclosure of reserves in the work area, etc). All of this is in addition to the current operative plans of the various technical organs and the plans for organization and technical measures. Doesn't this make it obvious that we need a definite unification of all these numerous plans? And most importantly, we must have a complex clarification of the effectiveness of all the designated work.

Along with this, in the area of determining the effectiveness of new technology there has appeared recently such a large number (sometimes contradictory) of procedures and instructions, that it is also necessary to unify them immediately. One must give thought to those planning indices which stimulate scientific and technical progress and not to those which would hinder it. In particular this refers not only to the index of gross production, but as well to a number of other indices which seemingly determine the "disadvantage" of new technology. These questions deserve the most thorough study.

On Perfecting the System of Material Stimulation

The further improvement in the system of material stimulation [incentives] for the workers (in the context of an incentive of a moral character) is particularly important for the development of economic work in industry. This system includes of course not only the material encouragement for the achieved results of work, but also in the creation of such planning indices which would immediately interest every enterprise and its personnel in furthering scientific-technical progress. In fact, is it not paradoxical that a reduction through re-designing of a machine's weight decreases the indices for fulfilling the plan in the enterprise which puts out the machine, since the amount of production is measured in tonnage? And along with this viewpoint wouldn't it be worthwhile if the State Committee of the Council of Ministers of the USSR on the Questions of Labor and Wages were to set up a number of experiments directly in the enterprises, and in so doing check the merit of different proposals on material encouragement for the workers. This is all the more possible in view of the fact that the Committee has already carried out economic experiments on other questions. The possibilities for the most progressive decisions lie in such research and experience.

We have shortcomings in the organization of material incentives. The Party has already several times corrected those economic managers who have tried to lower the plan assignments, for the easier the plan the easier it was to over-fulfill it and thereby become a leading worker and receive a greater material remuneration for over-fulfilling the plan. Now we have introduced a number of new regulations on bonuses which established new indices for giving bonuses and rewards and which provide for encouragement as a result of introducing new technology. However the main question is still unsolved: how to create the objective incentives for a maximum increase in the efficiency of productive and economic activity, and in particular for introducing advanced achievements of science and technology. It seems to us that for this it is necessary to stop considering the plan assignment (on any index) as the criterion for encouragement. Of course under the conditions of a planned economy it would be inadmissible to ignore the degree of fulfilling the plan. But it is one thing when the fulfillment of a plan is the

indispensable condition for an award or bonus, and another thing when the award itself is given for this feature. This is particularly important now when the mastery of new types of machines and the improvement of technology and the organization of production have become the most important aspects in the activity of an enterprise. Therefore it is necessary to create such criteria as incentives which would immediately be directed to the discovery and use of production reserves.

It would be expedient to establish that the giving of an award (under the condition of fulfilling the state plan) is brought about for a factual increase in the previously attained level of production or for improving other exactly calculated long established norms (production power, operating at a profit or some other index) depending upon the area of production. Let us say, for example, in the extractive industries, where the raw materials are not limited by the output of a product, it would be possible to stimulate an exceeding of production power or the actually achieved level of production; in the manufacturing industries one could work on an increase in the profit index, etc.

Such a system would permit a sharp reduction of various types of loss and would encourage the enterprise to seek reserve power more energetically. All innovations in science and technology will be introduced much quicker. There would also be an immediate interest in introducing suggestions for rationalization. Is it necessary to say how much the national economy would gain from this and how the rates of scientific and technical progress would be accelerated.

In reviewing the questions on the increase of independence and material incentives, it is necessary to decide at the same time the question of material responsibility. The instructions of V. I. Lenin are well known that "khozraschet" must include material responsibility as well. However in practice these instructions now are almost not carried out. Industry up til now has been led by the regulations passed in 1929 by the Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR on material responsibility for losses caused to the state. Under this as a rule, it was considered a crime for even a production failure. This regulation has become completely antiquated and long since in need of review. Really does a production failure or misappropriation mean a loss caused to the state? As a result of careless uneconomic work and unskilled management, great losses can be incurred in the state, but now most often this is punished by a penalty of an administrative character.

It is so that in a number of advanced enterprises there existed the practice of intra-factory "khozraschet" whereby those guilty of a loss were deprived of their bonuses or had them reduced. There was in effect a system of deficits (up to three months' pay), etc. We do not consider that these forms of punishment were completely satisfactory, but some sort of active material responsibility must exist if there is to be a system of material encouragement. The absence of a real material responsibility means in essence irresponsibility, and in such cases it

is difficult to speak about genuine economic accounting, or about the incentives of economic work.

Technical-Economic Analysis--The Most Important Means of Disclosing Production Reserves

Scientific-technical progress, as we have shown above, has within itself innumerable production reserves. But in order to bring them out it is necessary to thoroughly and systematically analyze all aspects of the production process, not only the financial-economic activity, but as well that which determines the progressiveness of the applied means of labor, technology and the organization of production. The complete and complex analysis of production-economic activity (technical-economic analysis) is the most effective means for disclosing the different reserves of production and its improvement. Such analysis to a significant degree differs from that analysis which goes on in financial and banking institutions where the work of the enterprise is valued on the basis of its account data (bookkeeping and statistical).

It is a question, in the first place of analysis not only of financial-economic but also production activity; consequently it is an analysis of the use of the means of labor, technology and the organization of production. In the second place, it is an analysis not only of account data (this is of course indispensable) but also of all the activity of the enterprise which in a number of very important instances does not occur in any accounting forms, but is characterized by different other documents (charts, technological maps, test results, etc.) or which demands special technical calculations.

For an example we will take the analysis of the design of an article or the technology of its production. Here it is very difficult to limit the calculations. From them (even if they are very well compiled) we can find out about the divergence of the actual expenditures from the established expenditure norms in individual loss components. But how is one to determine whether these norms have been increased or whether they have been correctly established? Let us say, for example, that the safety factor or the class of precision for manufacturing at our factory is set more often on the basis of the antiquated methods of accounting. This means that we need special checks of technical documentation with the corresponding accounts. But any instance of an increased safety factor would mean an enormous amount of useless unused material, working time, equipment, instruments, electric power etc. spent on working it up. It has been calculated, for example that if in the construction of gas, thermal and water piping smaller steel pipes were to be used than at present, that this alone would realize a savings for the national economy of several hundred millions of rubles. In what bookkeeping or statistical forms can one find such data for this type of calculation?

However this does not mean that it is necessary to refuse analysis of bookkeeping and statistical accounting. For under the conditions of rapid progress in science and technology it is impossible to limit them. We need the complex analysis with the participation of bookkeepers, planners, statisticians, financial experts, labor economists, and also designers, technologists, mechanics, energy and production experts. Here is a simple example. The Ural plant for hydroelectric machinery systematically fulfills its planning tasks. In 1959, it fulfilled its assigned task on product output by 103.2%, and the labor productivity plan by 101.3%; it over-fulfilled its task on net costs. It would seem that nothing better could be desired. But an analysis of the technological process made in the beginning of 1960 showed that the loss of rolled ferrous metals amounted to 44% in this factory, and the loss in man-hours was 25%. From this example it is perfectly clear that along with analysis of the data of accountability it is vital to investigate the technical documentation and carry out special calculations. It is namely this that will permit the discovery of the greatest reserves which lie in the sphere of scientific-technical progress. And really isn't this confirmed by the valuable experience of the public bureaus of economic analysis, where you will find working the specialists from the most varied professions? The joint regulation of the Sverdlov Sovmarkhoz and the Praesidium of the Oblast' Trade Union Council of 20 August 1960 emphasized the great effectiveness of the work of the public bureaus of economic analysis, and whose experience is now beginning to be widely spread.

It is characteristic of these public bureaus not only that they carry on complex and thorough analysis, but that also many workers are drawn into the struggle for disclosing the reserves of scientific-technical progress. At the Sverdlov Turbo-Engine Plant in August of the past year, 162 persons--economists, bookkeepers, technologists, master craftsmen and workers took part in the analytic work of the shop bureau. These bureaus systematically analyze the use of raw materials and goods, the effectiveness of introducing new machinery, scientific research, etc. On the basis of the bureau's suggestions it was possible to carry out measures which in material expenditures alone realized a savings of 50,000 rubles. And on the whole for the plant in only the first three months of operating, the recommendations of the public bureaus made possible a savings of 35,500 rubles.

It would seem that all of this is obvious. Moreover even as early as 1948, on the order of the government there was called the third All-Union Conference on Intra-plant Planning in Machinery Building where it was recommended that namely a system of technical-economic analysis would permit the disclosing of existing reserves most fully. A number of works were published in which the authors supported such a position. However up to now they teach only accounting analysis in the economic VUZes [Institutions of Higher Learning], and even in the texts for the courses in the technical VUZes, as a rule, you do not find a section which teaches the use of analysis for discovering and bringing

to light production reserves. Engineering and technical personnel as a rule who have not been instructed in how to draw up their calculations and drafts on an economic basis, commit many excesses and outright mistakes. This is why large losses arise in individual plants, and why it is necessary to basically redo a number of designs which are very costly in terms of labor.

It must be said directly: we have lost a great deal due to an under-estimation of this problem. And if we were to approach the solution of this problem on the basis of state action, and to find the successful forms of complex and systematic analysis in all aspects of an enterprise's activity, then this would sharply increase the level of economic work and become a serious stimulus to scientific-technical progress.

Some Organizational Conditions for Improving Economic Work

The improvement and development in economic work to a significant degree depends upon a number of organizational conditions. A number of suggestions have already been introduced on these questions in different forms, but they have been poorly realized.

First of all one must remark that our economic services still do not cope with those tasks which scientific-progress present. The economists still do not fulfill that role in the enterprises and in the Sovmarkhozes which they could and should fulfill. And it is not only the economists who are at fault in this. The status of an economist at an enterprise has not been defined in the necessary manner. Under the contemporary conditions it is impossible to reconcile oneself to the view that the economist's work in a plant comes down to calculations, and in plant management to a "determination" of the reasons for any sort of defect. Can many of the economists say that they look ahead to the aspect of technical progress as Lenin taught, that they analyze the processes at the enterprise, and that they not only disclose existing reserves, but also coordinate planning for scientific-technical progress and define its effectiveness and link it with the planning goals? And this is why we must whole-heartedly applaud the initiative of a number of Sovmarkhozes which are trying to alter basically the position of the economist at the enterprise and strengthen the management of economic work. For example, the Sverdlov Sovmarkhoz on 3 September 1960 passed a resolution on the introduction in 15 enterprises of the position of chief economist who is to be the assistant to the director.

One must remember that the situation for the economic personnel is unfavorable. Their staffs at the enterprises up to now have been cut down, and that sometimes there is simply no one to calculate the effectiveness of one or another measure or to analyze work etc. The contingents of those studying in the economic VUZes has systematically been curtailed on the "basis" that the staff in the enterprise, they

say, is already filled. And in the system for increasing economic qualifications (this is particularly important for large groups of field economists) the work has been neglected, and this matter is taken up haphazardly in individual departments and organizations. In truth, this task has been given to the VUZes of the Ministry of Higher and Middle Special Education, but it is doubtful that they would be able to fully provide for an increase in the qualifications of the practicing economists. In our opinion it would be expedient to create a central correspondence institute for increasing economic qualifications for management, engineering-technical and economic workers; this would make use of the allied faculties and the corresponding network of affiliates in the industrial centers and with the aid of a good deal of publishing.

It is not enough to require economic knowledge only from the engineers and technicians; it is time to demand also from the economists in every category that they increase their qualifications, both economical and technical. In general it seems to us expedient to introduce into practice special "minimums of economic knowledge" along the lines of the "technical minimums" which in their day played a large role in the workers' mastery of new technology. These obligatory "economic minimums" naturally should be differentiated.

The training of the scientific cadres is a problem of the greatest importance. To put it mildly there are few people among the scientific workers in economics who have scientific degrees and titles and who can enrich science and are used for the benefit of production. It is evident that it is a question of attracting more widely the important economists to scientific research so that they will work in production and in economic organizations.

The network of scientific-research institutes for economics has been insufficiently developed. Because of this the solving of questions in the field of economics and the organization of production is suffering. This question is particularly acute in industry. The Scientific-Research Institute for Economics and the Organization of Industrial Production which has been set up in Siberia cannot satisfy the needs of the whole country. The branch economic institutes in this area are already occupied, and the inter-area institutes (State Economic Council, Gosplan and the Academy of Science) cannot devote to these questions in economics and the organization of industry the attention which in fact they deserve. Of course it is difficult to propose that such a network of institutes with the necessary material base could be created at once under the conditions of an absence of a sufficient number of scientific workers. In order to accelerate this, it is obvious that we need first of all some sort of organizational-scientific center. Such a center could become the specialized scientific institution of an academy type, which would unite the network of economic institutes.

It would be expedient independently of this to create now within the Academy of Science of the USSR a scientific council on the problem of studying the reserves in the national economy (like the type of

councils existing now under the Academy of Science). Thus one could organize right away the forces of various scientific organizations for a planned study of this most important state problem.

Economic work can be rapidly improved if we will only take up our responsibility for it. A leading role in the development of economic work belongs to the Party, Komsomol and Trade Union organizations. In recent years in many enterprises, the commissions of the control of administrative activity have begun to play a significant role, and particularly in the areas of scientific and technical progress, increasing the quality of the product, etc. Within a number of the Party Municipal and Rayon Committees there are now technical-economic councils at work. In numerous Komsomol organizations they have created different posts and detachments to guide scientific-technical progress called "Komsomol savings boxes" and which carry on an active struggle for disclosing and utilizing reserves. And in the trade union organizations much has been done to develop higher forms of socialist competition to improve the activity of standing production conferences and the growth of mass inventiveness and rationalization.

However this work in which millions of workers have been involved has been carried out frequently at a low level. This is why we feel that it is necessary to have a serious review of the practice of public economic work above all in the very mass organizations, i.e., in the trade unions; there should be better communication and a sifting out of those who do not toe the line. This could be done by the special economic organs or by the public councils under the trade unions (from the primary organs to the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [VTsSPS]). Particular attention should be given to the activity of the scientific-technical societies which could become a center for public work for the development of science and technology, for improving economic activity in economic organs. Much could be done by the organizations for inventions and rationalization. Finally a prominent role could be played by the public bureaus (design, technological, economic analysis, etc.) which would be built in a number of places.

Community spirit in the USSR is a great force and with the further development of democracy it will assume ever greater importance. But in order to bring this about you cannot rely upon gravity. Various, and even effective forms of work usually become old, and they must be replaced by new forms with more boldness, and any valuable creative initiative must be rewarded. This is the fact. Why for example have public bureaus been created only in a few cities and only in a few enterprises. Really doesn't this work deserve wider distribution and greater support? And in fact there are many such forms of work. Success in this will depend upon the degree to which we can channel the activity and initiative of our engineers, technicians, planners, book-keepers, statisticians, finance workers, suppliers and other workers.

The task of the state, Party and other public organizations in the field of developing scientific-technical progress involves support of mass initiative, the creation of all necessary conditions for raising the level of economic work and by this accelerate the building of the material-technical base for communism.

THE PROBLEMS OF COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION*

[Following is the translation of an article by V. Sukhodayev; Kommunist, No 2, January 1961, pages 105-109.]

The Academy of Social Sciences under the Central Committee of the CPSU has carried out a scientific session on the problems of communist indoctrination during the period off the extensive building of communism. Taking part in the work of the session were scientific workers from the institutes of humanities in the Academy of Science USSR, and the institutions of higher learning, state, Party and economic workers, and teachers in middle schools.

The discussion of the actual questions of communist indoctrination once again gave a large role to the indoctrination work of the Party and of the Soviet state. All of the speakers emphasized the exceptional importance of the decisions of the 20th and 21st Party Congresses, the Plenums of the Central Committee, and the speeches of Comrade N. S. Khrushchev, as well as the Declaration of the Conference of the Representatives of the Communist and Workers Parties in the matter of solving the questions of communist indoctrination. The distinctive feature of these scientific conferences was the close tie of the theoretical proposals with life, with the practice of communist construction, the sharp criticism of bourgeois ideology, reformism and revisionism.

In the opening address the head of the Department on Propaganda and Agitation of the Central Committee of the CPSU for the Union Republics, L. F. Il'ichev, gave attention to the main theoretical problems and the practical tasks which now confront our Party in the area of communist indoctrination.

The main thing in indoctrination is the working out of a communist relationship to labor, and the custom of working in the communist manner. This is the very point where one must struggle constantly, without tiring, from day to day in decisively eliminating any manifestations of haughtiness or parasitism. It is necessary to indoctrinate every Soviet citizen with a striving to do his work more productively, and to unswervingly increase the organization, culture and discipline in labor.

One cannot count on this awareness in people coming about spontaneously and automatically as a consequence of a change in the

[* Note: the word "vospitaniye" includes much more than a formal education, but has a much larger connotation of upbringing and training. In the connotation here it means the instilling of a communist viewpoint, indoctrination.]

economic base. Only in the course of the struggle for communism, in the goal of systematic ideological and political work is it possible to indoctrinate and will it be possible to indoctrinate the man of the communist future. Such is the inspired line of the Communist Party in all of its ideological and indoctrination work.

The instilling of a communist attitude to labor cannot be limited to books, pamphlets or lectures on the question of communist labor; above all there is the need for constant and daily effective organizational work and the struggle for the creation of such conditions as will provide for productive labor in factories and mines, electric power stations and in transport, in the kolkhozes and sovkhoses, in the scientific laboratories and in the designing bureaus.

Particular attention by the participants in the session was given to research on the inter-relationships between the material and the moral stimulants [incentives] to work. During the period of the extensive building of communism, the material personal interest of every person as a result of his labor has great significance. At the session they criticized those articles in our press which emphasize only the role of moral incentives and which with disdain speak about the "ruble" interests or lean only upon enthusiasm and the description (which are in fact rather meagre) of a few examples of gratuitous labor. Speaking at the January Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Comrade N. S. Khrushchev noted, "We must raise material personal interests. Material interest should occupy a definite place in our organizational work. You don't get far on the moral factor alone. The moral factor supported by a good material incentive can have the greatest importance. It is necessary that the man sees and feels what the material incentive is. Really now is this a contradiction to our principles? In order to go toward communism we have to first of all be concerned about the people. And what is this concern about people? For good work, for high productivity of labor there must be corresponding wage and material encouragement. We can't forget this.

To forget about the personal material interest, said the participants in the session, would mean to divorce oneself from life. Therefore the perfection of planning, the forms of wages have the greatest importance so that they provide for a steady rise in the national economy and indoctrinate the people with the custom of observing public interests. However it sometimes happens that shortcomings in this matter place private interests in opposition to public interest. For example we all know of cases when the summary planning is given for gross production in rubles, it is possible, let us say, for a clothing factory to get its workers to produce expensive but tasteless, useless clothes and to disregard inexpensive articles which the workers need. Such contradictions should be solved by the means of establishing indices which have an economic base, and which would better provide for an identification of state and local interests.

Along with this the use and strengthening of personal material interests as a result of labor must be united with an instillation in

the people of an understanding of the primary importance of public interests and with the development of moral incentives in work.

The speakers noted that a practical precept of socialism is the principle "He who does not work, does not eat." The subsequent realization of this principle will bring about the evolution of a communist conscience, it will permit people to discover in work their capacities and talents, to perfect and develop them, to be irrevocably opposed to those who would live off others or would not work or work faint-heartedly.

The question also was brought up about the struggle with equalizing tendencies. A levelling distribution contradicts the very essence of the socialist order. In practice it would negate material interest as a result of work and the moral incentives for labor.

The session emphasized the importance of preparing the most thorough research which will disclose the principles and the character of distributing the commonweal between the members of Soviet society. In particular they spoke on the desire to thoroughly show the consequences of the growth of public funds of consumption for the communist indoctrination of the people. These public funds are the effective means found by the Party for increasing the well-being of the entire population, a means for uprooting the remains of private property. The fact that the portion of consumption from the social funds grows steadily for every Soviet family, has as its direct result the constant growth of personal interest of the Soviet man in increasing the public funds for consumption; that is an increase in the well-being of the society as a whole and of the entire people. This shows that the principle of material interest can become a source for the growth of moral initiative in labor.

The Rector of the Academy of Social Science, Yu. P. Frantsev, raised the questions of the inter-relations between the individual and the collective, between the people within the collective, and the reasons for the positive influence on the individual of some collectives and the impotence of others. The speaker reported that it is namely within the collective that each person finds his place in society, and clarifies the meaning of his practical activity and his social duty. Namely within the collective are the capabilities of people fully disclosed. As the transformation to communism goes on, continually more importance is given to the organization of leisure, cultural pursuits, and social activities. The Soviet man can not imagine his life without the collective and inside the collective.

It is namely through the collective that socialist society, the socialist order and the socialist state make themselves felt upon the individual. The influence of the state and the Party on each collective is the indispensable condition for its correct work, and all of its activity including indoctrination.

The Secretary of the Vyshnevolotskiy Municipal Committee of the CPSU, A. N. Matveyev, spoke on the experience of the collectives of communist labor in Vyshniy Volochok (Kalininskaya Oblast'). All of the

duties of the collectives which were fighting for the title of brigades and enterprise of communist labor are characterized by a striving to reach a higher productivity of labor by the means of better organization in production, and an increase in professional skills, rationalization and inventions. They are striving to perfect the relations between people involved in the process of production, to be concerned about the organization of cultural leisure, and are working for a healthy way of life.

The competition for the high titles of brigades and shockworkers of communist labor played a not unimportant role in increasing the awareness of workers; great changes were brought about in the views of people on production and studies. Thus, if in 1958 (i.e., before the introduction of this competition) there were 64 infringements of labor discipline at the plant "Proletariat Vanguard", then in the course of the competition the number of infringements fell 3.5 times. And in such departments as the weaving, reeling and packing, they have fully disappeared.

The devotion to communism impels the shock workers of communist labor to take on the most backward and difficult parts of production. This is shown in the deeds of six girls from the cotton combine in the brigade of communist labor of Lyudmila Shibalova. After the deeds of this brigade were published in the rayon newspaper, they received a letter from the Komsomols on one of the kolkhozes. The agrarian Komsomols wrote that "you it seems have worked hard for the title of brigade of communist labor; but you have the conditions for this: you work eight hours, and after work you have in your schedule, the theater, the movies, the club and the library. But just try to organize such a competition with us; perhaps it is possible to do this, but we couldn't. Help us."

The members of the brigade discussed this letter and decided to show that it was possible to organize a competition for the title of shockworkers and brigades of communist labor in a kolkhoz as well, if only there was the desire, the persistence, and high awareness. Six girls, members of the brigade, Vera Leont'yeva, Lidiya Semenova, Yevdokiya Dumcheva, Lyudmila Borisova, Antonina Klimina, Raisa Pavlova, decided to go as milkmaids to the most backward farm of the kolkhoz "Smychka." The municipal Committee of the CPSU supported their initiative. Nearly a year has already gone by since the girls have been working on the kolkhoz, and it is possible to say that they have justified with honor the confidence of the brigade and the community. The young workers have mastered their task, and have increased the milk output. They are competing for the title of farm of communist labor, participate in the social and cultural life of the village, and continue their studies. Of course this has not been without difficulties, but they have overcome them.

The struggle for communist labor, says A. N. Matveyev, does not end with the winning of the title of a collective of communist labor. Quite on the contrary, the struggle assumes even greater scope. The

life and work of the brigades of communist labor are complex and rich in content. They take on new increased duties. In their work difficulties also arise. All of this demands from the Party and public organizations close attention and skilled leadership.

The two time Hero of Socialist Labor, the Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR, and Chairman of the Kolkhoz "Red October", P. A. Prozorov told of the enormous changes in the awareness and the way of life for the kolkhoz workers.

"As a man, I have worked for 37 years as the chairman of the kolkhoz," said P. A. Prozorov, "particularly noticeable are the changes which have come about since the years of the formation of the kolkhozes in the life and awareness of the people; particularly marked is the transition of the peasant from a former individualist into a completely different person, a collectivist. The life of the kolkhoz worker has become intelligent, cultured and spiritually rich.

"Technology has made work easier and has shortened its duration; technology has made it more varied and more attractive. Now in our kolkhoz we are putting up the first milking hall in our oblast. What will this achieve? Before the milkmaids had to prepare the fodder, fetch water and take away the manure; i.e., each day they had to haul away nearly two tons of stuffs, milk 200-300 liters of milk and clean the cows. But the milkmaids still have a home, children and a family. When could she read a book? I doubt whether a book would make much impression on her after such work. A milking hall will make the work of the milkmaid easier and not so long. Now the kolkhoz worker in our agricultural artel works on an average of not more than 8 hours a day, and in this work his physical strength is almost in every place replaced by the power of a machine.

"In the old brigades of the agricultural artels, the kolkhoz worker did not own cows, was fed in the kolkhoz dining room, washed in the kolkhoz bath, washed his linen in the kolkhoz laundry, and raised his children in the kolkhoz kindergarten. The people were freed from the myriad daily minutia, and were able to work much better and to rest more. Unfortunately this has not been done in the new brigades (i.e., in the brigades formed from the kolkhoz workers which were joined to "Red October.") Therefore in them labor activity is much lower. In the old brigades for one worker he goes to work 26 times a month; in the new brigades it is not more than 18.

"We have developed remarkable specialists in their respective fields," continued P. A. Prozorov. Many of them do not have a special education, but in their knowledge are equal to an engineer because they constantly study, subscribe to special journals and have their own technical libraries. All of the projects in the kolkhoz are planned by the kolkhoz workers themselves; all enterprises and hundreds of electric motors, etc. are established or outfitted by the kolkhoz mechanics. The kolkhoz workers keep up their ties with many other artels in the country, with sovkhoses and agricultural scientific-research institutions; they go on missions to study new types of pro-

production on location. Knowledge of technics and technology enable them to work creatively, to be designers and rationalizers, by themselves to create new methods of labor and to advance science. In the kolkhoz are 18 Heroes of Socialist Labor.

"The labor of the foremost people in agriculture is now more than physical labor; it is the work also of the agronomist, the engineer and the scientist. They attain their own, even though small, discoveries. This in itself is an award for labor.

But not all of the people have this new attitude toward labor. There are unfortunately individual idlers, self-seekers and amateurs at doing a little less and getting a little more. But already such conditions have been created so that it goes very badly for such people, and they are becoming fewer.

"In the ideas of the kolkhoz workers the very conception of the word "prosperity" has changed. Now prosperity for the kolkhoz worker is not when the granary is groaning with grain and when 2 or 3 cows stand in the barn, but when the kolkhoz has become strong, for a strong kolkhoz provides the kolkhoz workers not only with all of the necessities of life, but also with the goods of a cultural life."

One of the characteristic features of the new stage in indoctrination work is the formulation in the Soviet people of a unified and structured ideology. Now it is not enough to have a person who is "basically" politically competent, and "basically" understands the Party policy. At the session it was emphasized that the scientists are summoned in many ways to assist man in working out a unified ideology, which is free from inconsistencies and any sort of gaps; they must teach man to look at things from the point of view of the overall national tasks, to understand the direction in public life and the process of the building of communism. The indoctrination of a whole individual is not only the working out of the unified ideology, and the unity of all its features, but as well the working out of the unity of personal convictions, views, feelings and tendencies. The whole man is the one who does not have a division between the word and the deed; this is the discord which V. I. Lenin considered as the greatest evil, and the most negative feature of the old bourgeois society.

Professor G. Ye. Glezerman spoke on the meaning of converting the norms of communist behavior into customs. It would be incorrect if under communism all moral norms became customs. Such an idea would greatly impoverish the spiritual work of a man in the communist society who had to decide complicated moral issues. But undoubtedly the sphere of elementary norms of behaviour which will become habits in people, is significantly expanding. Here one must consider not only the observation of social order and social discipline, not only the manifestations of honesty, truthfulness and conscientiousness, etc., but as well those norms of behavior which are specific for socialism and communism; such as the habit of participating in the decisions of public affairs, of working according to one's capabilities and the rational satisfaction of one's needs.

P. A. Rodionov, Candidate for historical sciences, told about the new experience in Party propaganda. N. S. Chernikh made a report on the role of the community and public opinion in communist indoctrination. The session also analyzed the activity of the people's friendship societies and the comrade's courts, etc. They stressed particularly the prevention of any sort of infraction of the law or anti-social behavior.

The Secretary of the Odessa Oblast' Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party spoke on the experience of attracting the wide masses in the struggle for the preservation of public order. Even the first results attest to the growing feeling of responsibility for a proper order of things at enterprises and in the city. The community has begun to deal more sharply with those who disobey the norms of socialist society. Now they are beginning to pay attention to those infractions which in the past were overlooked. Therefore the sharpness of the struggle has caused not an increase in the number of anti-social acts, but in the growth of demands by the people, and the strengthening of the struggle for moral uprightness in the people. In other words, anti-social manifestations have not increased, but we have reared Soviet people, and our demands have grown.

There was a lively exchange of opinion on the question of an aesthetic indoctrination. Professor M. N. Parkhomenko and the Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, V. A. Razumnyy spoke on the necessity of working out the theoretical problems of aesthetics and the means of formulating artistic tastes. The motion picture director, G. V. Aleksandrov dwelled upon the role of art and the responsibility of the artist for aesthetic indoctrination and along with this said that it is important to indoctrinate the artists themselves. The Secretary of the Central Committee of the Kazakhstan Communist Party, N. Dzhandil'din, gave the report "The Questions of the International Indoctrination of the Workers under the Contemporary Conditions."

The participants of the session discussed the actual problems of the struggle against the remains of capitalism in the conscience and way of life of people. V. I. Lenin defined the struggle against the remnants of capitalism in in people's consciousness as essentially a class struggle. "Really," he wrote, "the class struggle in the period of the transition from capitalism to socialism does not consist in protecting the interests of the working class from those handfulls, groups and strata of workers who persistently hold to the traditions (customs) of capitalism and who continue to look upon the Soviet state as was previously done; that is, 'give the state a little less and a little worse, take from it a little more money'" (Soch. [Works]. Vol 28, p. 79). Of course, the content and the character of the struggle with the remnants of capitalism in the consciousness of people during the period of the extensive building of communism has changed in comparison with the transitional period from capitalism to socialism. But this struggle is still going on.

The psychology of private property, nationalism, chauvinism, apoliticalness, religious and other remnants are objectively at war against us. Hence the struggle against them is a struggle against the influence of bourgeois ideology, the struggle for a communist ideology, and for communist morality.

The psychology of private property most fully discloses the remains of bourgeois consciousness, manner of thought and conduct. Cupidity and petty property tendencies, like rust, eat out the heart and soul of man.

In our country there are not the social bases for manifestations of private property. Soviet reality and the public character of socialist property literally revolt against these bourgeois remains.

The speakers gave their attention to those instances when individual authors have incorrectly explained the reasons for the vitality of the capitalism remnants in the consciousness and way of life of the Soviet people. They criticized the erroneous judgment which sees the reasons for the remains to lie in the socialist principles of the distribution of labor, and not in their misinterpretation.

Consumption of goods not derived from labor in a socialist society is not only amoral but illegal. V. I. Lenin devoted great attention to the control of the balance between labor and consumption. He wrote; "Only the voluntary and conscientious cooperation which is produced by revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses of workers and peasants in the teaching and control...of the swindlers, idlers and hooligans can conquer these damned remains of the capitalist society, these dregs of humanity, these hopeless rotten and dead members, this infection, plague and ulcer which has been left socialism as an inheritance from capitalism." (Soch., Vol. 26, p. 371).

In the struggle against the remains of private property, we may and must use fully both the strength of social pressure and the force of our laws. The participants of the sessions warmly approved the proposal of Comrade N. S. Khrushchev and the decisions of the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU on the necessity of sternly punishing imposters, careerists and other people who forget the interests of society and socialism. "We have to ruthlessly uproot the evils," said Comrade N. S. Khrushchev, "of idleness, a negligent attitude toward labor, and the psychology of private property. We must have an irreconcilable struggle against the remnants of capitalism, and in this struggle we must coordinate the measures of social pressure and the measures of strict administrative punishment. But the most important thing is the indoctrination of people."

At the session they also took up the questions involved in the struggle against religious remnants. With the entry of our country into the period of the extensive building of communism, the preconditions are created for a final vanquishing of religious prejudices. But regardless of its deep crisis, religion has still not yet gone out of existence, and it still lives on in the views of a significant part of the Soviet public. This is possible on the one hand by the

shortcomings in our anti-religious work, and on the other, by the adaptation of the religious ideology to the contemporary conditions.

Church-goers in many instances grossly break Soviet laws. They give particular attention to catching women, youth and children in the snare of religion. Religious thinkers increasingly try to adopt their reactionary ideology to the new situation and new conditions. They propagandize the fallacious thesis on the "peaceful coexistence" of communism and religion, about the common origin of communist and religious ideologies, the fable that Christ was the first communist, and that the communism to which Soviet society is aspiring is a copy of "Christian communism."

In the same light we publish few anti-religious works. In the books, pamphlets and articles at times the social roots and social content of religion is not shown, and the enormous achievements of the Soviet people in the building of communism and in the development of science and technology are poorly used for a proof of the truth of the scientific ideology. And it is not always shown with sufficient conviction that the religious ideology with its inherent mysticism, pessimism and its indifference to all earthly cares serves the cause of bourgeois propaganda and undermines the faith of the Soviet people in the construction of a new world.

F. A. Lukinskiy and P. F. Kolonitskiy and P. A. Pavelkin spoke on this question and made a number of interesting considerations and proposals for making anti-religious propaganda more concrete and also to differentiate it for women, the youth, kolkhoz workers and individual groups of workers and intelligentsia with a consideration for national differences. Much attention was given to increasing the struggle against religious sectarianism.

Soviet man is becoming the prototype of the new man for the entire world; the man of communism. Both our friends and our enemies will be watching our forms of activity and our deeds. It is understandable that this struggle for overcoming shortcomings, for a purity of the Marxist ideology and for the creation of a constantly communist, deeply human, enlightened and positive morality has the greatest significance not only on a national scale, but also abroad. Every Soviet man, wherever he lives and whatever he does, should be a communist in thought, word and deed.

The assistance to the Communist Party in fulfilling this magnificent task--the indoctrination of hundreds of million in the spirit of communist ideals--is the honored and responsible duty of the workers in social sciences.