

JPRS 70100

4 November 1977

U S S R

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 14, SEPTEMBER 1977

20000317 139

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

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

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, Springfield, Virginia 22151. 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 semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, 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.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

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

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET		1. Report No. JPRS 70100	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST No. 14, September 1977			5. Report Date 4 November 1977	
7. Author(s)			6.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201			8. Performing Organization Rept. No.	
			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.	
			11. Contract/Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above			13. Type of Report & Period Covered	
			14.	
15. Supplementary Notes Translations from KOMMUNIST, theoretical journal of the CPSU Central Committee, Moscow, published 18 times a year.				
16. Abstracts The report contains articles on political, economic, military and social developments and problems within the USSR and as they relate to communist and other countries.				
17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors USSR Political Science Sociology Propaganda Economics				
17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms				
17c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 5C				
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22151			19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 167
			20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price PCA 08

4 November 1977

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 14, September 1977

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year). Where certain articles, reprinted from other Russian-language sources, are not translated, indication of this fact is made in the table of contents.

CONTENTS	PAGE
Tribune of Discussion by the Whole People.....	1
Marxism-Leninism and the Revolutionary Renovation of the World (M. Suslov).....	12
Our Holiday (Henryk Jablonski).....	27
Austria's Welcome of the October Revolution (Friedl Furnberg).....	35
Lenin's City's Great Exploit (Lev Uspenskiy).....	44
Powerful Lever of Party Leadership (Yu. Rasumov).....	51
Comprehensive Approach to Party Committee Educational Work (M. Teslya).....	66
Dialectics of the Theoretical and Empirical in Contemporary Science (V. Shvyrev).....	77
Continual Creative Search (A. Karganov).....	88
Loyal Knight of the Proletariat; on the Centennial of F. E. Dzerzhinskiy's Birth (A. Velidov).....	100
Life Inspired by the October Revolution; in Memory of Paul Vaillant- Couturier (Fernand Grenie).....	112

CONTENTS (Continued)	Page
Self-Exposure of Maoism in Africa (Yu. Alimov, L. Fedorov).....	116
Society, Man, Management (G. Volkov)	137
New Research on the Problem of the Socialist Way of Life (P. Poshatayev).....	144
Historical Experience and Its Lessons; the Workers Movement in the Period of Transition to Imperialism (B. Likhachev)	146
From the Book Shelf.....	158

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No 14,
Sep 1977

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : Sep 1977

Signed to press : 21 Sep 77

Copies : 968,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1977

TRIBUNE OF DISCUSSION BY THE WHOLE PEOPLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77 pp 3-12

[Text] Very little time remains until 4 October--the day when the USSR Supreme Soviet, summing up the results of the nationwide discussion of the draft of the USSR Constitution, will undertake the consideration of this historical document. Unquestionably, the work of the supreme power organ of the Soviet state will draw the great attention of all citizens of the Soviet Union, of tens of millions of our foreign friends, and, naturally, of the political opponents of the socialist system.

Such an extremely keen interest will be displayed because "the adoption of the new USSR Constitution," as noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, Central Committee general secretary, at the May 1977 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "will become an important landmark in the political history of the country. It will become yet another historical contribution made by our Leninist party and the entire Soviet people to the great cause of building communism and to the international cause of the struggle waged by the working people the world over for freedom, human progress, and lasting peace on earth."

Vladimir Il'ich Lenin and our party have always considered the constitution of the Soviet state not only a juridical but a most important political document. This is understandable, for, codifying the gains of the working class, the toiling peasantry, and the people's intelligentsia, achieved under the leadership of the Communist Party, the fundamental law of the socialist countries formulates also the basic tasks related to the building of the new society in the future.

Our first constitution, the RSFSR Constitution, unanimously ratified on 10 July 1918 at the Fifth All-Russian Congress of Soviets, stated: "Russia is proclaimed a republic of soviets, of workers, soldiers, and peasant deputies." This reflected all Leninist decrees passed after the October Revolution, containing one or another constitutional stipulation, and, above all, the "Declaration of the Rights of the Working and Exploited People." Having established the class nature of the Soviet state the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the RSFSR Constitution clearly showed to the entire world the objectives proclaimed by the bolshevik party and the Soviet system.

On 31 January 1924 the Second Congress of Soviets passed the first USSR Constitution. This document, which formulated the principles governing the establishment of the union multinational socialist state, marked the triumph of the Leninist national policy. "It is only in the Soviet camp," it emphasized, "and only under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which rallied around it the majority of the population, was it possible to radically eliminate national oppression, create an atmosphere of reciprocal trust, and lay the foundations of fraternal cooperation among the peoples."

The creation of a powerful socialist industry in the country, the irrevocable conversion of the peasantry to collectivization, the complete and definitive elimination of exploiting classes, and the close unification of workers, peasants, and toiling intelligentsia around the party for a systematic struggle for the building of communism marked the victory of socialist social relations in the USSR. This victory was legislatively codified in the USSR Constitution approved by the Extraordinary Seventh Congress of Soviets, on 5 December 1936.

Over 40 years have passed since our state adopted the current fundamental law. Today we could say with full justification that the 1936 constitution, making the system of power organs and of the administration of the country consistent with the victorious socialist social relations, played an important role in their juridical codification and regulation, and that the then elaborated constitutional frameworks for the development of the Soviet society were able to withstand the test of time. For the first time in history a state solemnly proclaimed and factually guaranteed to the people the right to work, rest, education, and material support in old age or disability. The legislative codification of the great achievements of the Soviet people in the struggle for the ideals of communism mark the completion of an important stage in the building of socialism. The subsequent period was a process of gradual growth of the state of dictatorship of the proletariat into a socialist state of the whole people.

The course and direction in the development of the socialist society were brilliantly predicted by the founders of Marxism-Leninism. They believed that the dictatorship of the proletariat, needed in the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, and, as V. I. Lenin emphasized, being not only a weapon for suppressing the opposition of the exploiters but, above all, a tool for the reorganization of socio-economic, political, and ideological aspects of social life in a socialist direction, having fulfilled its tasks and having insured the conversion of all population strata to the socio-political positions of the working class, will develop into another, specifically, into the form of state system of the entire people. The example of our homeland shows the accuracy of these theoretical conclusions.

What characterizes our country today? First of all, the total domination of socialist ownership in the economy. The single powerful national

economic organism is developing on the basis of combining the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of the socialist system. The unbreakable union among the working class, kolkhoz peasantry, and people's intelligentsia, between physical and mental workers, has strengthened. The social homogeneousness of the Soviet society is growing. The process of rapprochement among all nations and nationalities in the country is insurmountable. A new historical community--the Soviet people--has developed. The USSR has reached the mature and developed socialist stage.

It was natural for the big and basic changes which affected all aspects of social life and the nature of the Soviet state required a corresponding juridical structure. The question of the elaboration and adoption of a new USSR Constitution was placed on the agenda as the fundamental law of the developed and mature socialist society. Characteristically, it was precisely the soberly thinking foreign observers who noted, above all, the fact that the draft of the constitution described the Soviet state as a state of the whole people. Unquestionably, this presumed the further development of socialist democracy. For example, the London TIMES wrote, soon after the publication of the draft, that the concept of a state of the whole people "means, from the political viewpoint . . . the legislative structuring of the present stage in the development of the society; it also presumes further historical progress toward communism." The Calcutta newspaper AMRITA BAZAR PATRIKA noted the following: "the fact that a state which appeared as a dictatorship of the proletariat developed into a state of the whole people leads to the conclusion that the broadening and intensification of democracy is the main trend followed by the draft of the new constitution." The press organs of the socialist countries rated the draft highly. "The new Soviet constitution," wrote, for example, RUDE PRAVO, the Czechoslovak newspaper, "will become for progressive mankind a textbook the proof of the development of the Soviet state and of the principles of socialist democracy and socialist society . . ." A number of foreign press organs have noted that the draft extends the right to work with new guarantees such as the right to choose one's profession, and type of employment and work in accordance with one's vocation, abilities, professional training, and education.

Against the background of these and other analytical statements related to the acknowledgment of the profoundly democratic nature of the Soviet state the attempts made by some western bourgeois personalities to convince the world that the USSR population is allegedly "deprived" of political rights look rather squalid. Unable to suppress the draft, our opponents, ranging from the extreme right to the pseudo-revolutionaries, are doing everything possible to distort its nature and present matters as though the Soviet people have been indifferent to the draft.

The nationwide discussion of the draft of the USSR Constitution is the simplest and most convincing refutation of such claims. In itself the nationwide discussion of the draft is a clear manifestation of broad socialist

democracy. The Constitutional Commission, headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Committee general secretary and chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, noted with satisfaction that the discussion is taking place in an atmosphere marked by political and labor upsurge. It is characterized by the great activeness of the Soviet people and by their high level civic-mindedness and maturity of judgments and their practical and sincere interest in the adoption of the type of fundamental law which will contribute to the growth of the power of the homeland, to upgrading its prestige in the international arena, to strengthening and advancing the Soviet state, to the further development of socialist democracy, and to insuring the progress of our society in the building of communism.

The materials of the Constitutional Commission, published on 30 July, cite figures on the scale of the discussions. First, on 20 July, i.e., shortly more than 1 1/2 months following the publication of the draft, over 650 meetings had been held in the country with the participation of 57 million working people. Over 4,500 plenums of party committees, and meetings of party aktivs, and over 287,000 party meetings, addresses by 1,925,000 party members, were held in the various republics, krays, oblasts, cities, and rayons. A total of 322,000 deputies addressed sessions of local soviets and supreme soviets of union and autonomous republics. The draft of the constitution was discussed by plenums and aktivs of trade union, Komsomol, and other public organizations, and by the USSR armed forces.

A sociological study conducted by a group of scientific associates of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, together with a number of party committees, helps us to trace the course of the nationwide discussion of the draft of the USSR Constitution, and to visualize more clearly the practical implementation of one of the main principles of socialist democracy as codified in the CPSU Program, which stipulates that the party deems it its duty to submit to nationwide discussion the most important problems of domestic and foreign policy. This project, based on a single coordinated program, was carried out in the Ukrainian, Belorussian, Georgian, and Tadzhik union republics, the Checheno-Ingush Autonomous Republic, Krasnodarskiy and Krasnoyarskiy krays, and Moscow, Kalininskaya, Kurskaya, and Rostovskaya oblasts. The study included collectives of industrial enterprises, construction projects, kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and scientific establishments and basic socio-demographic and socio-professional population groups, or a total of over 10,000 people.

The sociological study concerned, above all, the deep interest displayed by the Soviet people in the draft of the constitution. In the first 10 to 12 days following the publication of the document it had been read by 92% of those surveyed; soon afterwards familiarity with the document reached 100% in a number of collectives. Nine out of 10 working people polled engaged in its interpretation and compared it with the current USSR Constitution. Again and again the true internationalism inherent in the Soviet citizens was manifested: members of all nations and nationalities were unanimous in their assessment of the basic stipulations of the draft; not one of the

remarks expressed could be interpreted as a manifestation of nationalistic prejudices. The materials of the study also revealed a high level of civic-mindedness of the working people and their accurate understanding of their obligations and their rights as members of a socialist society: the people considered one or another stipulation in the draft in terms of the current and long-range problems of production activities from the viewpoint of upgrading labor and socio-political activeness. Such problems assumed ever greater importance as the discussion developed. Thus, whereas initially no more than 13% of those polled discussed problems of the organization and implementation of the socialist competition, one month later the figure was three to four times higher. Approximately 25% of the working people who had submitted their suggestions in the course of the study deemed necessary to upgrade the individual responsibility of the citizens both to the collectives within which they worked as well as to society as a whole. Suggestions on the elaboration of parts of the draft discussing the role of production collectives in our society logically stemmed from such a formulation of the question (a similar view was expressed, for example, by M. Pzilyuma, a worker at the VEF Plant, whose letter was published in KOMMUNIST, No 10).

Such facts and figures characterize better than words the active participation of the masses in the country's political life and the free manifestation of their will, proving yet once again that the Soviet people consider the interests of the state their own. The fact that in the course of discussions the working people closely linked basic problems of further development of our society with vital problems and tasks reveals the high level of political maturity reached by Soviet citizens.

These days the mass information and propaganda organs have become a truly nationwide rostrum. PRAVDA alone has received tens of thousands of letters containing a large number of suggestions and remarks related to the draft of the constitution. By 10 September 1,030 had expressed 722 suggestions and remarks in the newspaper. It is a valuable feature that many letters were in response to previously published materials on the nationwide discussion. This proves, yet once again, the attention and interest displayed by the Soviet people in the draft of the constitution. Authors of letters to PRAVDA have included secretaries of party committees, workers in industry and agriculture, ministers of the USSR and union republics, construction and transportation workers, kolkhoz members, employees, educators, lawyers, writers, economists, scientific workers, veterans of the Great Patriotic War and those who are now serving in the ranks of the Soviet army and navy, propagandists, and political informants. Authors of letters published in PRAVDA's sections allocated to the materials of the nationwide discussion in a few July issues have come from Kiev, Moscow, Alma-Ata, Ulan-Ude, Sverdlovsk, Grodno, Leningrad, Voronezh, Vil'nyus, Tbilisi, Chelyabinsk, Tula, Kostroma, Khabarovsk, Perm', Dushanbe, Odessa, Makhachkala, Tashkent, Rybinsk, Baku, Andizhan, Kishinev. . . briefly speaking, there has been no place on the map of the Soviet Union from which responses containing suggestions and remarks on the draft have not been received.

The draft of the USSR Constitution triggered a broad response among the readers of KOMMUNIST. In five of its issues the journal printed tens of articles and letters under the heading "Draft of the Fundamental Law: Nationwide Discussion Rostrum." Some materials, even though published in other parts of KOMMUNIST, dealt with various items in the draft, offering theoretical and political interpretations of a number of definitions contained in the document.

What are the problems concerning the journal's readers?

Let us note, above all, that many of them have drawn the attention to article six of the draft which speaks of the leading and guiding role of the CPSU in our society. The consensus is that this article will contribute to the growth of responsibility of party members for anything occurring in the country, for individual assignments, and for the entire course of the building of communism. In his letter, M. Ignatov, secretary of the Ust'-Kulomskiy CPSU Raykom (Komi ASSR) cites in his letter, the statement by L. Ulyashev, a sovkhos brigade leader, made at a meeting of the rayon party aktiv. "Each one of us, party members, wherever he may be working, and whatever his position may be," the brigade leader said, "must be a model of conscientious, full, and honest fulfillment of the constitutional requirements. This is a necessary prerequisite for the further growth of the role of party members in all economic sectors and in public life, and an important factor in strengthening their authority."

Taking his enterprise as an example in describing the vanguard role of the party members in the development of output and the establishment of the collective, in a letter published by the journal A. Zhabagina, party committee secretary at the Alma-Ata Cotton Fabrics Combine imeni 50-Letiy Oktyabr'skoy Revolyutsii, states that the party leadership in economic construction must be improved further. In particular, she writes that the fundamental law "should discuss the party's leadership of the economy and the fact that the party formulates economic strategy and policy and continually controls their practical implementation." An essentially similar suggestion is expressed by Doctor of Economic Sciences I. Kozodoyev from Moscow. Journalist Yu. Rayanskiy from Odessa considers the party's role not exhausted by the aspects codified in the draft. In his view the USSR Constitution should stipulate that the party is in charge of resolving the problem of cadre selection, placement, and training. According to G. Tsyryn, a CPSU member from Leningrad, the constitution should reflect the fact that the party "is the leading detachment of the Soviet people, reflecting its will and interests. Its ideological-political and organizational activities are implemented in the interest of the people and are aimed at building a communist society." G. Tsyryn considers such an interpretation an additional prerequisite for rallying the Soviet people even more closely around the Communist Party.

In their letters the readers of KOMMUNIST pay great attention to the principles of socialist democracy codified in the draft. They share their thoughts not only concerning the wording of the draft but also in connection with the possibility to improve the work of the power organs.

Thus, a number of readers have drawn the attention to the broadening of the rights of local soviets as stipulated in the draft. The letters to the editor cite examples of the effective work done by these organs of the people's system and analyze the nature of chapter 19 which discusses the work of local power and administrative organs.

"The party line of concentrating forces and means on the priority solution of problems of national importance, combined with the intensified role of the local soviets, reflected in the draft of the constitution," writes Doctor of Economic Sciences P. C. Sidorov from Cheboksar, directly stems from the stipulations of the 25th CPSU Congress on maintaining the optimal ratio between sectorial and territorial planning." P. C. Sidorov also believes that the local soviets should control the utilization not only of natural but of manpower resources on their territory, for the comprehensive approach alone, taking this important economic factor into consideration, could yield the desired results.

The role which the local soviets play in the comprehensive development of the cities is of interest to Doctor of Architecture Yu. Bocharov and Candidate of Geographic Sciences V. Lyubovnyy. "The need to intensify the role of the soviets in the comprehensive development of the cities," they write, "is dictated by the objective trends of economic and cultural development in the country and, above all, by the growth of material and spiritual needs, and the intensification of all aspects of socially useful activities . . . the city stands out among the other territorial units by the fact that its development is taking place under the conditions of a limited area and limited resources, and the poor opportunity to handle them flexibly . . . following the adoption of the new fundamental law of the USSR, in our view, a special expanded legislation should be drafted for the cities, refining the rights and possibilities of city soviets in guiding the development of the cities, mandatorily taking into consideration their ties with adjacent areas. In accordance with the new USSR Constitution the legal and administration forms of urban development management should be supplemented by a system of economic control measures."

The reason we have cited such an extensive extract from this letter is that it touches a very important matter in the contemporary stage of development of our society. Whereas in 1940 the USSR urban population accounted for 33% of the citizens, in the summer of 1977 the figure had risen to 62%. The increased percentage of urban population is an objective progressive trend. It is the consequence of the increased role of the industrial sector in the socialist economy and the growth of labor productivity and output in agriculture. Naturally, this has resulted in an increase in the numerical strength of the working class in the Soviet Union, and, at the same time, in the overall upsurge of the population's professional and cultural standards. The course and consequences of this process and its control deserve the closest possible attention of sociologists, and planning, education, and cultural workers. Naturally, the local soviets play one of the main roles in this respect.

In connection with the qualitative improvement and expansion of the scales of our industry, the authors of letters to KOMMUNIST discuss an important social problem such as the training of working cadres. For example, noting that the draft of the constitution pays considerable attention to vocational training, upgrading the skills, and training the working people in new skills, Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences I. Senchenko, director of the training courses combine of the Groznefteorgsintez Production Association, expresses the wish that the on-the-job training of young workers be improved further. In particular, he writes that "we know that the collective contracts and social development plans of production collectives of enterprises stipulate measures for the training of young workers. However, the planning of such measures suffers from substantial shortcomings: they are still poorly interrelated. They do not represent a single entity. They do no insure continuity and the systematic progress from one level of vocational skill to a different, higher one. The need is ripe to combine in the course of production work the numerous methods of vocational training within a single comprehensive system. Such a system should reflect the specific nature of the sector, establish a sequence in the stages of the professional growth of the workers, including their acceptance as a reserve for promotion to executive positions, and develop in every one of them a feeling of pride in his profession and a communist attitude toward labor."

The Groznefteorgsintez Association tried to develop and apply such a system. This helped to stabilize the young workers at the Groznyy Petroleum Refinery imeni V. I. Lenin. Today 9 out of 10 young workers are employed in the same shops in which, several years ago, they began their labor career. Thanks to the implementation of technical measures and the application of a system for worker training and upgrading of qualification standards, applied in a number of enterprises of the association, the number of brigade members servicing technological systems has been reduced between 13 and 40%. All plants were able to fulfill their petroleum refining plans. Brigades in charge of managing new technological projects were set up by the thus-released skilled personnel avoiding the need to hire additional workers and increase the size of the wage fund.

Recently the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers passed the decree "On Improving Further the Process of Training and Education of Students within the Vocational-Technical Education System." This decree earmarks specific measures aimed at the more successful solution of the problems formulated at the 25th Party Congress on training skilled workers for the national economy. It is quite probable that the experience of the Groznefteorgsintez Association described by I. Senchenko will be taken up by the collectives of many industrial enterprises. Yet, this letter which contains neither remarks nor amendments to the text of the draft of the constitution, is interesting not only because of the facts reported by the author. We see here how a reader of the journal, avoiding a discussion of individual stipulations in the draft of the fundamental law, raises an important timely question. Yes, many of the letters to the editors deal with current and long-term problems based on the draft of the constitution.

This proves that this draft is most closely linked with life, and that topical theoretical aspects of the building of communism are interwoven in it with the practice of the entire party, governmental, and national work.

In his report to the May 1977 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said that in the course of their mass discussion of the draft the working people will pay attention to topical problems of interest to them and to one or another shortcoming in the work. "We must react operatively and concretely to criticisms and suggestions," the Central Committee general secretary emphasized, "and adopt measures to improve the situation wherever necessary."

The KOMMUNIST mail related to the draft of the constitution contains a number of critical remarks on the work of enterprises, establishments, and planning and economic organs. Characteristically, many authors consider it necessary to add to the constitution stipulations increasing their responsibility to society and the state. There is, for example, the letter by Doctor of Technical Sciences Professor M. Seid-Rza from Baku. He claims that measures related to the social development of production collectives will help not only to fulfill production assignments and discover major internal production reserves, but also create favorable conditions for the all-round development of the individual. Yet, the author believes that the interconnection between social and economic progress is not as yet ubiquitously understood. He suggests, therefore, that a separate article be added to chapter 3 of the draft of the constitution, emphasizing the importance of plans for the social development of collectives and stipulating that state enterprises bear mandatory responsibility for their formulation and implementation.

In his letter M. Seid-Rza also raises the question of making more specific the text of draft stipulations discussing the struggle for environmental protection. Agreeing with him are CPSU members A. Lavorov from Leningrad, D. Brankevich, docent at the Kuybyshev Politechnical Institute, and other comrades. For example, A. Lavorov believes that it is necessary to supplement the draft of the constitution (articles 18 and 67) with the stipulation that the obligation to protect nature and the bearing of responsibility for harming nature should be extended not only to individual citizens but to industrial enterprises, sovkhoses, kolkhoses, departments, and establishments. "In my view," the author states, "the problem of strengthening environmental protection and improving the utilization of natural resources must become an organic part of the system of improving industrial management."

In their letters the KOMMUNIST readers discuss a number of articles in the draft of the constitution. Basically, they express their views on all basic provisions contained in the document and on all important phenomena in the country's social life. For example, V. Chebykin, senior editor at the Astrakhan Television and Radio Broadcasting Committee, discusses the

role and place of mass information and propaganda media in the socialist governmental and social system; Doctor of Juridical Sciences N. Yurkevich from Minsk considers articles in the draft discussing the family in the USSR; Hero of Socialist Labor M. Klepikov, brigade leader at the Kuban' Sovkhoz, Us'-Labinskiy Rayon, Krasnodarskiy Kray, believes, as does L. Sidorov, a kolkhoz member from Bellorussia, whose letters the journal published, that the USSR Constitution should stipulate that all land users are responsible for taking care of the land; Doctor of Philosophical Sciences K. Khanazarov discusses with firm conviction the growing role of the Russian language in the life of each socialist nation and nationality and of our entire society . . .

Leafing through the KOMMUNIST mail received on the subject of the draft of the USSR Constitution, and reading what Soviet citizens have written to other press organs and the materials of the discussion of this document received from enterprises, kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and scientific and other establishments, we become convinced of the truthfulness of the Marxist-Leninist view of the drastic enhancement of the role of the subjective factor in the administration of society under socialism. Based on their knowledge of the objective laws governing social development, the Communist Party and Soviet state are ably guiding the social activeness of the masses, manifested particularly fully under developed socialist conditions. That is why we, the Soviet people, are amazed neither by the fact that the draft of the USSR Constitution was published nor by its maximally broadest, free, and truly effective discussion. Would this be possible in the West? Could one imagine, for example, that the reactionary circles in the FRG would risk to ask the working people to express their opinion on the subject of the ban on practicing a profession on the basis of which the progressive citizens of the country are persecuted? Could one imagine the fact that the U.S. Congress took into consideration the opinion of the country's working class concerning the Taft-Hartley Act, for example, which curtailed the already limited rights of the working people in the struggle for their political and economic rights? No, this would be inconceivable in the capitalist world! Characteristic of bourgeois legislation is not only the fact that the toiling majority is kept away from the elaboration of the norms of governmental life but violation of the civil rights of the poor. Let us recall perhaps the firm opposition of the slave owners to attempts to extend to the negroes the rights proclaimed in the American Declaration of Independence of 1776. Over two centuries have passed since but to this day in the United States children of different colors go to school separated on the basis of race. What kind of equal rights are these!

In our society the objectives of the people and the party coincide entirely. They consist of building a communist society and raising the comprehensively developed person. Unquestionably, the new USSR Constitution will contribute to their fastest implementation. That is why the party and the Soviet authorities could not fail to address themselves to the people asking them to express their views on the draft of this charter of developed socialism.

Universal history knows of no precedent of such a broad and truly nationwide constitutional creativity. This social phenomenon will be attentively studied by the social scientists. Important theoretical conclusions will be based on the summation of the course and results of the discussions of the draft and their scientific interpretation. Yet, in our country theory and practice are inseparably linked. They enrich each other and contribute, in the final account, to the more successful progress of our society toward communism and to the molding of the man of the communist future. The nationwide discussion of the draft has already yielded substantial results. Coinciding in time with preparations for the celebration of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the Soviet state, it has triggered an inordinate labor thrust among the Soviet people and an exceptional development of the socialist competition in collectives within literally all national economic sectors.

"The popular masses can never become such active creators of a new social order as during a revolution," Lenin pointed out. Contemporary facts prove that the world's revolutionary process, initiated with the Great October Revolution, is not abating and that the gravitating of the peoples toward socialism, is intensifying ever further. That is why we are confident that the nationwide discussion of the draft of the fundamental law of the country and the adoption of the new USSR Constitution will have a tremendous revolutionizing influence everywhere.

At the May 1977 CPSU Central Committee Plenum Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said that "we counter the interpretation of the concepts of democracy and human rights, distorted and debased by bourgeois and revisionist propaganda, with the fullest and most real set of rights and obligations of the citizen of the socialist society. We put on the scale of history the truly epoch-making gains of the working people achieved as a result of the rule of the working class under the guidance of the Communist Party."

This year, 1977, is doubly significant. It will enter history as the year of the highest political and labor upsurge of the masses, related to the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution. It will enter history as a year in which the Soviet people adopted and ratified with their souls, hearts, and minds, the fundamental law of our life. The new USSR Constitution will strengthen even further the foundations of the building which the Soviet people are erecting under the leadership of the Communist Party. Like a beacon the constitution of the mature socialist society will indicate the way of the working people throughout the planet to their final liberation from the oppression of capitalist exploitation and true democracy.

5003
CSO: 1802

MARXISM-LENINISM AND THE REVOLUTIONARY RENOVATION OF THE WORLD

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77 pp 13-23

[Article by M. Suslov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee]

[Text] Considering the historical destinies of Marxism and pointing out the victories it achieved at the beginning of the 20th century, V.I. Lenin predicted for it even greater future triumphs. Lenin's prediction, based on a precise scientific analysis of social development and on the facts and experience of the workers and national-liberation movements, was realized. The new epoch in universal history, of which Lenin spoke, was inaugurated with the Great October Socialist Revolution, the main event of the 20th century which radically changed the course of human events and marked the beginning of the transition from capitalism to socialism on a worldwide scale.

The victory of the October Revolution was a great historical confirmation of the revolutionary doctrine founded by K. Marx and F. Engels and continued and developed by Lenin. It contributed to the broad dissemination of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism throughout the world and created considerably more favorable conditions for their factual embodiment.

In terms of its influence on the minds of the people and their social activities, Marxism-Leninism is far superior to all known human sociopolitical doctrines. Today this is not denied even by many of its opponents. The power of the ideological and political influence of Marxism-Leninism on millions of people in all countries is due to the fact that this doctrine is correct, that it represents the scientific expression of the basic interests of the working people who account for the overwhelming majority of mankind. This makes entirely natural the constant increase in the number of supporters of Marxism-Leninism throughout the world who consider it an ideological and political guide in the struggle for social progress, social justice, civic rights and freedoms and the revolutionary renovation of the world. The attractiveness of Marxism-Leninism drastically increases in periods of tenseness of the class struggle and at turning points in world history, when social thought is particularly inquisitively seeking ways for the radical solution of ripe problems. The question of the significance of Marxism-Leninism in resolving vital contemporary problems has been placed today by life itself and revolutionary practice in the center of the world's ideological struggle.

To the Soviet people the entire time since the October Revolution was a time of heroic struggle and selfless toil. It was marked by outstanding successes in the building of communism achieved on the basis of the scientific Marxist-Leninist leadership of the Communist Party of the development of Soviet society.

The 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution coincides in the Soviet Union with a most important governmental action, the discussion and adoption of the new Constitution--the fundamental law of the country's life. This is a Constitution of the developed socialist society built in the USSR, gradually converting into a communist society. This most important political and theoretical document reflects the historical accomplishments of the Soviet people and their Communist Party. All these accomplishments, as Comrade L.I. Brezhnev noted at the 25th CPSU Congress, are the direct continuation of the cause of the October Revolution and a practical implementation of the great Lenin's ideas.

Summing up the results of the development of the Soviet state over the past six decades of its existence, the adoption of the USSR Constitution and the implementation of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and the 10th 5-Year Plan are the components of the single great historical process of building a communist society. The Soviet people may be proud of their victories achieved under the leadership of the Communist Party and its Central Committee, headed by L. I. Brezhnev, the tireless perpetuator of Lenin's cause.

1

In the 60 years which have passed since the Great October Revolution a developed socialist society was built in the Soviet Union. This is the main result of the struggle and the constructive toil of the Soviet people and a convincing proof of the vital power of Marxist-Leninist ideas. Considering the new communist social system coming to replace capitalism, the Marxist classics formulated the concept of the two stages of its development: socialism, its first and lower stage, and communism, its second and higher stage. Defending and developing Marx's concept of the two communist stages, Lenin wrote:

"...The scientific difference between socialism and communism is clear. That which is usually described as socialism was described by Marx as the 'first' or lower stage of the communist society. Since capital goods become common property the word 'communism' is applicable here as well if we remember that this is not total communism...instead of providing scholastic farfetched and 'fabricated' definitions or engaging in fruitless semantic arguments (what is socialism and what is communism), Marx studied that which could be described as stages in the economic maturity of communism." (Note 1), ("Complete Collected Works, Vol 33, p 98) The experience in the building of socialism in the USSR and in a number of other countries confirmed the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the two stages of the communist socio-economic system. The experience gained and the level reached in the building of socialism raised the question of the stages of its development as the first phase of communism. V. I. Lenin taught us "strictly to distinguish among the stages which are different in nature, and soberly to study their development conditions..." (Note 2), ("Complete Collected Works," Vol 9, p 131) Developed socialism is a natural stage of the communist system. It covers a lengthy historical period in the course of which most complex problems of communist construction are being resolved such as laying the material and technical foundations for communism, insuring the full sufficiency of consumer goods, bringing closer and, subsequently, merging the two forms of socialist ownership of capital goods, eliminating class distinctions, gradually eliminating the major disparities between town and country and between mental and physical labor, and molding the new man.

The constructive forces of socialism are displayed most fully and the effect of the entire system of its economic laws and patterns governing its functioning and development are manifested most energetically only on the foundations laid by socialism itself. They contribute to the steady advancement of the socialist society and to the development within it, on an ever broader scale, of phenomena and processes preparing the growth of this society into a communist society.

The intensified theoretical work done by the CPSU and the fraternal parties of the other socialist countries has enabled us to establish the basic laws governing the building of developed socialism. They are the following: Insuring the high level of development of production forces on the basis of the utilization of the latest achievements of the scientific and technical revolution;

Further development in the economic base of society of socialist ownership in its two basic forms: state and kolkhoz-cooperative--and their gradual rapprochement;

Steady growth of the people's prosperity, which is the main objective of the socialist national economy;

Preservation over a lengthy period of time and advancement of the socialist principle of distribution according to labor as the basic distribution method;

Progressive changes in the social structure in terms of increasing the leading role of the working class, strengthening the unity of the entire society and its social homogeneity;

Growing ideological and political unity among all nations and nationalities on the basis of their equality and common communist ideals, and powerful development of their economies and cultures;

Growth of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a socialist state of the whole people, and intensification and overall development of socialist democracy;

Further enhancement of the level of education and culture of the broad masses, growth of their political conscientiousness and ideological maturity, molding the scientific Marxist-Leninist outlook of the working people and strengthening overall cooperation with the fraternal socialist countries;

Upgrading the leading role of the communist and workers parties in all realms of social life as the main prerequisite for the victory of socialism and communism.

The manifestation of these laws creates favorable conditions for accelerating the coordinated and harmonious development of all realms of activity of the socialist society: economic, socio-political, and spiritual. In the USSR socialism was essentially built as early as the end of the 1930's. The victory of socialism was achieved in a country with a backward economy, rightlessness of the people, and poverty of the broad toiling masses, which is what Tsarist Russia was after 20 years of effort by the workers and peasants who implemented the Marxist-Leninist ideas. The creation of the material and technical foundations for socialism, the successes of socialist industrialization, the completion of collectivization of peasant farms, the establishment of friendship among the peoples on the scale of the entire country, the implementation of the cultural revolution, and the elimination of capitalist and establishment of total rule of socialist production relations became its components.

On this basis the process of socialist and communist construction in our country received a powerful boost which, in the final account, could not be prevented either by capitalist encirclement, the difficulties of World War II, or its severe consequences. The Soviet economy is a vivid example of the dynamism of the socialist society. We shall cite some factual data characterizing its growth in the second 30 years of existence of the USSR, starting with 1947, when the country had basically healed the terrible wounds of the previous war and exceeded the pre-war 1940 level in a number of indicators:

Table 1. Basic Indicators of USSR Economic Development (1947 = 1)

Indicator	1967	1977 (Plan)
National Income Produced	7.5	13.5
Capital Assets, All Economic Branches	5.9	13.1
Industrial Output	10.1	20.2
Gross Agricultural Output	2.3	2.9
Haulage, All Transport	7.5	13.5
Capital Investments	8.3	15.5
Numbers of Workers & Employees	2.5	3.2
Labor Productivity		
In Industry	4.2	7.1
In Public Farming	2.4	3.6
State & Cooperative Retail Trade	8.2	15.2

Let us note the particularly major successes achieved by the Soviet economy in the past decade when economic construction in the country took place under developed socialist conditions, with its tremendous scale of social output. Judging by the enthusiasm with which the Soviet people are working this anniversary year, many of the 1977 plan indicators will be not only achieved but surpassed.

These growth figures reveal the basic qualitative changes which have taken place in the Soviet economy. Today it represents a single national economic complex covering all levels of social production, distribution and trade. Its development is based on combining the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of socialism.

The sectors which determine scientific and technical progress in the entire national economy are developing at the highest pace: machine building, instrument making, the production of automation facilities and the electrical engineering, gas, chemical, petrochemical, and microbiological industries. In 1976 alone industry developed 4,000 new types of machines, equipment, apparatus, instruments, and automation facilities. About 80% of the growth of the national income in 1976 was achieved as a result of higher labor productivity. In 1 year this saved the work of about 4 million people. The qualitative renovation of the technical potential of the national economy creates a solid material base for pursuing the course of drastically upgrading overall social production effectiveness, as proclaimed at the 25th CPSU Congress as the main trend of economical development, adamantly implemented by the Soviet people.

The developed socialist economy opened great opportunities for upgrading further the prosperity and cultural standards of the Soviet people. In the past decade the increased availability of durable household consumer goods (per 100 families) rose as follows: television sets, 2.23 times; refrigerators, 4.1 times; washing machines, 2.1 times; and electric vacuum cleaners, 2.6 times. Today 8 out of 10 families have a television set, and 7 out of 10 have a refrigerator and a washing machine. Consumption of most important food products rose substantially.

The growth of the people's consumption is based, on the one hand, on the steady increase in the production of consumer goods and, on the other, the steady growth of the income of the Soviet people through the systematic increase in their wages, steady growth of social consumption funds, and tax reductions. [paragraph continues]

The measures aimed at upgrading the material prosperity of the people affected, within that period, the overwhelming majority of the population. In the 9th 5-Year Plan alone the measures implemented on raising wages and eliminating or lowering taxes increased the income of over 75 million working people. The pensions, benefits, scholarships, and other payments from social consumption funds were raised for approximately 40 million people. The course of upgrading material prosperity was continued in the 10th 5-Year Plan: The wages and salaries of yet another 31 million workers and employees will be raised. The monetary income of the Soviet people is growing against a background of stable state retail prices of basic foodstuffs and consumer goods.

The USSR has achieved quite considerable successes in resolving the housing problem. In the past 10 years alone housing facilities in the cities rose 50%. This increase is 50% higher than the entire stock of urban housing available in the country in 1940. Presently, every year some 11 million Soviet people are improving their housing conditions. Housing construction on such a scope will enable us to undertake in its essential lines the allocation of new housing based on the principle formulated in the party program: an individual apartment per family.

Successes in economic construction and in upgrading the people's prosperity are the results of the heroic efforts of the people's masses themselves headed by the Communist Party. Socialism triggers the great constructive energy of the people and their turning to the future.

The social structure of Soviet society is developing further on the basis of the steady economic growth. It is directed toward the ever-greater rapprochement among classes and social groups, and the ever-greater strengthening of its unit.

At all stages of the country's development, our working class proved itself the true maker of history and the leader of the people's masses. The vocational skills and general education of the broad masses of the working class are rising under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution. To an ever-greater extent the labor of the worker is becoming similar to that of the engineering and technical personnel.

The working class is making a decisive contribution to the creation of the material and technical foundations for communism. It is the largest class of the socialist society and its basic production force. The key positions of the working class in the socialist economy and its revolutionary nature, organization, collectivism, discipline, political awareness, and active participation in the administration of governmental and social affairs also determine its leading role in the Soviet state, a role which it will retain until communism has been built.

Important progressive changes are taking place among the kolkhoz peasantry. Today's kolkhoz member was raised under socialism. His character and ideological and moral features were shaped under socialist conditions. In terms of educational level, labor conditions, wages, and consumption level the way of life of the kolkhoz member is similar to that of the urban people.

The role which the Soviet intelligentsia plays in the building of communism is growing steadily. This is the direct consequence of the higher cultural standard of the people and the unparalleled importance of science in public production and in the life of the entire society. Our intelligentsia is inseparably linked with the entire people in terms of origin, social interests, and ideological and spiritual aspects. It is working in the field of science, technology, art, culture, education, and health care for the sake of the ever-greater economic and social progress of the Soviet state, both present and future.

Under the Soviet system relations of close friendship and cooperation have developed among workers, kolkhoz members, and the intelligentsia, among all nations and nationalities in our country, in the course of the building of socialism, and on the basis of the single national economic complex and common Marxist-Leninist ideology, and under the conditions of the united, voluntarily founded union state. A new historical community known as the Soviet people appeared and was shaped.

The growth of the social homogeneity of our society is characterized by the common features of the way of life of the Soviet people which embodies the best of human progress. These features are free and creative toil for the good of society, the sociopolitical and ideological unity of the people, a spirit of true collectivism and comradeship, moral purity, love for the socialist homeland, and a firm friendship among all nations and nationalities in our country. Internationalism has become the deep conviction and norm of behavior of the Soviet people.

The major characteristic of the socialist society and state is that as they develop democracy is steadily broadened and intensified. The first socialist state in the world arose and developed in our country fully consistent with the Marxist-Leninist doctrine as a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the political rule of the working class allied with the peasantry and the other working people accounting for the overwhelming majority of society. Lenin emphasized that "the dictatorship of the proletariat is a particular form of the class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the working people, and the numerous nonproletarian toiling strata (petite bourgeoisie, petty entrepreneurs, peasantry, intelligentsia, and so on), or the majority of such strata, an alliance against capitalism, an alliance with a view to the total overthrow of capitalism and total suppression of the resistance of the bourgeoisie and to attempts on its part to promote a restoration, an alliance aimed at the definitive creation and consolidation of socialism." (Note 3), ("Complete Collected Works," Vol 38, p 377)

The dictatorship of the working class was the most widespread democracy for the working people and for the majority of the population, previously unparalleled. The dictatorship of the working class was established not once and forever but only for a specific historical period, a period of transition from capitalism to socialism. Following the elimination of the exploiting classes and the reasons which created them, and with the victory of socialism and the establishment of the moral and political unity of society, it fulfills its functions and is no longer necessary.

The draft of the new USSR constitution codifies the growth of the state of proletarian dictatorship into a state of the whole people. This means that in the course of building communism all population strata converted to the ideological and political positions of the working class. The social base of the Soviet state, expressing the will and interests of workers, peasants, the intelligentsia, and all nations and nationalities in the country, broadened.

The CPSU conclusion, based on the experience of the Soviet Union on the growth of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a socialist state of the whole people, is of international significance. It shows the way from a democracy of the working people, accounting for the overwhelming majority of society, to total democracy for the entire people.

The draft of the USSR fundamental law further develops the democratic principles governing the shaping and activities of the soviets and earmarks the main ways for strengthening their ties with the masses. The role of the soviets of all levels has been enhanced in the country's social life and in controlling the activities of executive organs.

The most important manifestation of the democratic nature of the state of the whole people is that it guarantees the freedoms of the individual. The range of socio-economic, political, and individual rights and freedoms of USSR citizens has not only been broadened but the guaranteeing of such rights on the part of the state and the creation of the conditions for the further strengthening of socialist law and order have become fuller and firmer. The factual implementation of democratic principles is what distinguishes socialist democracy from bourgeois democracy. The advertising of democracy, as practiced in capitalist countries, is alien to socialist democracy. The revolution and socialism gave the Soviet people the right to work, pensions, paid leave, free medical aid, and education. The revolution brought true equality to all nations and nationalities and equality between the sexes. It guaranteed freedom of speech, press, assembly, and demonstrations to those who lacked it--the working people. The developed socialist society is systematically implementing the principle formulated by Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific communism: ". . . the free development of each is a condition for the free development of all." (Note 4) (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," Vol 4, p 447) Socialist democracy and freedom are democracy and freedom created by the people and for the people. This is their main purpose and content.

2

According to Lenin the main aspect of Marxism is to clarify the universal-historical role of the working class as the creator of the socialist society. Reaching maturity, the proletariat, the most progressive and revolutionary class of our time, sets up a political party to guide its class struggle, seize governmental power, and build socialism and communism.

Under current conditions, the historically proved Marxist-Leninist conclusion to the effect that it is insufficient for the working class to seize the state power but that it must also be able to retain it, is of exceptional importance to all revolutionary forces. The revolution is solid only when it can not only win but defend its gains and oppose the forces of reaction and counterrevolution. In order to make a revolution, consolidate its successes, and develop from a victorious beginning to a victorious end, the working class needs its own political party, as was established by Marxism-Leninism and confirmed by the experience of a number of countries. The Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the universal-historical mission of the proletariat was confirmed not in words but in the practical actions of the working class of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, able to unite and rally within the creative process all social strata and groups of working people.

The growth of the leading role of the Communist Party is one of the most important laws in the development of the socialist society and the building of communism. The CPSU--the party of the working class--which, under developed socialist conditions, became the party of the entire Soviet people, opens to the country the path of progress, awakens in the people a gigantic constructive energy, and insures the purposeful development of all social life and the successful solution of the complex problems arising in the course of this development on the basis of a thorough Marxist-Leninist analysis of economic, socio-political and ideological processes, and the skillful use of the laws governing social development. It is only under the leadership of a party enjoying the highest prestige and boundless trust of the people that the intensive and effective growth of the material and moral forces of the entire country may be achieved with a view to building communism and systematically improving the material and cultural living conditions of the people.

The draft of the new USSR constitution formulates with complete clarity the position of the Communist Party within the political system of Soviet society, offers an extensive characterization of its leading and guiding role, and concretizes the nature of its activities. The draft of the constitution states as follows: "Equipped with the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the Communist Party determines the general prospect of social development, and USSR domestic and foreign policy. It guides the great constructive activities of the Soviet people and provides a planned and a scientifically substantiated nature of its struggle for the victory of communism." In the course of discussing the draft of the constitution, the Soviet people particularly emphasized the essential importance of including in it a special article on the role of the CPSU in the life of Soviet society. This proves the inseparable unity between the party and the masses and the full support given by the entire Soviet people to the party's policy. One of the most important prerequisites for the constant strengthening of the ties between the party and the masses is the fact that, being now a party of the working class and the vanguard of our entire people, the party encompasses the best representatives of the working class, kolkhoz, peasantry, and people's intelligentsia.

On 1 July 1977 the CPSU numbered nearly 400,000 primary party organizations, rallying over 16 million members, 42 percent of whom were workers, 13.6 percent peasants, and 44 percent engineering and technical workers, agronomists, zootechnicians, scientific workers, teachers, physicians, and other economic specialists. In the first half of this year alone 338,500 people were accepted as candidate party members. Of them nearly 59 percent were workers, about 11 percent were kolkhoz members, and about 24.5 percent were national economic specialists. The considerably increased influence of intraparty life on the entire society is one of the characteristics of the leading activities of the Communist Party under contemporary conditions.

In its intraparty life the Communist Party strictly watches over the strict observance of Leninist norms. It is steadily and persistently improving the ways and means of its organizational and political activities. It is displaying constant concern for insuring collective leadership and for the systematic and firm observance of the principle of democratic centralism by all party organizations and leading organs. It demands that the extensive development of intraparty democracy be mandatorily paralleled by the strengthening of party discipline and the upgrading of the responsibility of all party members for their assignments.

The CPSU pays a great deal of attention to systematically improving the qualitative structure and ideological and organizational strengthening of its ranks, the selection, deployment, and upbringing of cadres, the development of criticism and self-criticism, the improvement of the structure of party organs and primary party organizations, and the broadening and strengthening of relations with the masses. These are the main directions followed in the development of the party's internal life, upgrading organizational, political and ideological leadership, and enhancing the combat capability of all its units. It is on this basis that intraparty norms and principles are being comprehensively developed. This contributes to the improvement of socialist social relations and of the entire system of the political organization of our society.

As demanded by its program, the party offers an example as a model for all state and public organizations whose activities it coordinates and guides, as the leading nucleus, enabling them to formulate and apply the most advanced and effective ways and means of work. The party is promoting the use of the Leninist style in the work of all state and public organizations. This insures the adoption of a scientific approach to all problems and their creative solution. The party displays constant concern for the overall upgrading of the activeness and autonomous work of all public and state organizations.

The CPSU considers it its duty to steadily promote the Leninist doctrine of a revolutionary party of the working class, and to develop, defend, and protect it in the struggle against anyone who tries to distort the time-tested Leninist principles of party construction and political leadership. Marxism-Leninism teaches that man himself, creator and transformer, changes and grows morally and spiritually in the process of the revolutionary reorganization of the social way of life and under the influence of the dynamism of developed socialism. Our current reality provides a clear example of this. The comprehensive ideological and educational work of the party and of all its organizations and institutions plays a tremendous role in man's spiritual growth. The party tries to develop in the working people feelings of international brotherhood and socialist patriotism. It works to make them master in knowledge of the richest cultural heritage of mankind. It develops the constructive activity of the working people for the benefit of the entire society. The Soviet society has a rich spiritual and moral potential. The party is promoting the maximum utilization of this potential in the interest of the complete triumph of communism.

The party's theoretical activities and the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory play a tremendous role in molding the communist outlook of the Soviet people and strengthening the ideological and political unity of socialist society. The ability to master theory enabled the party to formulate the proper political line for each stage of historical development. As Lenin taught, the revolutionary theory for the Communist Party is "above all and more than anything else a manual for action." (Note 5), ("Complete Collected Works," Vol 31, pp 44) This tireless attention and most serious attitude toward theory stems from the nature of the Leninist party as a revolutionary and innovational party, always going forward. It stems from the essence of the socialist society which is growing into a communist society and encountering on its way a number of problems requiring a scientific interpretation and solution; it stems from the nature of the tasks facing the party and the people which could be implemented only if guided by Marxist-Leninist theory. Loyalty to the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist doctrine is the main prerequisite for the successful implementation of the leading and guiding role of the Communist Party in Soviet society. The CPSU perfects revolutionary theory embodied in the brilliant works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and in the many documents of our party and the international communist movement. However, it approaches theory not as a collection of frozen dogmas established once and forever for all cases, but creatively, as a living and steadily developing matter.

The CPSU is the party of scientific communism and creative Marxism. It bases its entire revolutionary-transforming activity on the solid foundations of science and progressive theory. Hence, the party's constant concern for the ideological and political education of the working people, the extensive dissemination of Marxist-Leninist ideas, and the overall development and further enrichment of theory with new conclusions consistent with the requirements of changing circumstances and the new experience acquired by the party and the international workers and communist movement.

As was emphasized at the 25th CPSU Congress, at the present stage of the Soviet country and the need for further creative development of theory becomes even greater rather than lesser. Marxist-Leninist theory gives the party members an understanding of historical prospects. It enables them to assess the current period, determine the trends and directions of socio-political and economic development for many years ahead, predict events, and be properly oriented in all phenomena of all international life.

In the last quarter of the 20th century the shape of the world is the result of the growing influence of the Leninist ideas, the Great October Revolution, and the socialist system they originated. The practical implementation of the ideas of scientific communism is what determines the essential features of our time. The dialectical unity of a factual socialism, full of vital energy, and scientific theory on which it is based, and unity between Marxist-Leninist doctrine and social practice give the working people in socialist countries and the entire international working class and its allies an insurmountable revolutionary transforming force. Under the influence of existing socialism radical historical changes have become clearly apparent in international relations and in the world's revolutionary process. First, we see ever more favorable external and internal conditions for the building of socialism and communism in the countries of victorious socialism, for the development of the class struggle of the working people in the capitalist world, for new victories by the democratic and national liberation movements, and for decisive social changes in the citadels of capitalism and the vast party of the world which once represented the colonial rear and reserve of imperialism and is now an important beachhead of social progress.

Second, objective prerequisites have developed for the restructuring of the entire system of international relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems, aimed at insuring total equality and mutually profitable cooperation among all countries and peoples and, above all, forever rescuing mankind from the threat of a world war. These two changes are inseparably interrelated. They express a common process which covers all aspects of social life within national borders and on a worldwide scale.

The turn toward peace and detente has given a new quality to the development of the entire system of international relations. The conclusion that under contemporary conditions a worldwide military conflict is not fatally inevitable was a major achievement of the collective thinking of the communists and was first formulated by our party. It has been confirmed by life itself.

The party members and all Soviet people are justifiably proud of the contribution which the country of the October Revolution has made to detente. A line of uninterrupted continuity links Lenin's decree on peace with the peace program adopted at the 24th congress and developed and supplemented at the 25th CPSU Congress. Presently the basic principles governing the Soviet peaceful foreign policy are codified in the USSR Constitution. Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, plays an outstanding role in the elaboration and implementation of the foreign political course of the Soviet state. The course is aimed at making detente firm and irreversible, all embracing and ubiquitous.

The main way to achieve this objective is to achieve an end to the arms race and undertake the implementation of practical and factual disarmament measures. Today mankind has no more vital or urgent problem. We cannot fail to see that the ship of detente is sailing in stormy seas. In the capitalist world there are influential circles which would like to sink it if their hands were not tied by the present ratio of forces in the world, the active policy of the members of the socialist community and other peace-loving countries, and the pressure of world public opinion. Explosive hotbeds remain in many parts of the world. Reactionary and militaristic circles are not abandoning their attempts to take the world back to the time of the cold war. [paragraph continues]

The increased activeness of the North Atlantic hawks, who are promoting an increase in military expenditures on the part of NATO member-countries, the steady increase of the U.S. military budget and the demonstrative acceleration in the development of new types of weapons and, in particular, of such a cruelly refined one as the neutron bomb are facts which contain the serious danger of a new round in the arms race. That is why it is urgently necessary for all peace-loving forces to continue to increase their fight against the threat of war.

History knows of frequent cases in which members of the obsolete system, in an effort to prolong their existence, have tried to don the garbs of freedom lovers. Something similar is occurring today. Alarmed by the successes of the cause of peace and fearing the growth of the ideological influence of socialism on the conditions of detente, the world's reaction is energizing its ideological subversions and slanderous campaigns against worldwide socialism. In this case, hypocritical priority is given to speculations on the subject of human rights and freedoms.

The defenders of a social system built on the merciless exploitation of the working class and the other working people, and the hunger and poverty of millions and millions of people, a system responsible for crises and mass unemployment, senseless predatory wars, tens of millions people killed and maimed, and all the horrors of colonialism, racism, and fascism are trying to present themselves as the champions of freedom. Yet, what could they pit against socialism which embodies the age-old dreams of the working people and the ideals of the best thinkers of the past?

We are against the freedom of imperialist and reactionary domination. We are against the freedom of the exploitation of man by man and against the freedom of racial discrimination and hatred, and spiritual enslavement of the working people. We do not allow and shall never allow such "freedoms" in our country. We shall not give the hostile forces the opportunity to engage in subversive activities against the gains of the working people. It is precisely this that determines our attitude toward the paltry handful of so-called "dissidents" who are the accomplices of imperialism. To demand freedom of action for such renegades means, essentially, to demand the freedom to engage in subversive imperialist activities within our borders. The CPSU is in favor of developing comprehensive contacts among nations, considering them an inseparable element of the policy of detente. We have been and remain the supporters of a broad exchange of truthful information and of the spiritual wealth of the peoples. Yet, we oppose interference in the domestic affairs of other countries under various false and provocative pretexts.

The Soviet Union is increasing its efforts to implement the program for the further struggle for peace and international cooperation and for the freedom and independence of the peoples, proclaimed at the 25th CPSU Congress. The visit which Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, paid to France, and his meetings with the heads of a number of fraternal socialist countries have become important landmarks in this struggle. We are doing and will do everything to insure the full implementation of the Helsinki agreements and for fruitful work and successful completion of the Belgrade meeting. The peoples of the world can continue to rely on our country as a bulwark of the cause of peace and security the world over.

Worldwide events are indicating ever more clearly that capitalism has historically exhausted itself. A most profound crisis has spread over all aspects of the capitalist system: economic, political, cultural, ideological, moral, and way of life. The very foundations of capitalist reality are shuddering under the effect of most acute antagonism.

The unparalleled broadening of the composition and the general upsurge of revolutionary forces as a result of the intensification of all contradictions within the capitalist system and the awareness gained by the broad masses of the historical need to replace capitalism with socialism are the distinguishing feature of our time.

The revolutionary forces are fighting in countries with different levels of production forces and socioeconomic maturity, disparate political structures, and different historical traditions. The wealth of national and historical characteristics demands of each communist party the creative application and development of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, and the thorough and specific study and consideration of all specific aspects of the circumstances; it originates differences in the ways to lead the masses to socialism and in the methods for organizing the working people and the struggle, as well as in the specific programs for social change. Specifically, it is a question of using the possibilities for a peaceful transition to socialism which have broadened considerably as a result of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the creation and powerful progress of the world's socialist system, the failure of colonialism, the general upsurge of the international workers and national liberation movements, and the overall crisis of capitalism.

The activities of a party which ignores national-specific and concrete historical traditions and trends of development of the ratio of forces in the world arena and the characteristics of the international circumstances cannot be successful.

Reality also confirms that the variety of the ways of struggle for socialism and of methods for accomplishing socialist changes adamantly raises the question of the general principles governing Marxist-Leninist theory and practice and of the general laws of the socialist revolution and the building of socialism.

These laws are not a code of abstract "rules" but a sum total of scientifically established and practically tried guidelines for action requiring, naturally, a creative application. The question of our attitude toward them is, essentially, a question of the attitude toward the overall significance of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, and toward the already acquired very rich experience in the class struggle and the building of socialism. A party which ignores the general laws of the socialist revolution and of the creation of a socialist system dooms itself to wandering in the dark.

Finding specific ways and means of struggle for democracy and socialism in specific natural-historic conditions does not mean to begin every time and in each separate country from scratch. The method of ignoring the lessons of history and the desire to do at all costs the "opposite" of already tried forms of struggle cannot be a reliable way for the elaboration of an autonomous political strategy and tactic.

The CPSU has always favored the thorough study and efficient use of the experience of the fraternal parties. We know that, looking at the history of the Bolshevik party, Lenin noted that it "embraced particularly eagerly and successfully the correspondent 'latest word' of American and European political experience." (Note 6), ("Complete Collected Works," Vol 41, p 8) Today as well, our party studies with great attention the experience of the other fraternal parties and considers it in its own activities.

History confirms that the creative approach to the theory and practice of social change, based on Marxism-Leninism, an approach inseparably linked with an acknowledgement of the hegemony of the working class and the understanding of the need not only for its participation in the administration but also for its seizure of political power, allied with the other toiling strata, brings success to the revolutionary forces. Marx transformed socialism from utopia into science precisely because he discovered a social force capable of meeting the objective need for the socialist reorganization of the world. This force is the international working class. A refusal to acknowledge its historical role would mean to go back from Marxism to social utopia.

The unalterable truth of the Marxist-Leninist stipulation that the working class alone, headed by its vanguard, the Communist Party, can lead the entire mass of working people in the struggle for the overthrow of the exploiting system, the victory of the socialist revolution, and the creation of a new social system, was convincingly demonstrated through the experience of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

The historically substantiated policy of broad social alliances and of the unification of all leftist and democratic forces, pursued by the fraternal parties in the capitalist countries, is introducing a great deal of new aspects in formulating the task of insuring the vanguard role of the communists. As practical experience indicates, however, such a policy does not eliminate this task but makes it even more urgent and important.

One of the most important principles of the revolutionary movement is the international solidarity of the fighters against social and national oppression. The outstanding accomplishments of the revolutionary forces of our time would have been inconceivable without their international interaction and reciprocal support. The significance of internationalist solidarity to date was most strongly emphasized at the Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe.

The many-sided nature of contemporary internationalism and the broadening of the circle of social and political forces whose international interaction is needed for the solution of the basic problems of our time cannot conceal the fact that, as before, the working class and the international communist movement remain the main bearers of and spokesmen for internationalism. By their very nature and ideology they must act as the most consistent international force, as a rallying basis of the general revolutionary process of our time. Their internationalism, solidarity, unity and joint actions are founded, above all, on the common basic interests of the international working class and the common objectives, outlook, and unity of revolutionary Marxist-Leninist science.

Under the contemporary conditions of the revolutionary movement the dialectical connection between the national and the international becomes more flexible. The importance of the national principles in worldwide development and in the activities of each fraternal party unquestionably grows. At the same time, however, the role of the international unification of all liberation forces becomes ever more important. Never before have the internal conditions of the class struggle been so clearly linked with the ratio of forces in the world arena, the state of international relations, the successes of socialist foreign policy, and the international struggle for peace and social progress. However essential the importance of the activities of the communists within the national framework may be, reducing the national duty of the Marxist-Leninist party to it would mean the unjustified narrowing of the criteria of internationalism.

The need for the solidarity and unity of international revolutionary forces is dictated also by the fact that the imperialist reactionary circles systematically coordinate their activities in the struggle against the forces of socialism, democracy and national liberation. They do not shy at using the most unseemly means in organizing the export of the counterrevolution. At the Berlin conference Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said: "As to proletariat internationalism, i.e., the solidarity of the working class and the communists of all countries in the struggle for the common objectives, their solidarity with the struggle of the peoples for national liberation and social progress, and voluntary cooperation among fraternal parties, while strictly observing the equality and independence of each one of them, we believe that such comradely solidarity, whose flag-bearers the communists have been for over 100 years, has fully retained its great importance to this day. It has been and remains the powerful and tried weapon of the communist parties, and in general, of the workers' movement."

As we know, at the Berlin conference Comrade L.I. Brezhnev discussed the need for extensively comparing viewpoints and experiences of different parties in shaping the views they express in the course of comradely discussions.

We entirely agree with the comrades from many parties who favor fraternal and respectful discussions, believing that they should not lead to the opening of "loopholes" so that the class enemy may join such discussions. He should not be given the opportunity to use such discussions to promote his own interests.

The Soviet communists and the entire Soviet people assess with satisfaction and deep gratitude the extensive ideological and political campaign launched by the fraternal parties in connection with the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. We see in this another vivid expression of the traditional solidarity of our class brothers with the struggle waged by the Soviet people for socialism, communism, peace and social progress the world over.

In turn, the CPSU has invariably considered that the main and decisive factors in relations among communist parties are friendship, cooperation, and joint struggle for common objectives and interests. It is on this basis that our party has always built and will continue to build its activities in the international communist movement.

For the past 60 years scientific communism, discovered by Marx and Engels, and developed and continued by Lenin, has been not only a theory but a practical project for the millions of people implementing it. The basic laws of the appearance, establishment, and development of the communist socioeconomic system were tested and proved through the experience of the socialist countries. This experience is the most valuable international gain of the communists and the revolutionaries the world over.

The victory of the October Revolution, the socialist revolution in other countries, the establishment of a worldwide socialist system, the building of a developed socialist society in the USSR, and its successful building by the members of the socialist community, the appearance of socialism in the world arena, the strengthening of its international positions, and the changed ratio of forces in its favor confirm the conclusions drawn by Marxist-Leninist theory on the legitimately necessary and inevitable replacement of capitalism with a new system. This is also confirmed by the extreme aggravation of all contradictions within contemporary capitalism and the continuing intensification of the insoluble general crisis of its entire economic, political, and ideological system, the solution to which lies in socialism alone.

Our party has always considered Marxist-Leninist theory and the international experience of the communist and workers movements as a guide for its practical actions. It deems it its duty continually to make its contribution to the development and enrichment of revolutionary science and to the common cause of the communists the world over.

Marxism-Leninism is an internally living and developing doctrine. It is becoming steadily enriched thanks to the practical actions and creative revolutionary thinking of the communist and workers parties of all countries. This is the reason for the vitality and the inexhaustible world-changing power of Marxism-Leninism and a guarantee for its full triumph.

5003

CSO: 1802

OUR HOLIDAY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77 pp 29-35

[Article by Henryk Jablonski, member of the Polish United Workers Party Central Committee Politbureau and chairman of the State Council of the Polish People's Republic]

[Text] Inaugurating a new era in the history of mankind, the Great October Socialist Revolution had a decisive impact on the destinies of all peoples on earth. The victory of the heroic Russian proletariat, headed by the bolshevik party, laid a path to the future for even the most geographical distant peoples, becoming an irrefutable proof of the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the development of human society. It proved with all possible depth and persuasiveness the revolutionary mission of the working class. It became an inspiring example to all people fighting for national and social liberation on earth.

This alone is a sufficient reason for the fact that the anniversary of this greatest historical event of the 20th century is being celebrated with such enthusiasm and uplift by anyone who cares for the ideals of progress and socialism. We, the Poles, have also our own special reasons. They stem from the close ties linking the fate of the liberation struggle waged by the Polish people with the development of the most progressive forces in Europe. The most important element of these ties which were of decisive importance to Poland was the alliance between the Polish and Russian revolutionary movements. The economically most developed part of the Polish lands, with its large working class and long traditions in the liberation movement was part of the Russian empire. That is why we fully understand F. Engel's thesis to the effect that "the independence of Poland and the revolution in Russia are interdependent" (K. Marx and F. Engel's "Soch." [Works], Vol 18, p 509). This was also the thought of the members of the Russian section of the First International who noted in their program that ". . . the emperor's yoke oppressing Poland is an identical obstacle to the political and social freedoms of both nations . . ."

The problem of reciprocal relations between the most progressive forces of Poland and Russia evolved further with the development of the revolutionary

movement in Russia and, particularly, the establishment of the political vanguard of the proletariat. It became ever clearer that the national and social liberation of the people depends on revolutionary changes throughout the empire. An awareness of the historical necessity of becoming most closely united with the Russian revolutionary movement developed within the left wing of the Polish workers movement from the very beginning of its establishment, on the territory which was part of the Russian empire. As early as 1880 the principal organizer of the first Polish socialist party which entered history under the name of "The Great Proletariat," Ludwig Warynski, wrote: "Russia will stop being a bulwark of the reaction, for it carries the revolution within itself." He drew from this logical conclusions and tried to combine fully the liberation struggle of all forces whose objective was the overthrow of Tsarism and the establishment of the socialist system on its ruins.

These traditions were adopted by the ideological followers of "The Great Proletariat," particularly by the social democrats of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania, who expressed their internationalism through their organic unification with the RSDWP. Vladimir Il'ich Lenin sharply criticized the social democratic movement of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania for its erroneous approach to the question of national self-determination and the peasant problem, and for its erroneous view on the role of the party. Yet, he also determined the reasons for the immaturity displayed by the left wing of the Polish workers movement and for its inability to draw final conclusions from Marx's doctrine which the social democratic movement accepted as a theoretical base of its program. This criticism was positive and necessary. Subsequently, when reality itself proved its correctness, it yielded substantial results and raised a large detachment of party leaders who were able to understand the nature of the party and its role within its own class and among the people accurately, like Lenin.

Lenin criticized the errors and vacillations of the leadership of the social democratic movement of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania. However, he fully supported it in its struggle against nationalism and against attempts to undermine the solidarity of the workers movement. He expressed great sympathy for the Polish revolutionary movement, considering it a loyal ally. This was fully manifested during the 1905-1907 revolution. No one valued higher than Lenin the significance of the battles fought by the Polish working class, by the "heroic proletariat of heroic Poland," to use his words ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 10, p 314).

Lenin's words written in November 1905 in the article "Our Tasks and the Soviet of Workers Deputies" sounded like a prediction for the future: "The program of the provisional revolutionary government must grant immediately effective and total freedom to the peoples oppressed by the Tzarist monster. A free Russia has been born. The proletariat is on guard. It will not allow for heroic Poland to be suppressed yet once again. It will join the battle itself and will rise to defend the freedom of both Russia and Poland not with a peaceful strike but arms in hand" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 12, p 67). Many years later, a Pole cannot read these

words without deep emotion. No leader of another party on the territory of the then existing Russia could have expressed them. Yet, it was precisely here that a struggle was being waged of the greatest importance to all mankind, a struggle on which the future of Poland depended.

True, that time the revolution did not end with the overthrow of Tsarism. Yet, it provided one more irrefutable proof of the fact that the most loyal friends of the Polish people were the most revolutionary forces of the then existing world. If we look at the brotherhood in arms of the Polish and Russian proletariat during the 1905-1907 revolution and in the subsequent stages from this point of view it becomes clear that, being a struggle for social liberation, this was also a struggle for the national liberation of the Polish people.

Several ideas on "resolving the Polish question" existed in World War I. However, not one of them gave the Poles even a hope for their liberation. The revolution alone could open the path to freedom.

With the exception of the most reactionary social strata, the desire for independence was widespread among the Polish people. The policy of conciliation and compromise with the imperialist countries was intensified in proportion to the growth of the fear which rich classes had of the people's masses of their country. As to the groups which relied on the petite bourgeoisie, the peasantry, and part of the working class, while not denying the sincerity of their desire for independence, we must nevertheless recognize that they were unable to understand the fact that the possibility for gaining independence was totally based on a possible proletarian revolution in the eastern part of Europe. This leads to the simple conclusion that anyone who weakened the forces of the revolution also postponed the possibility for national liberation, regardless of his subjective attitude toward the question of independence; anyone who served the revolution contributed to the development of conditions enabling the Polish people to gain their independence.

History most fully confirmed the correctness of the positions held by the Poles who had linked their patriotic hopes with the bolshevik party and the victory of the proletarian revolution in Russia. The overthrow of Tsarism itself did not in itself mean that the right of the Polish to self-determination would be recognized. In its appeal "To the Poles," full of pompous statements, the provisional government somehow acknowledged Polish independence. However, it brought no clarity to the problem of borders or of what specifically the proclaimed military alliance between Poland and Russia was to consist. At that point Lenin took up the defense of the Polish people yet once again, sharply criticizing at the Seventh Conference of the Bolshevik Party, the position taken by the provisional government pointing out that, in reality, such an alliance presaged the complete military enslavement of Poland. The situation was changed only with the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The Decree on Peace, the Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia, and the abrogation of all treaties on the division of Poland were the implementation of a program, long proclaimed by Lenin and his party, which radically changed the situation of the Polish people from the viewpoint of international law. This was of great importance in changing the positions of the countries involved in the war while in Poland itself it drastically increased the striving for independence. The gaining of Polish independence in November 1918 was a logical completion of the process which, following the victory of the Russian proletariat in October, developed inevitably and consistently, but, this time, in a single direction.

Reality confirmed the profound justice of Lenin's words to the effect that "the freedom of Poland is impossible without the freedom of Russia" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 17, p 269). It also confirmed the fact that thousands of Poles in Russia, rising shoulder to shoulder with the bolsheviks, fulfilled their international and patriotic duty.

That is why, after World War I every Pole aware of the path leading to the liberation of his people clearly felt that every anniversary of the Great October Revolution should be his own anniversary as well. Unfortunately, it was neither a simple or easy matter to promote awareness of this fact.

The Polish people were able to make only partial use of the favorable circumstances created by the revolution in Russia.

Seizing power in the Polish state, the rich classes proved their inability to insure the security and development of the country. They failed to resolve any major social problem. Internationally, blinded by their hatred for the Soviet state, they pursued an anti-Soviet policy, concealing from the Polish public Soviet initiatives aimed achieving peaceful and friendly coexistence between the two countries. Even at the time of mortal danger created by Hitler's Reich the then Polish bourgeois government was unable to abandon its attitude toward the Soviet Union and use the opportunity of accepting its support in its struggle against Hitler's aggressive plans.

The 20 years of rule by the rich classes in Poland and the policy they pursued in the period of World War Two definitely proved that their time had come to leave the political arena for the sake of the further existence of the people and the restoration of independence and economic and cultural development.

The Polish people did not submit to the aggressor and did not lay down their arms, fighting fascism to final victory. However, the bourgeoisie tried to direct the people's patriotism into a different channel and, having imposed its will on the masses, use it against the interests of the working people and continuing its anti-Soviet policy.

This policy was doomed to failure. Forces which could effectively counter it existed in the Polish people. It was precisely they who developed a

realistic and truly patriotic political concept which guaranteed total national and social liberation based on the alliance and friendship with the Soviet Union.

The struggle which the democratic camp, rallied around the Polish Workers Party, had to wage among its people, poisoned for many years by anti-Sovietism, was difficult and hard. However, with the development of events ever broader circles of the Polish public began to realize that World War Two was not a usual conflict between two coalitions, as had been the case in 1914-1918, but a great struggle of historical significance for a new aspect of the world, to be completed with the victory of the forces of progress. The understanding that a union with the Soviet state would be of decisive significance to the existence of the Polish people became widespread.

This was fully confirmed by history. For the second time in the life of a single generation Poland gained its freedom thanks to the forces brought to life by the Great October Revolution. The alliance and friendship with the Soviet Union and the joint struggle between the Polish and Soviet armed forces against fascism laid the path to the liberation of our people. Over 600,000 Soviet soldiers gave their lives in battles fought on Polish soil and their memory will live forever in the hearts of all grateful Polish patriots. The February 1977 decree of the Polish United Workers Party Central Committee Politbureau states: "The idea of Polish-Soviet brotherhood in arms is an eternally living tradition which, in the days of peace, has developed into a tradition of fraternal joint labor for the good of our people, and a fraternal systematic struggle by our parties for the ever fuller implementation of the ideals of socialism and the ever fuller satisfaction of the material and cultural needs of the entire society."

However, we are not merely continuing the traditions of the joint combat path which brought about the liberation of Poland from Hitlerite occupation. We do not forget for a minute that it was precisely the support of the USSR that led to the implementation of the aspirations and hopes of many generations of Poles--the unification of age-old Polish lands with the homeland. The just borders of people's Poland in the west and north are a confirmation of Polish-Soviet brotherhood in the period of the molding of the political aspect of our world, firmly etched on the map of Europe.

In the new state those who came from the people and wanted to serve the people came to power. However, the Polish reactionary forces had no intention of yielding voluntarily. They were too weak in the country to win; they did not even hope to achieve this, knowing that they would be unable to succeed without outside support. They relied, with reason, on the protection of the western countries, believing that they would be able to regain their lost positions through international deals. In the face of this danger the help given by the USSR was equally invaluable. The export of counter-revolution to Poland failed. The Polish people were able to undertake in accordance with their desire the restoration of the country destroyed by the war and Hitlerite occupation, understanding ever better and more profoundly the meaning of the socialist changes made under the

leadership of the working class and its party. This was helped by the all-round selfless aid of the Soviet Union. The 21 April 1945 Friendship, Mutual Aid, and Post-War Cooperation Treaty codified the historical turn in relations between our states and peoples. This was the most important international act of the Polish People's Republic.

Close and all-round fraternal cooperation with the Soviet Union became one of the basic prerequisites for the successful building of socialism in Poland. Following this path in the post-war period our people achieved tremendous and, in terms of scale, one could say historical achievements in all fields of life. Today we are comprehensively developing and strengthening these achievements.

Implementing the new strategy for socio-economic development, adopted at the Sixth Congress of the Polish United Workers Party, taking into consideration the laws governing the contemporary stage of the building of socialism and communism, we accelerated the growth of production forces. On this basis we were able to upgrade considerably the living standard of town and country working people. The past five years were marked by outstanding economic and social accomplishments. Socialist social relations strengthened. The socialist state became stronger. The leading role of the party grew and the patriotic unity of the people became firmer.

A program for building a developed socialist society was adopted at our seventh party congress. This long-term program is based on the all-round study of the potential of our economy, the level of development of our society, and its material and spiritual forces and requirements. It is deeply humane. It is a program for the practical implementation of the ideals of social justice in the new stage of development of the republic. Its stipulations are based on the faith of our party in the creative ability of the people to resolve ever more daring problems. Addressing the Eighth Plenum of the Polish United Workers Party Central Committee (June 1977) Comrade Edward Gierek, Central Committee first secretary said: "All social and national arguments are on the side of socialism, on the side of our people's state. All Poles are rallied around the policy of our party, and around the common program of the Popular Unity Front, for this is the only true and only realistic program. Our aim is the prosperity of our people, the strength and security of Poland, and its high prestige in the world.

"We shall steadily upgrade the prosperity of the people, increase the economic potential, intensify socialist democracy, strengthen the observance of the law and justice, and firmly protect the vital interests of the country."

The program for building a developed socialist society has both a class and a nationwide character. Its basic stipulation is to increase the role of the working class in the country's political life, and to consolidate the socialist principles in social life. In an effort to provide the working class conditions for its all-round professional, social, and political development, our party is doing everything necessary for the further socialist

reorganization of the entire society. The intensification of the role of the working class in the making and implementation of all most important decisions affecting the life of the country, and the strengthening of the role and significance of the central organs of management and of state and economic administration have been the main ideas behind the reform in the administrative, economic, and management systems implemented in recent years in Poland.

Assessing today the distance covered we could proudly say that the Polish people did not waste their opportunities. In the past 30 years Poland's social, economic, and cultural development surpassed all the expectations of the Polish patriots. That is why the Polish United Workers Party Central Committee Politbureau expressed the opinion of the entire Polish society by stating in its February decree that "Polish-Soviet alliance, friendship, and cooperation are a decisive factor for the independent existence and development of people's Poland, the cornerstone of our party's and government's policy, and a major base for the security and strong international positions of our homeland."

The strong international positions are the result of the unbreakable linking of the destinies of our people and state with the destinies of world socialism. They are the result of our membership in the comity of socialist states and, particularly, of the tested friendship and fraternal cooperation with the leading force of our time--the Soviet Union.

Polish-Soviet relations have been strengthening and becoming richer throughout the entire post-war period. They have been developing particularly dynamically in the course of the present decade. Essentially, they have entered a new higher stage. This is the result of the interaction between our Marxist-Leninist parties--the Polish United Workers Party and the CPSU--an interaction based on ideological unity. This is greatly the accomplishment of the heads of our parties and peoples--Comrade Edward Gierek, Polish United Workers Party Central Committee first secretary, and Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, for whom our people feel particular respect and sympathy as the outstanding fighter for a policy of detente and as a great friend of Poland.

The visit which the Polish party-state delegation paid to the Soviet Union last November offered convincing proof of the new higher stage reached in Polish-Soviet relations. This was pointed out by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev. "Your visit," said he, "is an important landmark in the further development of Soviet-Polish relations. Never in the past have such relations been so solid and profound. They are based on total equality and profound mutual respect, and on the great principle of socialist internationalism. The establishment of such relations is, above all, the contribution of the communists, of their policy.

"Class solidarity and close interaction between Marxist-Leninist parties is what cements, above all, our fraternal alliance."

The desire steadily to develop and enrich the fraternal Polish-Soviet cooperation has been confirmed at every meeting held by the leaders of the two countries. Our party and entire people welcomed with great satisfaction the announcement on the talks held by Comrade E. Gierek and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the Crimea.

The all-round strengthening of relations with the Soviet state and with the great Soviet people represents the creative implementation of the ideas of the October Revolution. It is a basic principle and a priority direction followed in Polish policy. It is the implementation of the basic interests of our people and of our socialist state. That is why friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union have been codified in the constitution of the Polish People's Republic.

The stipulations of the constitution are consistent with the practice of socialist Poland. It considers comprehensive cooperation with the USSR and the entire socialist comity, its steady expansion and intensification, and improvements and enrichment of the forms of interaction in reciprocal relations and in the international arena the inviolable law of its policy. We see in this both conditions for insuring the successful building of socialism and communism in our countries as well as for serving the interests of all progressive forces on earth. Consequently, with a persistence worthy of this great cause, the Soviet Union is waging its struggle for universal peace and progress and for a better future for all mankind. Achieving ever greater successes in the building of socialism, the Polish people are trying to be not only its loyal but its ever more valuable ally in this struggle. Perfectly realizing that the source of our national and social liberation, our taking the path of socialist development, and our achievements and prospects was the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, we consider its 60th anniversary our own major Polish holiday.

5003

CSO: 1802

AUSTRIA'S WELCOME OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77 pp 36-43

[Article by Friedl Furnberg, member, Communist Party of Austria Central Committee Politbureau]

[Text] The Great October Socialist Revolution radically changed the world. This fact is unquestionable both for its friends and its enemies. This great revolution remains the focal point of ideological and political clashes, for the great struggle it initiated is continuing to this day. In the course of the six decades since October 1917 this struggle spread literally throughout the world and affected the destinies of hundreds of millions of people. Lenin predicted that World War One would inaugurate a period of revolutions. His prediction was fully confirmed. Such a period was indeed initiated and, in the course of these decades, it covered a variety of phases and has not ended to this day. That is why the story of the immediate impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution, in this case on Austria, is not merely a historical description or a recollection of revolutionary events which shook the world, but, in many respects, it remains an event of topical significance in the great worldwide struggle now waged between capitalism and socialism.

The appeal which Lenin and the Second Congress of Soviets of Workers and Soldiers Deputies launched with the famous 8 November 1917 Decree on Peace had a truly inflammatory effect on the twin Hapsburg monarchy at that time ruling the second biggest country in Europe, influencing both open nations within this multinational state and all of its population strata. This appeal answered the desire for peace of the peoples in all belligerent countries. In Austria, however, by virtue of special reasons it had a particularly strong effect. The first Russian revolution of 1905 had already had a deeper influence on Austria than on the other European countries. This is not because the peoples within Austria were more receptive to revolutionary advance than other peoples. Nor did the fact that the Czechs, Slovaks, and southern Slavs were linked with the Russians by closer national ties have a decisive significance. The depth of the impact of the 1905 Russian Revolution on Austria is explained by the fact that at that time a situation similar to that of Tsarist Russia prevailed in Austria. Even

though here national oppression and the feudal forms of rule were weaker, national freedoms and equality as well as bourgeois democracy were not to be found in Austria as they were not to be found in Russia. Because of such objective circumstances the influence of the 1905 Russian Revolution was particularly strong. The following call was launched among the people's masses and, above all, among the workers: "Let us begin to speak Russian to the ruling class." As to that class, the revolutionary events in Russia threw it into a state of fear and confusion. A stormy movement developed among the popular masses of the country, among the working class above all, demanding, directly linked with the 1905 Russian Revolution, the introduction of universal, equal, secret, and direct vote, i.e., the implementation of one of the main political requirements of the workers movement of that time, a demand for which it had been fighting over a number of decades. This was recalled even better by the Austrian people's masses in 1917.

In 1917 the ever growing discontent of the people's masses had already been expressed in a number of actions such as short strikes and demonstrations. On 21 October 1916, shouting "Down with absolutism! We want peace!", Friedrich Adler shot Prime Minister Count Sturgk. This was an action of individual terrorism, for Friedrich Adler did not believe in the possibility of mass revolutionary action. The leadership of the Austrian Social Democratic Party (SPA) described this attempt on the life of the prime minister as an act of madness. However, this action and the subsequent trial had a strong revolutionizing effect on the people's masses, particularly if we bear in mind that poverty continued to grow and that the number of casualties, killed and wounded, at the fronts rose while the enterprises were operating on the basis of a rigid military control system. The women suffered particularly severely from this: living in constant fear for the lives of their husbands and sons, they worked at armament plants and factories and, with an ever growing shortage of food, were no longer able to feed their families. The fanning of national hostility, to which the ruling class continued to resort, again and again, was turning out to be ever less effective: the workers of different nationalities living in Austria were becoming ever closer to each other.

The state apparatus, which had long been the cementing material of the Hapsburg monarchy, was already in its initial stage of decay and had lost a great deal of its former authority and power.

The February revolution in Russia did not fulfill the hopes for peace. Yet, the first word of the October Revolution was peace, a peace without annexations and reparations. This immediately became the demand of the people's masses in Austria-Hungary. The halt of a revolutionary struggle for peace, bread, democracy, and national freedom now spread among the masses to an ever greater extent.

From the very beginning of the war, like the socialist leaders of most parties belonging to the Second International, the leadership of the SPA had taken the side of the bourgeoisie. It had not voted for the war credits,

for until 1917 the Austrian parliament had not been convened to begin with and had not held a single session. When under the ever greater pressure of the people's masses the government convened the parliament in 1917 the representatives of the socialist party began to express a moderate opposition to the government, as though expressing the feelings of the people. Yet, this even suited the government, which from time to time itself encouraged the leadership of the SPA to engage in such criticism.

Thus, on 7 April 1917, the leadership of the SPA launched the appeal of ignoring that year as in the previous years of the war, the celebration of May Day in order to "act consistently with the extraordinary conditions of the war and the emergency laws and thus to prevent the development of a number of complications and difficulties which we would like to avoid." However, the imperial government believed that a May Day demonstration under the slogan of peace, in which it itself was now interested, could prove to be useful. It gave a proper hint to the leadership of the SPA. Therefore, the same newspaper--ARBEITERZEITUNG--which had carried the appeal we mentioned in its 7 April issue published literally the following in its 26 April issue: "On May Day, in the afternoon, the working class will hold meetings in which it will express its desire for international peace." Only, in the name of everything sacred, let there be no class struggle! That is why the appeal was followed by the following: "In order to implement such measures most effectively all other problems of domestic policy will not be discussed at such meetings this time." Naturally, there would be no strikes! That is why the newspaper further stated that "work will resume on 2 May as usual."

This trick was still successful on 1 May 1917. After the October Revolution, however, the working class became armed with a far stronger class awareness and revolutionary will.

The October Revolution itself was welcomed in Austria with tremendous enthusiasm. In Vienna, the SPA leadership was forced to organize a meeting to express solidarity. Despite the intentions of its sponsors, it developed into a huge mass meeting. The resolution passed at the meeting stated the following: "Now, when the workers and soldiers of Petersburg have deprived the treacherous bourgeoisie of its power, created their own government, and appealed again to all countries and peoples for peace without annexations and reparations, the workers of Vienna send the workers of Petersburg their fraternal greetings. We welcome the victory of the Petersburg workers as the beginning of a new epoch in the liberation struggle of the international proletariat. The victory of the proletarian will for peace in Petersburg gives us the hope that through the joint efforts of the workers of all countries, in the final account we shall be able to put an end to the fratricidal war among the peoples. We shall dedicate our efforts to the tireless and fearless continuation of the struggle in our country for putting an end to the war through a speedy democratic peace consistent with the vital needs of all nations" (ARBEITERZEITUNG, 12 January 1918).

Two months later the Austro-Hungarian workers launched their big January strike. The immediate reason for it was a reduction of food rations. However, the deeper reason was the discontent of the people's masses with the fact that the peace suggested by the Soviet government had still not been accepted by the Austrian government. Furthermore, the workers displayed ever more clearly their intention of putting an end not only to the war but, in general, to the entire system of oppression followed under the aegis of the imperial government. In his book "The Austrian Revolution," Otto Bauer has described accurately this feeling of the people's masses: "The huge masses of strikers, the unrestrained revolutionary passion of their mass meetings, and the elections of the first workers soviets at strikers' meetings gave the movement a tremendous revolutionary nature and awakened in the masses the hope that the strike could be directly converted into a revolution, and that they would seize the power and make peace."

In fact, when I was barely 16, on 11 November I took part in a meeting of solidarity with the October Revolution which took place in Vienna's concert hall and outside it, and, subsequently, in the big strikers' meetings of January 1918, these events were steps toward the revolution not only to me, a young person, but to the working masses as well. The conviction that the movement should be directed not to the solution of one or another individual problem but to the entire problem, to the problem of the revolution itself, had become popular among the workers. One of the leaflets stated the following: "Using the most effective means of the class struggle such as the mass strike, armed actions, and street battles, the Russian workers and soldiers fought not only for their own freedom. No! They shed their blood for the liberation of all peoples on earth, for freedom from the sufferings of war and the yoke of capitalism." The leaflet further appealed as follows: "Elect workers soviets as they did in Russia!"

However, the policy which the SPA leadership pursued was entirely different. A pamphlet on the January strike (after rejecting it) of the SPA leadership directly stated the following: "Whereas the uprising which broke out and spread spontaneously covered the entire lower part of Austria in three days (and, subsequently, Vienna and the other parts of Austria--the author), from the very beginning the party's board took measures to take over the movement, direct it, and protect it from errors and deceptions." The SPA management assumed the leadership of the movement not in order to guide the struggle in a revolutionary direction but precisely in order to behead it and make the strikers go back to work.

Here again it acted hand in hand with the imperial government: ministers issued reassuring statements on which the SPA leaders relied entirely.

Thus, for example, Count Toggenburg, the minister of internal affairs, made the following statement in parliament: "We understand the fear of the people that some of the main events of today may be ignored. The task of anyone who has an influence on the people is to reassure them in this respect and tell them the following: 'You could fully rely on the fact that everyone

is aware of the problems under consideration.'" He stated that Count Czernin, minister of foreign affairs, "has no objective other than peace."

At that time, addressing workers delegates, SPA leader Victor Adler said literally the following: "As to the question of peace, the ministers are as impatient as the rest of us."

It was only with the help of an organizational trick that the SPA leadership succeeded in putting an end to the strike. It had already agreed in advance on those who were to attend the decisive conference at which, in addition to representatives of enterprise soviets elected by the workers, it had invited its own reliable reformist-leaning district officials. In the course of the heated debates which, nevertheless, took place at the conference the SPA leadership used all possible demagogic means to bring the strike to an end. Thus, it even referred to Trotsky's withdrawal from the Brest-Litovsk talks for which, as we know, Lenin criticized him most sharply. Seitz, one of the noted SPA leaders, exclaimed: "We can not go on with the strike while waiting for Trotsky to return to the talks." He attacked those who stated that "the Russian comrades have already shown us what could be accomplished."

Nevertheless, the consensus was that the reformist policy of the SPA Board was to be abandoned in favor of a decisive revolutionary struggle. However, the SPA leadership, both the right and the left Austrian Marxist wing, did not wish to have anything to do with this.

It succeeded in putting an end to the strike only by using the promise of "resorting again to extreme defense means should anyone dare to undertake anything which could threaten the peace." In reality, however, the SPA leadership undertook absolutely nothing when, after the strike, hundreds of workers delegates were arrested, while in Brest-Litovsk the Austro-Hungarian government supported the dictatorial predatory demands which the German government submitted to Soviet Russia.

Thus the January 1918 strike ended with a defeat for the workers. However, nevertheless, it had several important consequences: many of the workers soviets were preserved, even though clandestinely; faith in the SPA Board declined sharply and a group of left-wing radical workers reached the clear understanding of the need to separate itself organizationally from the reformist current.

Revolutionary feelings began to spread in the army and navy as well. The number of desertions in the army rose sharply. Armed mutinies broke out in a number of places and, in the navy, the famous mutiny in Cattaro (today Kotor in Yugoslavia), the Austro-Hungarian military port, broke out. The military command clearly realized that a spirit of rebellion was spreading ever more extensively among soldiers and seamen and issued orders to counteract it with all possible means. The emperor's war office introduced the strictest possible censorship measures and ordered "the prompt exposure of all

intrigues and their merciless elimination in order to prevent the dissemination of revolutionary ideas in the army threatening the subsequent subversion of the state." The government invariably referred to the contagious example of the October Revolution and its influence on the masses.

Despite the extremely heavy pressure, Draconian punishments, and death sentences, the revolutionary feelings in the army and navy, with their deep social and national roots, continued to grow. A song frequently sung at that time showed the spirit which prevailed among the soldiers.

It included, in particular, the following words: "Brother soldiers! Whether you are German or French, whatever your country may be, and whatever uniforms you may be wearing, stop shooting and extend to one another brotherly hands! Arise! Let us go back to our homelands to rescue our people from the tyrants, for wars are waged by tyrants only; we want to be soldiers of freedom."

The song reflected not only a revolutionary but an internationalist spirit. This was precisely the spirit of the sailors' uprising in Cattaro.

The mass strike of January 1918 was extended also to the Austrian ports of Trieste, Pola (today Pula), Fiume (today Rijeka), and other cities. A clandestine sailors' committee was set up which included Austrians, Croats, Hungarians, Poles, Czechs, and others. The committee decided to follow the Kronshtadt example and to mutiny. On 1 February 1918 red flags were hoisted on the masts of 40 ships totalling 6,000 sailors. Officers were removed from their commands and some of them were detained. However, the rebels did not realize with sufficient clarity the objective of having a single leadership and ties with the working class. Using all possible tricks and means of violence, the uprising was suppressed. The members of the sailors' committee were arrested and four of its leaders were executed on the spot.

The imperial authorities did everything possible to keep news on mutinies and executions secret. However, on 11 February the SPA Board learned the virtually entire truth about the events accidentally from a witness. This witness was the social democrat Julius Braunthal who, four years later became secretary of the Second International. Did the SPA Board sound the alarm and inform of the events the working class and the entire people? Not at all. A delegation of social democratic deputies went to see the war minister who confirmed the events and accepted his view as follows: "The mutiny and everything related to it (i.e., the execution of the participants-- the author) are strictly confidential; no word of this should become known." The government and the SPA deputies were aware of the fact that any news on the uprising in Cattaro would trigger a storm of indignation throughout Austria-Hungary. That is why they kept this news secret fearing nothing more than the downfall of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy.

After the fall of the Hapsburg monarchy the powerful influence of the October Revolution began to manifest itself in Austria most fully and

openly. Soviets of workers and soldiers deputies arose spontaneously everywhere. A red guard was set up in Vienna. The old governmental system broke down and the factual power in all industrial areas and cities was in the hands of the soviets of workers and soldiers deputies. However, they had no organizing and guiding force, a revolutionary Marxist party. The workers still nurtured many illusions concerning the social democratic party whose leadership was assumed by left-wing Austrian Marxists. They were headed by Otto Bauer and Friedrich Adler. Both voiced their acceptance of the principles of the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, every day both of them found new reasons for which a proletarian revolution was impossible in Austria then. Yet, they kept talking of solidarity with Soviet Russia. For example, in March 1918 Otto Bauer wrote the following in the newspaper DIE ZUKUNFT: "The October Revolution was the victory of the Russian proletariat. Today the bolsheviks are the spokesmen for the Russian proletariat and the fate of the Russian working class depends on their fate. That is why we express to them our sympathy and, like the fighting proletariat of all countries, we are giving them our help to the extent of our possibilities . . . Opposing the bourgeoisie which is fighting the bolsheviks with the lies in its press and the bayonets of its soldiers, we must take the side of the bolsheviks with whom we are and will remain linked with the ties of the international common class interests of the proletariat and the common socialist ideal" ("Der Kampf" [The Struggle], 1918, p 148).

One can easily understand that such or similar statements made almost daily had a certain influence on the revolutionary workers. It made no difference that, for example, Otto Bauer subjectively did not engage in the least in deliberate deception. Yet, he believed that the October Revolution was doomed to defeat, for it did not fit the time, the "model" which social democratic leaders such as Kautsky and others had formulated for the socialist revolution. He believed that a bourgeois democracy had to be established initially in Austria so that then, moving away from it, one could reach socialism through peaceful and slow reformism. He promised the easy and bloodless victory of socialism without sacrifices and difficulties. The young communists--the Austrian Communist Party had been founded on 3 November 1918--firmly opposed this; yet, they lacked experience, training, and authority among the working class.

The Austrian working class--naturally, the communists in particular--watched with extreme attention and great sympathy the difficult struggle which the Soviet system was conducting against the counter-revolution and the intervention. The revolutionary wave rose even higher after the establishment of a Soviet republic in Hungary and a brief soviet rule in Bavaria. The Bavarian counter-revolution revealed at that time the bloody face of white guards.

When an international day of struggle in support of Soviet Russia and against supplying weapons to the enemies of the Russian revolution was proclaimed in July 1918 the SPA leadership was forced to join the workers deputies in the Vienna Soviet in proclaiming a 24 hour general strike.

Great sympathy was displayed for the Russian brothers. However, the SPA leadership was able to prevent taking a decisive revolutionary step toward seizing the power in its own country, despite all communist efforts. The situation of the democratic state in which the demands of many years' standing of the working class had been met (eight hour working day, social security, sick pay, and others) made it possible for the SPA leadership to present the reformist way as easier and better.

History proved that the path taken by the SPA leadership enabled capitalism to regain its positions, brought about fascism and World War Two, and caused thousands of times of greater suffering and casualties for the people than could have been required by a socialist revolution in 1918.

Subsequently, in his book, "Between Two World Wars," Otto Bauer drew at least partially some lessons from the past. His writings on the transition from capitalism to socialism are interesting and significant to this day. Here is what he said: "In order to achieve a transition from the capitalist to the socialist production method the opposition with which capitalists and landlords oppose attempts to expropriate them must be crushed. The entire economic and ideological mechanism of the rule with which the capitalist class keeps within its sphere of influence petty owners, peasants, intellectuals, and even individual strata of employees and workers, forcing them to serve its interests, must be crushed. In precisely the same manner we must surmount the opposition of the bureaucratic and military governmental apparatus personally and ideologically linked with the capitalist class" ("Der Kampf," 1918, pp 193-194).

The insurmountable truth remains: the transition from capitalism to socialism is impossible without the adamant, difficult, and decisive class struggle, and without the establishment of a consistently democratic state headed by the working class.

In his famous work "The Infant Left Wing Disease in Communism" Lenin wrote: "After the proletarian revolution in Russia and the victories achieved by that revolution on an international scale, unexpected by the bourgeoisie and the phillistines, the entire world has now become different. The bourgeoisie as well has become different everywhere" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 41, p 85).

Indeed, how greatly the world, the bourgeoisie, and the working class itself have changed over the 60 years of existence and upgrading of Soviet rule! Today two trends are becoming ever clearer in bourgeois policies: on the one hand, the most merciless and bloody suppression of the peoples, the suppression of nations fighting for their freedom; on the other hand, the desire to conceal capitalist rule behind statements on human rights and all sorts of promises, as well as sinister threats about the future. In the capitalist countries, in Austria for example, this policy is assisted by the social democratic leaders who have "evolved" to such an extent as to speak now, as is being done Palme in Sweden, for example, of some kind of

symbiosis between capitalism and social democracy, quite similar to the symbiosis of the crocodile with the little birds which peck at the bits of meat stuck between its teeth to keep them intact.

Today the ideas of the Great October Socialist Revolution have become familiar to hundreds of millions of people. The working class, the working people, have changed within that time while international solidarity, whose nucleus is proletarian internationalism, has become a powerful force.

New socialist states have appeared side by side with the Soviet Union. Their comity is growing, strengthening, and confidently watching over the peace, and supporting and promoting the social progress of all mankind.

The Austrian working class and Austrian people owe a great deal to the Great October Socialist Revolution and the Soviet Union now celebrating the 60th anniversary of this universal-historical event. In 1938, when Austria was erased from the political map of the world by Hitlerite Germany, the USSR did not acknowledge this act of violence. In the course of World War Two the Soviet Union had already called for the restoration of Austria as a free and democratic state. At that time it defended the very possibility for the existence and security of our republic and prevented Austria's involvement in the aggressive NATO bloc. Finally, in 1955 it was able to achieve the conclusion of a governmental treaty and the establishment of Austrian neutrality which is the basis of its national existence.

We are celebrating the 60th anniversary of the Soviet state not only by giving its due to this great period and not only from a feeling of gratitude. We are also celebrating the great common struggle waged by the international working class for a socialist revolution, a struggle which began in 1917 in Russia, and we are drawing lessons from the experience of the struggle against fascism, the heroic period of World War Two, the experience of the struggle waged during the period of the cold war, and the successes achieved in the struggle for detente.

Always and, particularly, in the past 60 years the bourgeoisie has spared no efforts in its attempt to divide the working class both within the individual countries as well as internationally. However, the successes it has achieved in this field have always been short. The slogan raised in the Communist Party Manifesto "Workers of the World Unite!" is no mere propaganda slogan. It stems from the scientific understanding of the need for joint struggle against capitalism which today has become a state-monopoly capitalism exceeding national boundaries.

Sixty years ago the Russian communists engaged in a revolutionary struggle to overthrow the capitalist system. They won not in the least because they were able to understand and take into consideration the characteristics of this bridgehead on which they fought, the characteristics of Tsarist Russia.

Today the communist parties are fighting under different conditions which must also be taken into consideration. However, all of them are joined by the objective pursuit by the Soviet Union over these entire 60 years: peace to the peoples, independence, freedom, and socialism.

LENIN'S CITY'S GREAT EXPLOIT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77 pp 44-48

[Article by Lev Uspenskiy]

[Text] On the eve of the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution the great city on the Neva, "where every tower had heard Lenin and would have gone into flames and smoke for him" is changing, becoming more beautiful and youthful. The revolutionary past of these famous squares, streets and bridges comes alive.

It was here that the dawn of the new epoch began. In my mind all the trials experienced by our country in the past 60 years are linked with it. I particularly well remember 1941. It was then that the fate of the country, the fate of the revolutionary gains was on the balance.

Our country has many heroic cities. All of them were in the same line of iron, withstanding the pressure of the merciless enemy. All of them today have been awarded eternal and unfading glory and gratitude.

Leningrad is a leader in their great ranks.

The unparalleled defense of the fortress on the Neva lasted 900 days and nights. For 900 days the steely loop of the blockade was girdling the city on the south following the bristling ridge of Voronye Gory at Duderhof turning west of Kronshtadt by the Lavansari Islands, and by Beloostrov to the north, forming an arc ending at Ladoga.

Nevertheless, after many hard months of struggle, the entire power of the Hitlerite hordes hurled against Lenin's city were unable to break the will and strength of its defendents. Enduring, and giving the enemy an incredibly long resistance, the soldiers of Leningrad, with the support of the entire people, headed by the Communist Party, threw back the fascists far beyond the walls of Leningrad and reached Berlin!

The city on the Neva became a proud symbol, a vivid manifestation of the courage, endurance, and will to win of our entire country, of the entire people.

Each generation has its culminating point. To my generation, born with the 20th century, who were still children in the days of the October Revolution, the Great Patriotic War became the peak of their civic service to the homeland. To those who had the honor, yes, precisely the honor, of finding themselves in September 1941 in Leningrad and on the Leningrad front, it was the blockade.

Resurrecting in our memories this distant past one may feel that we, now old people, would unwittingly drown both ourselves and our younger listeners with an endless chain of dark memories, painting one terrifying and morbid picture after another.

Yet, it is precisely the opposite that is happening: when the participants in the blockade gather their faces brighten with an inner light. This is what happens when the rays of the sun peer through the shaggy clouds of a spent thunderstorm. We recall not only the hunger and cold, the bombing and shelling, or only our fellow fighters who fell by our sides . . . it is as though we relive the amazing feeling of fellowship which was shared then by all the people of Leningrad (even though many of them had seen that city for the first time only several days before the blockade began). There was something else which rallied us, which made us feel close to one another then--the firm belief in victory. This was the feeling with which we woke up every morning.

. . . I have heard and read thousands of times that "the people of Leningrad faced death for 900 days."

It seems to me that these words do not say it all. Yes, we stood firmly and indeed faced death. Yet, most importantly, we did this for the sake of life. It was precisely this that gave the city the strength, "withstanding the knocks of fate," to feel the way the "heavy hammer" of the blockade could forge in its sons the sword with which we counter attacked.

Naturally, no one in Leningrad could be then confident of his safety. It was rather the opposite. Yet, at least it seems to me, ever since the enemy ring closed around us as though blending our destinies together, we felt with unparalleled urgency the great city as an indivisible entity, as a single family of all its defenders, and, therefore, mine, yours, hers, and of thousands and thousands of other people . . . somehow the truth became immediately entirely clear to all: the life or the death of an individual was not so important compared with the most important thing: Leningrad will live! It will live to see the victory!

No, we did not swear this to one another every minute. In all likelihood we were not even aware of this idea with a clarity with which I am trying to formulate it now. Unquestionably, however, it lived deep in everyone's mind. And, when the time came, it led forward the soldier at the front, the girl manning anti-aircraft guns, and the adolescents who fearlessly threw themselves over the enemy's shells in the first months of the shelling.

The fascists who had tried in vain to set the city afire soon gave up the use of thermite bombs altogether: Leningrad did not go up in flames . . .

No additional propaganda was required for the people of Leningrad could not forget for a single minute the person after which their surrounded city was named. The traces of a great life stood together with the people of Leningrad at the square in front of the Finland Station, where, as before, Il'ich stood on top of an armored car, shielded from shrapnels, at the splendid facade of Smol'nyy Palace each of whose columns clearly stood out in the air now free from urban smoke, as well as at the former Shirokaya Street on the Petrograd side, long renamed Lenin Street.

Not only Il'ich was recalled. We recalled and somehow seemed to relive the recent life of peace sanctified by his work. Palace Square at May Day and October celebrations. Could one assume even for an instant that we would never again take part in holiday demonstrations, passing by the rostrum, carrying our children in our arms, admiring the red flags waving over us. Passing by the Kirov Plant which was working also during the blockade, we recalled the painting "V. I. Lenin's Speech at the Putilov Plant." Passing through the tall wall surrounding the plant's yard we unwittingly sought with our eyes the shop roofs and the tall chimneys which had "seen" and could "remember" Il'ich.

Defending their city, it was as though the people of Leningrad were protecting with their bodies the revolution and its leader. Perhaps not all of them realized what they felt. However, the feeling was alive and warm. It was that feeling that converted the defense of the city into something special something which could have only one outcome, only one completion--victory!

"Sitting out" the blockade, I had the opportunity to talk intimately with a great variety of people: navy seamen and officers, frontline soldiers and women in our far from tranquil city rear lines almost undistinguishable from the front. I attest that not once did I hear from anyone even a hint of the possibility that Leningrad might surrender.

Speaking or writing of the blockade, we the living witnesses, convert most frequently our thoughts into recollections (which will not fade as long as we live).

Now, writing these lines, I recall suddenly an event. It occurred in April 1942. That day I was walking to the Kirov Plant. I walked unhurriedly, covering 10 kilometers in no less than 3 hours. Along the entire way I saw (not counting two military units marching in step) slightly over 100 women still wearing their winter quilted jackets and trousers, undistinguishable from the men from a distance. Nevertheless, these were women and there were only six men in civilian clothes with them. This struck me so much that I recorded it in my diary.

Our entire reality then, something which now seems to us almost fantasmagoric, a fabrication, an exaggeration, seemed then natural, as though

self-evident, as the only possible thing . . . nevertheless, much of it was on the edge of the miraculous or, possibly, had even gone beyond that edge.

Was it not a miracle, for example, that a musical comedy theater was performing in this hungry city cut off from the entire world, despite the bombing and the shelling?!

In front of its proud facade, in the impenetrable darkness of the blackout, one could always see a crowd of people wearing all kinds of clothes and shoes rushing into the theater: "Comrade Officer! Would you have a spare ticket?"

Another miracle were the journals and books published in the city. Some people wrote stories and poems, others composed music, set the print or engraved notes, and others again read and listened to all this, admiring, laughing, or crying but not at the hard reality around them! All these feelings were triggered by the music, the poetry . . .

As early as the end of 1942 three zealots, Detgiz workers, found the possibility to resume the publication of KOSTER, the Pioneers' journal, and it was almost impossible to get hold of an issue, as all the copies were sold instantaneously!

I am looking at my own little book "Mify Drevney Gretsii" [Myths of Ancient Greece] written for school children. It was signed to press 18 days before the war broke out and remained in a warehouse until the end of 1942.

I remember being told by the publishers that it will be sold in the store of a distant suburb almost at the front line. I was not in a hurry: who would need now a booklet for children? I decided to go look for it three days later.

Yet, I was told at the store that the book had been sold out. It was only because I, its author, had walked 15 kilometers and also perhaps I was wearing a navy overcoat with officer insignia that the saleswoman "found" for me five copies. I sent the five copies to the rear, to my relatives, not keeping even one for myself. After a television show in the course of which I described the case I was suddenly presented a copy as a gift by a Leningrad engineer who had gotten hold of it as an adolescent in the blockaded city . . .

This flood of memories have made me think once again that people who could read poetry, go to performances, and be interested in the myths of ancient Greece under the bombs and the shells were also able to sacrifice everything, including their lives, for the sake of a lofty dream, of the flaming torch of the victory to come!

My memories lead me along the blockaded Leningrad. Here is the tall building which then, as today, housed the radio center and all studios broadcasting from our city.

Those days, I had the frequent occasion to read my works on the radio. Even more frequently I heard from the loudspeakers the voices of my fellow-craftsmen--writers and poets--at night, in the lonely streets, sleeping as though drugged.

The residents of today's noisy cities could not even conceive of such a thing. One would be walking in total silence disturbed only by the dry beat of the radio metronome, along the Bol'shoy Prospekt on the Petrograd side, for example, while suddenly the silence would be broken:

"Attention! This is Leningrad! . . ."

The prospekt is quite long and has many loudspeakers located at varying distances. The sound comes to you not immediately but in streaked sequence, in counterpoint, repeatedly:

"This is Leningrad . . . Leningrad . . . Leningrad . . ."

This was overwhelming the imagination in the absolute quiet, without street-cars, motor vehicles, or people walking and talking! Sitting behind the microphone in the studio, unwittingly I imagined every time the way my voice boomed rolling along the streets of the beloved city. At that moment I proudly realized what a great honor it was to be speaking with all the people of Leningrad and how immeasurably great the responsibility was of anyone entrusted with this right . . .

Once, as a news correspondent, I visited a railroad battery. It was firing at the approaches to one of Leningrad's railroad stations. It was late when I reached the artillery men. That evening, alighting from the railroad car, I suddenly heard the familiar voice of the announcer. Here, however, in an even more impressive environment, away from the center, as though outside the city, the voice was suddenly tremendously powerful.

It was strange to think that such a powerful voice was human. Perhaps, in fact, there, behind the fog, standing in its full gigantic height, it was the legendary giant, our city, that was talking to everything around it:

"This is Leningrad!"

Many loudspeakers had been installed around the railroad station as well. Voices could be heard to my right and my left, and ahead of me and behind me. They rolled over the snow covered tracks and the suburban empty lots, reaching the nearby front line . . .

"The front line?" asked one of the officers with whom I was sharing my impressions. "No, Comrade Captain! Along the front line we have set up our own loudspeakers, more powerful than these. Whether they like it or not the krauts must hear what Leningrad is saying! Well they do not like it and for weeks on end they look for the loudspeakers to shoot at . . . a waste of time! If one is knocked out the next day there will be a new loudspeaker on the next birch tree! And then again there will be 'this is Leningrad!' the same type voice: calm, confident, powerful . . . "

Yes, no one who has ever heard this voice could ever forget it!

What the people of Leningrad accomplished in 900 days of blockade will be forever part of the chronicle of the greatest human accomplishments. The firmness, courage, and inflexible will of the city's defenders represent the heroism of the entire Soviet people who withstood on their shoulders the main burden of the struggle against the Hitlerite hordes, people who sacrificed 20 million lives for the sake of victory. The exploit of Leningrad, Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev has said, "is one of the most outstanding, most stupendous mass exploits of the people and the army in the entire history of war on earth."

This military feat was accomplished also for the sake of the bright future of all mankind. Yet, thinking of this titanic exploit, one asks oneself: when did it begin?

Was it when the Leningrad front came into being, in the alarming days of 1941? Was it when the first voluntary divisions of the people's militia were gathering on the city's squares and streets in the very first days of the war? Was it when the enemy was able to complete the blockade and cut off Lenin's city from Lenin's country?

I believe that this took place far earlier . . .

I think of the blockade of Leningrad yet I see the severe image of Petrograd in the civil war . . . I see iron pieces of trucks and boilers on Frontanka Street, along the river, at the Kalinin Bridge in 1919, turned into armored points . . . I hear mentally powerful hits: the "Petropavlovsk," the future "Marat," is firing from the port area at Yudenich's troops . . . the thunder of these shots blends with that of the batteries of 1943 or 1944 . . . it seems symbolic that Hitler's fascists were stopped in front of those same Pulkovo heights at which, 22 years previously, the fierce white guard columns had been routed . . .

Today, listening every year on 9 May the happy booming of the fireworks I see how, outside my window, high up in the sky, bouquets of red, green, and fiery rockets shoot up. Suddenly, I see myself, in 1917, in a dark November night, at the then Konnogvardeyskiy Boulevard, two blocks away from where my desk stands today. I walked, eagerly looking and listening to the tense and expectant silence of the autumn night. Suddenly, it was as though a metal

rod had pierced my throat, as though powerful hands had slapped my ears. I froze. At that time I did not know what had happened.

Today, six decades later, I do: it was the shot of the "Aurora." Looking through my window I see on the sidewalk across the street, above the Neva itself, a granite monument erected exactly on the opposite side of the site where the great battleship had been moored that great night. Now, 60 years later, I know: an unbreakable tie links the victory of 9 May with the victory of 25 October. Such ties go even farther and deeper into the past of history. There, beyond those victories, are the Sunday of 9 January 1905, and Lenin's circles beyond the Nevskaya Zastava, of the turn of the century.

Thus, once again, glory to you, city of Lenin! Glory to you, Leningrad!

5003
CSO: 1802

POWERFUL LEVER OF PARTY LEADERSHIP

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77 pp 49-61

[Article by Yu. Rasumov, deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee Department of Organizational Party Work]

[Text] Reflecting the basic features of mature and developed socialism, and its political organization, the draft of the new USSR Constitution brings to light the universal-historical accomplishments of our people achieved under the leadership of the Leninist party. With full justification, legitimacy, and substantiation it provides an expanded characterization of the role of the CPSU as the leading and guiding force of Soviet society, and as the nucleus of its political system and of all governmental and public organizations.

"The powerful lever through which the party influences the course of social development is its cadre policy," emphasizes Comrade L. I. Brezhnev. It is precisely the cadres, their loyalty to the cause of communism, knowledge, and experience that are the decisive link in the party's leadership. It is noteworthy that practically together with the task of setting up a proletarian party of a new type, V. I. Lenin gave priority to the problem of raising and training cadres who could organize and guide the revolutionary movement. He formulated profoundly and comprehensively the party principles governing the choice, placement, and training of leaders.

Steadfastly following Lenin's instructions, the party has always based its cadre policy on the specific circumstances and the problems resolved at one or another historical stage. In the difficult years of clandestine work the party workers underwent a revolutionary training and political tempering in the course of the irreconcilable struggle against Tsarist autocracy, the landlords, and the bourgeoisie. The cadres of revolutionaries-bolsheviks, trained in the front lines of this struggle, played an outstanding role in insuring the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. When the party seized the power the cadre problem assumed a new timeliness and even greater importance. Lenin pointed out that "the importance of the leader, the practical organizer, is incredibly great in organizing the millions of people." It was necessary to find and train hundreds of thousands of leaders not only for the party but for the governmental and economic organs.

The existing backwardness of the country and the acute shortage of skilled specialists loyal to the revolution made this task exceptionally difficult. However, it was implemented successfully.

The CPSU raised and trained from among workers, peasants, and the Soviet intelligentsia, a large army of leaders who are tirelessly implementing its policy and are organizing the masses in the struggle for the implementation of the plans for the building of communism, and who are honestly and dedicatedly serving the people. The high effectiveness of the party's cadre policy was convincingly proved in the course of the solution of most complex problems such as the industrialization of the country and the collectivization of agriculture. It withstood the severe trial of the Great Patriotic War and of the period of restoration and further development of the national economy. Considering the cadre problem a key problem of party guidance, the CPSU is not lowering its attention toward it for a minute. There has been no party congress or Central Committee plenum at which problems of work with cadres have not been discussed to one or another extent. Today, at the stage of the developed socialist society, they are considered with particular thoroughness and depth.

The new complex tasks facing the party and the country in this period called for a thorough scientific elaboration of the most important problems of the party's guidance of society, including problems of cadre policy. This was brilliantly accomplished in the CPSU Central Committee accountability reports submitted by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 24th and the 25th party congresses, his speeches at Central Committee plenums, his other addresses, and the Central Committee's decrees. As a result, today the party organizations are equipped with efficient and profoundly substantiated concepts on work with cadres.

I

The proper placement of cadres which enables every worker maximally to reveal his possibilities is a prerequisite for all successes. Lenin considered that workers must be studied from the viewpoint of their conscientiousness, political positions, knowledge of the work, and administrative abilities. He taught how to seek and recognize most carefully and patiently the true organizers and, after extensive tests, to promote them to responsible positions, assigning them initially most simple and, subsequently, ever more difficult tasks. Lenin's approach to the assessment of cadres, based on political and practical characteristics, remains entirely valid.

The political qualities of cadres are determined by loyalty to the cause of communism, necessary theoretical training, and ideological tempering. The party ascribes prime importance to the fact that a worker's Marxist-Leninist education become his manual for action. The high political maturity of a person is characterized by the extent to which he struggles actively and firmly for the implementation of the party's policy, and the extent to which he dedicates himself to serving the people. "Communist idea-mindedness is

an alloy of knowledge, convictions, and practical actions" said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 25th CPSU Congress.

The practical aspect of the workers is assessed, above all, on the basis of their general educational and vocational training, experience, inclination to increase and improve their knowledge, organizational talent, and ability to organize the joint work of the collective. The determination of a person, his industriousness, persistence, and initiative are of great importance.

Cadre characterization organically includes an assessment of their moral qualities. In our country a leader can be only a person distinguished by impeccable morality, discipline, honesty, conscientiousness, modesty, and simplicity. A worker entrusted with the destinies of the people must be principle-minded, and straight. Yet, he must be attentive and responsive and must not misuse his power.

The various facets of a person are characterized by his political, practical, and moral qualities. It is only the consideration of such qualities in their unity and interaction that offers an accurate and most complete idea of such a person. Resolving the problem of promoting a worker, we must mandatorily take into consideration the nature and characteristics of his assignment. It is entirely obvious that rayon party committee secretaries must possess some qualities which are different from those of a manager of a scientific research institute or a militia chief.

Developing the necessary qualities of managerial cadres the party considers that these are not only broad but quite flexible concepts. The meaning invested in the concept of a worker's professional suitability gains a new content with the growth of the educational level, political maturity, and level of professional training of cadres, and with the broadening of the scale and increased complexity of the problems they must resolve. The systematic implementation of the Leninist principle governing the selection of people calls for a proper knowledge of the objective criteria which today's cadres must meet.

"The contemporary manager," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 25th CPSU Congress, "must organically combine party-mindedness with extensive competence, and discipline with initiative and a creative approach to the work. Yet, whatever his sector, the manager must take into consideration socio-political and educational aspects. He must be responsive to the people and to their needs and requirements. He must give the example at work and in life." These requirements are directly linked with the further intensification of the responsibility of managerial cadres for the successful solution of socio-economic problems of broader scale and greater complexity and for the implementation of the party's course of upgrading the effectiveness and quality of the work at all levels.

The quality of the work depends, above all, on the level of the skill reached by the workers, their conscientiousness, activeness, and effectiveness.

"Bolshevik intolerance of shortcomings and of any indifference toward the work, and profound party responsibility for achieving the greatest national economic results while using the least possible resources," according to Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "must become the mandatory qualities of any manager."

The party has formulated and is resolving a most important historical problem: the organic combination of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of the socialist economic system. As we know, the advantages of socialism are attained not automatically but through the conscious and purposeful activities of the people. Success is directly linked with the scientific and technical training of cadres, the extent to which they have mastered contemporary management methods, and the extent to which they understand the objective laws governing the socialist production method. Particularly important in this respect is Lenin's view on the competence of the workers. In order to manage, Lenin taught, "one must be competent. One must be familiar with all production conditions fully and precisely. One must be familiar with the technology of a given production process at its current stage. One must have a certain scientific training" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 40, p 215).

The profound changes currently taking place in social life and in production enhance even further the importance of qualities such as initiative-mindedness and a feeling for the new. Success accompanies managers who, proceeding from the national interests, resolve boldly and creatively their problems, work with an eye to the future, lively respond to everything that is new and progressive, display initiative themselves, and, at the same time, actively support the valuable initiative of others. Conversely, it would be difficult to expect good results of someone who is passive, who is inclined to await detailed instructions and guidance from above in all cases, and who prefers to avoid the making of independent decisions, particularly on matters requiring a thoughtful approach and personal responsibility.

In our country the broad toiling masses have reached high cultural and educational standards. Their spiritual world is becoming steadily richer and their production and social activeness is rising. Under such circumstances, in order successfully to combine the functions of organizer and educator, the leading workers must be well trained not only politically and practically, but as all-round educated people.

This demand is intensified as the result of the aggravation of the ideological struggle in the world arena. Our leading cadres must engage in daily active ideological struggle for the communist ideals and for the purity of Marxism-Leninism. They must expose all bourgeois ideological diversions knowledgeably and substantively.

II

Taking into consideration the new requirements facing the cadres, the party is always concerned with having politically mature, knowledgeable, and

capable organizers to head all sectors of party, governmental, economic, cultural, educational, and public work. As a result, the qualitative structure of cadre workers of all categories is steadily improving in our country. This is reflected, in particular, in their higher general educational, political, and specialized training.

Presently virtually all secretaries of communist parties of union republics, and of party kraykoms and obkoms, are with higher education. Over 71 percent are industrial and agricultural specialists and 21 percent are candidates and doctors of sciences. In addition to their specialized training over 40 percent of the secretaries have undergone party-political training. The number of specialists in the economic sector most characteristic of a given oblast, kray, or republic has risen considerably among this cadre category. Many of them held leading positions in industry, construction, and agriculture prior to their promotion to party work. Two-thirds of them were city and rayon party committee secretaries, or secretaries of party committees of big enterprises.

Similar changes are taking place among party cadres on the rayon and city levels. Today 99.3 percent of party gorkom and raykom secretaries are with higher education. Over 60 percent have specialized training while 46 percent are graduates of party schools. As a rule, one or two secretaries of any gorkom or raykom have engineering-technical, economic, or agricultural training.

The qualitative structure of the other cadres of the party apparatus and of the personnel of soviet, trade union, and komsomal organs is improving. Three-quarters of the chairmen of councils of ministers of union and autonomous republics, and of kray and oblast executive committees are industrial or agricultural specialists; 45 percent of them are graduates of party schools. In their overwhelming majority these cadres have undergone party training. The political and business training of chairmen of executive committees of city, rayon, village, and settlement soviets has been improved.

Most of our command cadres in industry are distinguished by their high level professional competence. Thus, 92 to 96 percent of the heads of enterprises in the machine building, metallurgical, chemical, and coal industries are specialists with higher education. The best trained and most energetic production organizers were appointed managers of production and scientific-production associations in the course of their organization. The general directors or directors of the biggest associations have specialized training and practical experience as managers or chief specialists of enterprises, scientific research institutes, or design bureaus. Most directors of scientific-production associations are candidates or doctors of sciences.

The training level of agricultural workers is rising steadily as well. At the present time specialists with agricultural or technical higher or secondary education account for 93 percent of sovkhos directors and 84 percent of

kolkhoz chairmen. Yet, not so long ago, the situation in the villages was different: 10 to 15 years ago nearly one out of four sovkhos directors and over one-half of all kolkhoz chairmen had nothing but practical experience.

Unquestionably, never before have we had such a properly qualified structure of leading cadres. Nevertheless, taking into consideration the ever rising requirements concerning the level of management the party is systematically improving the selection and training of workers for all sectors of party, state, economic, and social activities.

The CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th party congress emphasized that we must continue to promote to party work even more adamantly politically mature and active national economic specialists with experience in working with people. Practical experience has confirmed the correctness and effectiveness of this line in cadre policy. The reinforcement of party organs with people possessing profound specialized knowledge, production experience, and organizational skills contributes to upgrading the level of the party's management of the economy. Under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution this is of tremendous importance. Understandably, it is not a question of the party committees to undertake the direct management of production affairs, as they have always been political organs. However, the party committees could successfully fulfill their role under the conditions of the growing complexity of the development of the national economy only through a qualified approach to the solution of economic problems.

The task of strengthening enterprises in the local, meat and dairy, and food industries, consumer services, and trade with specialized managerial cadres remains very topical. Skilled specialists are still in short supply in these sectors, even though in recent years their number has increased.

Despite the considerable reinforcement of kolkhoz and sovkhos cadres with agricultural specialists, to this day many farms are still short of skilled managerial cadres, middle level personnel in particular. That is why the party and soviet organs are adopting active measures aimed at improving further the organization of the all-round training of such cadres.

The systematically implemented party course of promoting members of the working class and kolkhoz peasantry who have been properly trained and possess organizational talents is of special significance. Many thousands of party, and soviet managers, production leaders, and men of science and culture have been trained from among our workers and peasants.

The party is always concerned with the creation of favorable conditions for such growth. In our country workers and kolkhoz members are extensively represented in elective party organs. Currently they account for 41 percent of the members and candidate members of party raykoms, gorkoms and okruzhkoms, and for over 30 percent of the party obkoms and kraykoms and central

committees of communist parties of union republics. All in all over 1.5 million workers and kolkhoz members have been elected to leading organs at all party levels, including primary party organizations. They are members of the bureaus of practically all CPSU gorkoms and raykoms, and of 50 percent of the party's kraykoms and obkoms. Here they are trained in party-mindedness and politics, and master the ability to engage in organizational and educational work. The number of members of the working class kolkhoz peasantry in the soviets of deputies of the working people and in trade union and Komsomol organs has increased noticeably.

Everywhere in our country a healthy and efficient atmosphere, favoring the growth and the manifestation of the abilities of the workers has been created. Trust in and respect for the people are combined with principled exactingness. Thanks to the fearful and concerned attitude toward cadres established in the party an end was put to their unjustified rearrangements and frequent replacement. As was pointed out at the 25th CPSU Congress, in our country cadres are moved whenever this is required by the interest of the work and the need to strengthen one or another work sector. The replaceability of elected personnel has been reduced noticeably. It amounts to 17-18 percent per year for party gorkom and raykom secretaries, and chairmen of executive committees of city and rayon soviets of deputies of the working people. Previously, as a rule, almost two-thirds of secretaries of primary party organizations were replaced after each election, compared with slightly over 25 percent today.

Practical experience has indicated that the stability of party cadres has a positive influence on their work. It raises the level of managing the activities of party organizations. However, it would be a serious error to keep in responsible positions people unable to cope with their work for the sake of an abstractly conceived "stabilization." "Even more so," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 25th party congress, "we must not retain in leading positions people who show irresponsibility and live with their old knowledge, assuming that the position in itself secures their authority and respect for them."

The party ascribes great importance to the natural process of cadre reinforcement and renovation to be always regulated on the basis of the proper combination of mature with young workers. Our cadres are a firm alloy of people of different age. This allows us to make most full use of the knowledge and experience of the senior generations of managers and the energy and initiative of the young. Let us take a category of party cadres such as party raykom and gorkom secretaries. As a rule, the people promoted to such positions are those who already have a certain party and practical experience. Nevertheless, today 42 percent of them are under 40 years old.

The party's Central Committee is systematically pursuing a line of promoting local personnel to leading positions in party and soviet organs. The overwhelming majority of secretaries of oblast, kray, and republic CPSU committees, and the chairmen of councils of ministers of union and

autonomous republics, and of kray and oblast executive committees, promoted in recent years, were local personnel and only a small number of such workers were sent from the center. This is understandable, for everywhere numerous cadres of well trained workers and of capable and energetic managers have been trained. Therefore, it is expedient to choose and promote people directly from the local party organizations where they grew up and are well known for having worked together with the others.

The question of the extensive promotion of women to leading party, state, economic, and public work plays an important role in the party's cadre policy. In the USSR women account for over one-half of the total number of people employed in the national economy, and for almost 60 percent of all specialists with higher and secondary specialized education. In recent years the party organs have begun to promote more energetically women to leading positions. Women account for 31 percent of the party gorkom and raykom secretaries newly elected on the eve of the 25th congress. The number of women appointed secretaries of primary party organizations has reached 30.3 percent.

This, however, is insufficient. It is proper to point out that, for the party as a whole, today women account for under 20 percent of gorkom and raykom secretaries. In many oblasts, krays, and republics there are no women among the chairmen of rayon and city executive committees. There are few women in leading positions in the textile, clothing, meat and dairy, and food industries, and in trade where, as we know, they account for most of the personnel. Extensive possibilities exist for the promotion of women to responsible positions in agriculture, particularly as section managers, brigade leaders, and heads of livestock farms.

The creation of national cadres in union and autonomous republics is among the biggest achievements of the party's Leninist national policy. The careful raising such cadres has enabled us to promote them extensively to all levels of the party and governmental apparatus. At the same time, the more intensively the USSR and the entire Soviet society develop, the more clearly is the process of internationalization of social life manifested. Members of tens of different nationalities live and work in each Soviet republic side by side. Such circumstances are taken into consideration in cadre selection and promotion. The structure of leading workers in all republics reflects ever more fully the multinational nature of their party organizations and their populations.

III

Reality has confirmed that success in the selection and placement of cadres may be guaranteed providing that the party committees have proper reserves, and providing that they study systematically, profoundly, and comprehensively the people who could be promoted to leading work and higher positions.

We have no shortage of trained and educated workers. The problem is to note promptly and properly assess the abilities of a person, to determine the

type of work in which he could show his best qualities, to promote him on time, and to help him master the work. The training of a promotion reserve is the duty of every manager, whatever his level or rank. The ability to observe the people, to recognize their business qualities, and to find the proper place for everyone was considered by Lenin as the main talent of the organizer. The standard of a leader and his party-mindedness and responsibility for his duty may be accurately determined by the extent to which he trains carefully and timely one or another worker as a cadre reserve who could, in particular, at a given time, take over his own work.

Deputy managers are a natural reserve for promotion to leading positions. If trained people are selected to fill such positions, gaining experience, they could become suitable for promotion to independent work. However, such a reserve should not be limited merely to deputies. One must look for able organizers among the broad aktiv. We have 4,300,000 members of elective party organs, over 400,000 of whom are members of central committees of communist parties of union republics, kraykoms, obkoms, okruzhkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms. The supreme and local soviets number over 2,240,000 deputies. These are the leading people of town and country, possessing a broad outlook, a variety of knowledge, and practical experience. Another major reserve is the Leninist Komsomol. The skillful use of these sources enables us steadily to reinforce the party and government cadres with fresh forces.

Great attention to the training of a cadre reserve is paid by the Leningrad oblast party organization. Here the study of the people on the basis of their practical accomplishments has been improved. Extensive use is made of certifications and talks held at the party committees. Promising workers are considered as members of the reserves after taking into consideration the opinion of public organizations and of the party and economic aktivs. Comrades earmarked for promotion, who include a number of workers, are systematically trained at skill upgrading faculties and courses sponsored by higher educational institutions, at courses for the party and economic aktiv, and at seminars. They are assigned various tasks. Many economic organizations offer practical training to workers for the positions to which they will be promoted.

The purposeful work done by the party organizations with the cadre reserves has made possible to strengthen in recent years production and scientific-production associations and many scientific institutions, planning organs, vocational-technical schools, and other important sectors with skilled and intensively trained energetic workers. In the past five years some 200 workers from Leningrad's enterprises have been promoted to leading party, soviet, and trade union work.

The practical experience of the Rostovskaya Oblast organization with agricultural cadres, approved by the CPSU Central Committee, is of interest. This work is being done purposefully, on the basis of long-term plans. All kolkhoz and sovkhoz managers and specialists attend refresher courses and

seminars regularly, once every two to three years. Thousands of young workers are trained at special courses set up on the basis of the best sections, brigades, and livestock farms. The rayons have councils for the dissemination of the experience of leading production organizers. Every year some 600 people among the rural youth who have proved themselves at work are sent to agricultural VUZs and technical schools at the expense of the kolkhozes and sovkhazes; over 300 brigade leaders, heads of livestock farms, or section managers lacking specialized training are studying by correspondence. All this makes possible to develop a good reserve and not only to strengthen kolkhozes and sovkhazes with skilled managers but systematically to resolve a topical problem such as improving the quality structure of secondary level cadres. Today virtually all sovkhazes and 90 percent of kolkhozes in the oblast are headed by personnel with higher agricultural training. Over 62 percent of the secondary level cadres are diploma'd specialists or else people studying by correspondence. It should be recalled that for the country at large 36 percent of brigade leaders, heads of livestock farms, and section managers are agricultural specialists, whereas in oblasts such as Novgorodskaya and Omskaya they are only 15 to 16 percent.

One of the reasons for errors in personnel choice and promotion is that in a number of cases related to cadre problems a person is judged only on the basis of official investigations. Not always is there any interest in the extent to which he has proved himself a good organizer, in his ability to work with people, and in his moral qualities. Occasionally in the promotion of one or another worker the opinions of people who know him closely or of the collective in which he works are ignored. There have been cases in which cadre selection problems are resolved without the participation of the party organization. It is precisely for such reasons that poor workers are shifted from one position to another and that unsuitable people are promoted to leading positions.

Practical experience shows that the joint public solution of cadre problems is a major guarantee against errors in personnel selection and promotion. In this connection the ratification and release of workers by party committees is of major importance. Party principle-mindedness, and the deep and comprehensive knowledge of the committee members of the qualities and shortcomings of a person, and the consideration of the views of the party organization and fellow workers limit opportunities for a subjective assessment of the workers, their appointment based on individual loyalties or friendships, and so on.

The party committees and their apparatus must study systematically and comprehensively the structure of cadres and the changes occurring within it. They must promptly note characteristic trends, consider the condition of the professional and general educational training of the workers, and the implementation of the party's line of combining mature with young cadres, and promote to leading positions progressive workers, members of different nationalities, and women. They must actively influence these processes.

With a view to a better study of the workers and of upgrading their skills and responsibilities, we are extensively using the system of certification of leading cadres and specialists in all national economic sectors. This has a positive impact on upgrading their political maturity, practical training, and creative activeness. Certification offers extensive possibilities for the all-round study of cadres. It contributes to their more objective assessment and the creation of a necessary promotion reserve. It helps to strengthen many production sectors with capable and energetic organizers and educators. The open and principled assessment of the qualities and shortcomings of those to be certified, and the collective opinion encouraged them to fulfill their obligations better and to fight more actively for production effectiveness and quality.

The certification results show that the overwhelming majority of management and engineering and technical cadres are adequate for their positions and are successfully coping with their assignments. Many among the certified personnel are promoted or considered the reserve for promotion to higher positions. Some workers require a second certification. There also are those considered by the commissions as inadequate for their positions. They are released or demoted.

It should be pointed out that substantial shortcomings in certifying workers are allowed at some enterprises, organizations, sovkhozes, and kolkhozes. Occasionally this is reduced to a simple confirmation that the worker is suitable for the position he holds. The commissions make a superficial study of the materials characterizing those to be certified. It may also happen that the recommendations and conclusions of certification commissions are not put to practical use and that unsuitable people are left in their positions.

Not all ministries and departments provide the necessary control over such certifications or profoundly analyze their results. Some party committees as well do not study the content of the certifications. Yet, such matters deserve constant and very close attention. The active participation of party, trade union, and Komsomol organizations in certification work upgrades its effectiveness.

IV

Our party has always considered the question of improving the qualitative structure of the workers a process which organically combines the selection and placement of the people with their education. In this process factors such as mastering revolutionary theory, developing criticism and self-criticism, collective leadership, effective organization of control of execution, and ties with the masses play an important role. These factors were extensively discussed at the recent party congresses, CPSU Central Committee plenums, and Central Committee decrees.

Mastering the Leninist work style is a synthesizing indicator of the leader's maturity. We must point out that such a task has existed at previous stages of our development as well. Today, however, in the period of developed socialism, it has assumed a truly comprehensive and urgent nature. Its timeliness has become particularly tangible in connection with the party's course of upgrading the effectiveness and quality of the work at each level. "The struggle for effectiveness and quality," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the October 1976 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "means that every manager and specialist must master the Leninist work style and science of management. He must promote contemporary methods for planning and organizing the production process. He must be an active promoter of scientific and technical progress."

The Leninist style encompasses the principles and methods of party work tried and proved with its entire revolutionary experience. The most important among them is the scientific approach to the formulation and resolution of essential problems of domestic and foreign policy, unity between revolutionary theory and practice, ability to focus forces and attention on key problems of communist construction, systematic collective leadership, unbreakable ties with the masses, efficiency and persistence in reaching planned objectives, constant self-critical analysis of work results, and clear demarkation between the functions of the party organs and the tasks of state, economic, and public organizations.

This style was formulated and developed in the party under Lenin's direct guidance and under the influence of his outstanding personal qualities. In our days the activities of the CPSU Central Committee and its Politbureau provide an outstanding example of the Leninist style of work. The party is systematically promoting the establishment of a Leninist style in all realms of party, state, economic, and public activities. It is adamantly teaching the cadres the "conscientious choice of ways, means, and methods of struggle which could yield the biggest and most durable results with the lowest possible outlay of efforts" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 9, p 208).

The features of the Leninist style are based on the party's nature. In human practical activities they develop not by themselves but on the basis of the systematic observance of the Leninist norms of party life and the exacting study of the effectiveness of the work methods used in an atmosphere of principled criticism and self-criticism.

The ability to acknowledge openly and frankly shortcomings in one's work, to draw an honest and truthful conclusion on one's omissions, and to earmark and implement measures to surmount them is proof of the principled-mindedness and the high party-mindedness of the worker and his awareness of responsibility for assignments. Such a person could be entrusted with a serious matter. At the same time, we can not rely on those who are unable to assess the situation self-critically, who take credit for any success and blame others for errors and shortcomings. This particularly applies to managers. It is precisely they who must give an example of proper attitude

toward criticism. It is precisely they who influence, above all, the principle-mindedness in the formulation of problems and of the creation of conditions for frank criticism from below and for the effectiveness of measures based on critical remarks. An atmosphere of healthy and effective criticism and self-criticism is a necessary prerequisite for the proper education of the workers, their fruitful activities, and their further growth.

Formulating its requirements on upgrading the responsibility of cadres and on the further strengthening of party and state discipline, the CPSU proceeds from Lenin's instructions to the effect that socialist discipline must be based on high conscientiousness and deep loyalty to the communist cause. The party radically rejects discipline based on fear and rigid administration, for this deprives the people of confidence, kills initiative, and triggers over-cautiousness and other negative phenomena.

Yet, we still encounter cases of bureaucratic attitude toward cadres. Some managers consider the reprimands they occasionally address to their subordinates without sufficient grounds as the universal and just about the main way for the elimination of shortcomings. It is known, however, that groundless reprimands create a nervous atmosphere and hinder rather than help the work.

The party, soviet, and economic organs must strengthen the discipline and upgrade the individual responsibility of cadres by extensively using the various means of education and public influence. They must promptly expose the shortcomings and errors of their comrades and help them to correct them. Stricter measures including the loss of position should be applied to workers who fail to draw conclusions from criticism, behave improperly, and grossly violate the discipline.

"Combining collective leadership with personal responsibility for assignments is a mandatory prerequisite for the growth and education of cadres, and for the proper organization of our entire work," says Comrade L. I. Brezhnev. Proper, comprehensively considered decisions could be formulated and possible errors prevented only through collective leadership. No single worker, however talented and experienced or knowledgeable he may be, could replace the experience and creative initiative of an entire collective. The more complex the problems to be resolved are, the more obvious this truth becomes.

Our party is distinguished by the inviolable unity between words and deeds, and the ability to implement efficiently and systematically its political line. The CPSU Central Committee is systematically seeing to it that efficiency and practicality be inherent in all party and state organs, all units of the administrative apparatus, and all leading cadres.

The efficiency of any leading organ or of its personnel can not be judged by truly external characteristics. A party or soviet organ may pass a great number of decisions and frequently convene various conferences and

meetings which take a great deal of time and effort. Such efforts, however, may fail to yield positive results if the decrees passed are not backed by necessary organizational work, a rational deployment of forces, clear assignment of obligations, and principled control.

In its decree "On the Organizational and Political Work of the Krasnodarskiy Party Kraykom on the Implementation of the Decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress" the Central Committee pointed out that control must influence more actively the course of the work, and prevent possible errors and underfulfillment of tasks. The decree states that every manager must personally undertake to control execution as a most important official duty and remember that essential features of control are principled criticism of shortcomings and comradely support of useful efforts and positive changes.

Steady improvements in the training and retraining cadre system are an inseparable structural part of the party's comprehensive work of cadre upbringing. In 1976 our national economy employed 24 million specialists with higher and secondary specialized training. Taking into consideration the requirements of the scientific and technical revolution and the task of training cadres capable of resolving the problems earmarked by the party by virtue of their ideological, business, and moral qualities, the 25th CPSU Congress earmarked the directions for the further development and improvement of the public education system. Specifically, the Tenth Five-year Plan calls for the training of 9.6 millions specialists with higher and secondary specialized training, paying particular attention to supplying with cadres areas of intensive development of production forces.

We have a large network of specialized schools for the training of party and soviet cadres: the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, the CPSU Central Committee Higher Party School, the CPSU Central Committee Higher Party School by Correspondence, and 14 republic and interoblast higher party schools. In the period between the 24th and 25th congresses alone 40,000 people were trained by the party's schools. There is no area of party, soviet, or other public work not employing party school graduates.

The establishment of a system of permanent courses for the retraining of party and soviet workers was an important measure in improving work with cadres. In accordance with the instructions of the 25th congress, the Central Committee is continuing to improve this system. In 1976 the permanent courses at the CPSU Central Committee Higher Party School were reorganized into the Institute for Upgrading the Qualifications of Leading Party and Soviet Cadres. Leading workers of party and soviet organs of republics, krays, and oblasts attend this institute. The activities of all other courses are being restructured.

The Institute for the Management of the Economy was created in 1970 to upgrade the skills of leading workers in the areas of contemporary management methods, productions organization, and planning. The Higher School for Agricultural Management, based on the Moscow Agricultural Academy imeni K. A. Timiryazev, was set up in 1975.

Every year over one million economic managers and specialists attend qualification upgrading institutes, faculties, and courses, increasing their knowledge in accordance with the requirements of scientific and technical progress and the need to upgrade production effectiveness. Training methods such as theory seminars, conferences, party aktiv courses, and universal economic training are being applied and improved everywhere.

While developing the organizational forms of workers training, the party also believes that independent studies are a basic method for the broadening and intensification of their ideological-theoretical and professional knowledge.

The Soviet people are implementing the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress with growing energy. The nationwide discussion of the draft of the new USSR Constitution throughout the country is accompanied by a powerful growth of the political and labor activeness of the masses and the unanimous desire of the working people properly to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. The implementation of the stipulations contained in the new constitution will unquestionably raise to a higher level our governmental and economic activities and the work of the power and administrative organs. This will mean that the requirements facing leading cadres at all sectors of the building of communism will become stricter.

5003

CSO: 1802

COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO PARTY COMMITTEE EDUCATIONAL WORK

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77 pp 62-71

[Article by M. Teslya, Rostovskaya Oblast Party Committee secretary]

[Text] The communist education of the Soviet people holds an important position among the problems considered by the 25th CPSU Congress. This is due to the fact that it is impossible to resolve successfully economic and socio-political problems without the molding of the new man. ". . . the party," emphasized at the congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, "considers as its permanent concern the promotion of communist conscientiousness and of the willingness, desire, and ability to build communism." The congress indicated the main way for upgrading the effectiveness of ideological work: the adoption of a comprehensive approach to all education, i.e., insuring close unity among ideological-political, labor, and moral education.

The practical implementation of this party instruction requires extensive and persistent work, and highly qualified ideological cadres and ideological aktiv of party committees; it requires a developed feeling for the new, and the ability critically to interpret gained experience. As we know, the CPSU Central Committee recently considered the work of the Orsk City Party Committee on the comprehensive solution of problems of ideological and educational work. It gave it a positive rating but also noted existing shortcomings, which, to speak frankly, are typical of many party committees in our Rostovskaya Oblast. The Central Committee formulated specific tasks for upgrading further the effectiveness of the ideological activities of party organs and organizations, while insuring a comprehensive approach to education involving the all-round consideration of the social, professional, and age characteristics of the different population categories. These requirements stem from our party's entire previous ideological practice.

The comprehensive approach to education arose as a conceptual and methodological principle with the birth of the theory of scientific socialism and the appearance of truly revolutionary parties of the working class. K. Marx and F. Engels scientifically substantiated the idea of molding a comprehensively developed personality. They emphasized that this problem

could be resolved only as a result of the revolutionary reorganization of society, the establishment of the public ownership of capital goods, and their all-round development. V. I. Lenin repeatedly noted that ideological-political education is effective when combined with active labor and social work. Only under such circumstances could communism become a live project rather than a set of ready-made and memorized formulas and prescriptions.

We must bear in mind that comprehensiveness is a capacious and multi-level concept. It means a dialectical interaction among systems of social relations, political and ideological factors, and human living conditions, i.e., among everything which surrounds man and affects his consciousness. Comprehensiveness is one of the basic principles of CPSU theoretical thinking and practical activities and a characteristic feature of its policy.

The contemporary formulation of the problem of a comprehensive and systematic approach to the management of society as a whole and of its individual social units and realms of activities, including communist education, is based above all on the fact that socialism has entered its mature stage, and on the tasks of the present stage of the building of communism. As we know, the draft of the new USSR Constitution codifies the fact of tremendous historical and political significance that a developed socialist society has been built in the Soviet Union. Now, when socialism is developing on its own base, the constructive forces of the new system and the advantages of the socialist way of life are becoming ever more apparent. The working people are benefiting ever more extensively from the results of the most important revolutionary gains achieved by the Soviet people under the party's guidance. As the draft of the constitution notes, powerful production forces, and progressive science and culture have been created in our society. The people's prosperity is growing steadily and ever more favorable conditions for the all-round development of the individual are becoming present.

The task of our party and ideological cadres, and of anyone involved with the education of the Soviet people is to make maximal use in the work of the favorable moral and political circumstances prevailing in the country, relying on the growing maturity of labor collectives and on the best representatives of the working people--party and non-party members. Here we must bear in mind the circumstances mentioned at the 25th CPSU Congress such as the appearance of new generations, the renovation of socio-economic conditions as a result of the continual development of science and technology, the increased conscientiousness and level of information of the population, and certain changes in the international arena--anything which indicates the need to continue to improve the organization of communist education, upgrade the effectiveness of ideological influence on the people, and seek and find ways, means, and methods of work among the masses consistent with the times.

It is important to take into consideration the close interconnection existing between the molding of a communist conscientiousness and a communist behavior in the people and the growth of their labor and creative activeness

and desire to work more productively and achieve better results, and, therefore, to upgrade their specialized, economic, and political knowledge, professional skills, and general culture. That is why any improvement in communist education contributes to one or another extent to hastening the solution of problems such as the creation of the material and technical foundations for communism, the improvement of socialist social relations, and their reorganization into communist social relations.

The draft of the constitution stipulates that these, along with other, are the main tasks of the Soviet state. As we know, they are also program tasks of CPSU activities. On the basis of its committees and organizations the party is working for the successful economic and social development of all union republics, administrative rayons, industrial areas, and individual labor collectives. It is concerned with the maximal utilization of the growing possibilities for the all-round development of the individual, so that every Soviet person may become a conscientious and profoundly ideological fighter for communism and for the implementation of the party's plans and of its economic policy and strategy, working honestly, and considering the implementation of state plans and assignments his personal project.

In the course of its practical activities the Rostovskaya Oblast party organization focuses its attention to problems of the economic, organizational, and political support for the fulfillment of the Tenth Five-Year Plan, for upgrading further production effectiveness, improving the organization of labor and management, and maintaining an efficient work rhythm at each industrial enterprise, kolkhoz and sokhoz. The role of the party committees and bureaus, and of ideological workers has increased immeasurably in the solution of these problems. Ever more frequently we are achieving a comprehensive approach to education and a truly organic unity between economic and educational work.

Let us recall, above all, the movement guided by the slogan of "Let us Work without Laggards." It was born at the beginning of the previous five-year plan. In April 1977, a letter was addressed to Comrade L. I. Brezhnev on behalf of all party members and working people of the Don, describing what we had accomplished to upgrade the effectiveness of the socialist competition and to urge on lagging enterprises and sectors to reach the level of the leading ones. The letter pointed out that the party, soviet, economic, trade union, and Komsomol organizations are implementing a set of inter-related measures of organizational and political work which include the education and training of the people, prompt aid to those who fall behind, improved control, and upgraded responsibility of cadres for the fulfillment and overfulfillment of shift, monthly, quarterly, and annual plans and the five-year plan as a whole, and that positive results had been achieved. The number of enterprises failing to cope with the assignment of increasing labor productivity dropped from 180 to 15.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev highly rated the Rostov patriotic movement. In his letter to the CPSU Obkom, the oblast executive committee, oblast trade union, and Komsomol obkom he emphasized that under the conditions of steadily expanding production-economic relations the strict observance of planning discipline by all economic units assumes exceptional significance. It is important, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted, for each production collective to fulfill its planned assignments and orders on time and with excellent quality of output. It must never let down its related enterprises and customers. That is why the party organizations work extensively to develop in all working people, from the worker to the manager, a feeling of high responsibility for the fulfillment of plans and for the honor of their enterprise.

In the Eighth Five-Year Plan 80 industrial enterprises failed to fulfill their annual marketing plans while 130-150 industrial enterprises failed to fulfill their labor productivity plans. Similar circumstances prevailed at the beginning of the Ninth Five-Year Plan. This situation became particularly intolerable in the light of the familiar decisions of the December 1972 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. The tasks of strengthening the planning, labor, and production discipline, and of mobilizing and effectively utilizing production reserves rose in their full size. The solution of these problems was largely helped by the comprehensive approach adopted to education and the intensified attention paid by the party and the other public organizations to the professional, ideological, and spiritual growth of every working person.

The oblast party committee studied and summed up the experience of the comprehensive approach to educational work acquired by the primary party organizations of leading production collectives. Let us take the Novochoerkassk Electric Locomotive Engines Plant as an example. Its party committee is organizing its work on the basis of the long-term five year plan aimed at upgrading the ideological and moral training and developing the labor and socio-political activeness of the working people.

The party committee pays particular attention to the ideological cadres. The plant has over 3,000 lecturers, propagandists, political informants, agitators, and youth tutors. The party committee directs the ideological activity to insuring in the course of its work and social and educational work an inseparable unity between word and deed, and making all its various activities purposeful and effective. It calls upon the party members not to ignore a single enterprise worker and to take into consideration the individual qualities of everyone along with his political and vocational training and thus to contribute even more energetically to upgrading the effectiveness and quality of the work. Most enterprise propagandists and agitators have their individual plans for upgrading the socio-political and labor activeness of the working people. These plans were formulated on the basis of the specific circumstances prevailing at one or another production sector and of the strong and weak aspects of the activities of the individual labor collectives and their party groups.

At the end of 1976 the plant's party committee and administration studied jointly the condition of the efforts to strengthen socialist labor discipline. At that time the young workers, essentially graduates of vocational-technical schools, allowed the greatest number of disciplinary violations. It turned out that this was essentially due to the insufficient vocational-technical training of some of the young people and their dissatisfaction with the organization of the work in some shops. A number of educational and organizational--technical measures were formulated and implemented. Special experimental-statistical production norms were set for the young workers and they were assigned tutors. Cadre workers raised the slogan of "Every Young Worker Must Reach the Tutor's Level." The party committee then held a plant-wide meeting of young workers and summed up their critical remarks and suggestions on improving the working and living conditions and organization. The plant strengthened its ties with the vocational-technical schools: workers began to meet with labor veterans more systematically; the public organizations undertook to draw the young production workers into attending various forms of training, to engage in rationalization work and to participate in production management. All this yielded positive results: cadre turnover declined noticeably and cases of labor discipline violations dropped by one-half. Today most young workers are successfully meeting their production norms and socialist obligations in honor of the Great October Revolution anniversary.

In the course of discussing the draft of the new constitution by the enterprise collectives, the speakers paid particular attention to the fact that it not simply guaranteed citizens of the USSR the right to work but also mentioned their duty to work conscientiously. It was natural for the discussion of the draft to result in an energizing of the creative thinking of the workers and to their search for inner reserves and better methods for the organization of labor and production. They accepted the patriotic initiative of the complex fitters-welders brigade headed by party member M. P. Myasishchev, which, having thoroughly considered its possibilities, decided to fulfill its annual assignment by the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution. The initiative was approved by the CPSU obkom bureau and taken up by other enterprises as well.

The electric locomotives builders are achieving new successes in the implementation of the plant's five-year plan for upgrading production quality and improving quality control. A system of faultless work has been applied in the shops. The party and trade union committees have seen to it that the workers have studied at progressive experience courses the proper production organization and technology; they have promoted in the collective competition for upgrading the quality of the work at each workplace. At present three types of electric locomotives have already been awarded the state's Emblem of Quality.

While approving as a whole the work of the plant's party organization, the oblast party committee is aware of existing shortcomings as well. Above all, the enterprise's party committee does not always efficiently

coordinate the work of the public organizations. This frequently creates unnecessary duplication in areas where a certain demarkation and clarification of their individual functions are needed. In the field of mass political work not all shop organizations and party groups approach every individual. The practice of the steady and extensive study of needs, demands, and suggestions made by the working people has not been developed everywhere. The measures for exerting public influence on the few people who are indifferent to the worker's honor and violate labor and production discipline and morality norms are occasionally excessively timid and, therefore, ineffective.

Generally speaking, many party committees have not as yet formulated an effective system for the moral education of the workers and their families. Whereas in the labor collective a person acts so to say in public, on the outside he is usually not within the sight of the public organizations. The problem of organizing the sensible utilization of leisure time and developing in the people a desire for spiritual enrichment is facing us with all its magnitude. This is a huge field of work for party and other public organizations, soviets, and cultural institutions.

The organic ties and unity between economic and ideological-educational work is a major prerequisite for their success. Even though we have achieved certain accomplishments in the education of the working people, we believe that this would be greatly helped by improving economic management methods, insuring the development of the economy through intensification and higher production effectiveness. In particular, the oblast's industrial work has been positively influenced by the fact that most leading workers have been retrained at higher sectorial economic courses organized on the basis of VUZ facilities. The party obkom, gorkoms, and raykoms have energized the activities of courses for the party and economic aktiv where the heads of oblast administrations and enterprises are studying the theory and practice of economic management, and progressive production organization methods. Finally, regular seminars and conferences with leading party and economic cadres are being held on improving the style and methods of economic management.

All this has made possible to pay greater attention to lagging enterprises and to give them all-round assistance. The party committees assigned to them experienced specialists who, together with the party workers studied the situation on the spot and helped the collectives to formulate and implement specific measures for the elimination of shortcomings. The enterprises have been strengthened with experienced cadres of managers and specialists with the reputation of able organizers and educators. All in all, over 10,000 party members have gone to work in lagging collectives. The slogan of "Work without Laggards" has gripped the minds of the people and earned the warm support of the working people. Practical science conferences on establishing the best possible conditions for the successful development of this movement were held in the oblast's cities and a number of rural rayons.

The role of the party committees as organs of political management has risen noticeably. Problems related to upgrading their vanguard role in production and socialist competition, and of improving party control over the work of enterprises and construction projects have been frequently discussed at their plenums and party member meetings. Such control requires an operative analysis of the situation exercised by the primary party organizations; every ten days the results are submitted to the raykom or the superior party organ. The party obkom, gorkoms, and raykoms discuss monthly the work of the enterprises with the participation of the managers of lagging labor collectives. The results of the oblast socialist competition are summed up on a quarterly basis at a joint session by the CPSU obkom bureau, the oblast executive committee, the oblast trade union council presidium, and the oblast komsomol bureau. Such sessions are addressed not only by the winners of the competition but by managers of enterprises and oblast administrative organizations which have fallen behind in one or another indicator. The reports which party members submit to the obkom bureau and party gorkoms and raykoms, and at sessions of the oblast council administering the socialist competition help to make the party's control successful.

The movement under the slogan of "Let us Work without Laggards" linked even more strongly the work of the people with the main directions of the party's economic policy and strategy and had a noticeable influence on improving the organization of the competition, making it more meaningful, and intensifying its educational role. Problems related to the growth of labor productivity, improved quality and economic effectiveness of the work, installation of new equipment, better utilization of capital assets, and strengthening economy and thrift have begun to play an even greater role in socialist pledges and contracts. At the same time, items covering the political and social activity of the of the working people and their desire to upgrade their economic and professional and technical knowledge and practical skills are extensively reflected in the pledges.

The party committees and organizations have done a great deal to study, sum up, and improve the process of extensively applying progressive experience gained in production and ideological-educational work. They have supported a number of valuable work initiatives and contributed to their dissemination. Thus, extensive explanatory and organizational work was done to popularize the initiative launched by party member A. A. Shapko (Rostov Bearings Plant No 10), who called upon the oblast's machine tool operators to join the movement under the slogan of "Effectiveness Document for Each Machine Tool." Following the approval of the initiative by the CPSU obkom bureau, workers meetings were held in the labor collectives. A. A. Shapko and his followers published articles in the press and spoke on the radio and television. Posters and pamphlets on their experience were printed. Political education days were assigned to this topic everywhere. This made possible to inform every working person of the meaning and significance of this innovation.

This method contributed to the success of other initiatives as well: the leading brigades in the coal mining industry decided to work according to

the slogan of "For One Thousand Tons of Coal per Day per Long Face"; the brigade headed by foreman G. M. Mukhin at the Rostsel'mash Plant called for working on the basis of individual five-year thrift accounts; the collectives of the harvesting and transportation teams headed by Hero of Socialist Labor N. V. Bochkarev and Hero of Socialist Labor N. V. Pereverzeva can be taken as examples of the highly productive utilization of agricultural equipment; 50 among the best kolkhoz and sovkhoz brigade leaders in the southern rayons of the oblast have sponsored lagging farm brigades and sections in the northern rayons helping them to grow high yields.

The signing of creative cooperation contracts between workers and engineering and technical personnel of industrial enterprises and the formulation of creative plans by specialists, listing their individual participation in the dissemination of leading experience, the application of progressive labor methods, and improvements in the organization of the socialist competition, also played a great role in the movement for "Let Us Work without Laggards."

Propagandists, political informants, and agitators have made their contribution to the development of this movement. About 20,000 among the oblast's propagandists have their own creative plans which call for helping students within the party training system in discovering and using reserves for upgrading production effectiveness. The agitation collectives of Oktyabr'skiy Rayon in Rostov, and of Sal'skiy Rayon launched the slogan of "No Single Lagging Member in the Collective where the Agitator Works!" Its basic purpose is that the agitator backs explanatory and educational work with organizational work aimed at applying progressive labor methods and helping those who fail to cope with their assignments.

The CPSU obkom, gorkoms, and raykoms formulated a system for rewarding cities, rayons, enterprises, organizations, collectives of production subdivisions, and leading production workers and innovators. Prizes named after noted oblast people were established as awards to brigades, shops, sectors, and teams. The best collectives will be awarded commemorative flags and pennants, anniversary honor certificates, and prizes. A "Mandate for the Winner of the Oblast Socialist Competition in Honor of the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Revolution" has been established allowing the winner to participate in the oblast rally of anniversary competition winners. Leading workers and kolkhoz members write articles and speak on the radio and television and their statements are subsequently discussed by the labor collectives.

Such are the basic ways and means of organizational, political, and ideological-educational work which have contributed to the success of the movement of "Let Us Work without Laggards." On the basis of the acquired experience the oblast party organization has called for the further development of this movement and for seeing to it that there is no single lagging shop, brigade, and sector in the oblast and for every worker to fulfill and overfulfill his production norms, reach high production quality, work creatively, and develop a communist attitude toward labor.

If we are concerned with intensifying the role of labor collectives in communist education it is important to take into consideration that they are molded under the influence of those objective and subjective factors which must be taken into consideration in our practical work to the fullest extent and knowledgeably. The tremendous pace at which the socialist economy and scientific and technical progress are growing leads to the creation of new enterprises and new types of production facilities every year. Occasionally, this radically changes the nature and content of labor. In the past decade over 30 enterprises equipped according to the latest technology were built in our oblast. They employ essentially young people. For example, over two-thirds of the collective of the Shakhtinsk Cotton Fabrics Combine have secondary education and are between the ages of 17 and 30. The age and professional structure of the workers and the nature of their work are changing in the old enterprises as well, extensively engaged in reconstruction, technical retooling, and building of additional production premises. Naturally, each labor collective has its own characteristics determined by the specific nature of the production process, the composition of the workers, and the condition of the moral and psychological climate. All this calls for a differentiated approach to educational work and, naturally, for particular attention to new collectives which have not developed as yet their own traditions and where the party and other public organizations have not acquired any experience in organizational and educational work.

The unification of the collective and its educational influence on the young workers are intensified by extensively involving the plant's workers in the elaboration and implementation of plans for economic and social development. In the oblast over 200 enterprises, kolkhozes, and sovkhoses are implementing such plans whose characteristics are substantiation, purposefulness, comprehensive approach to the solution of production development problems, and improving the working, living, and recreation conditions of the working people. For example, the Taganrog metallurgical plant, implementing a plan for the development of the collective, achieved great successes in the reconstruction of the enterprise and of the palace of culture and palace of sports. A health and preventive medicine establishment was built on the shore of the Azov Sea. In five years' over 3,000 workers have improved their skills at the plant's university for technical and economic knowledge; nearly 1,500 enterprise workers are attending higher educational institutions, technical schools, and evening courses. The plant has opened a labor glory museum. The mood of the people is good and their labor activeness is high. Everything here contributes to the better utilization of the working and leisure time. This is the reason for which the collective of metallurgical workers is in the vanguard of the anniversary competition.

Every year over 30,000 graduates of secondary and vocational-technical schools join the labor collectives of our oblast. Most of them find their labor vocation and develop a clear outlook in life. However, some enterprises still fail to pay sufficient attention to the young workers and to

create the necessary conditions for the manifestation of their knowledge and abilities and for the growth of their professional standards. This creates cadre turnover; some young people abandon production work. Experience has shown that this could be avoided above all by developing individual methods of work with the young workers. Today the tutorship of cadre workers over the young people, sponsorship, and guidance by experienced production masters of Komsomol-youth brigades, teams, and crews are becoming ever more widespread. Annual city and rayon tutors' rallies have become a tradition.

The vocational guidance of the students has become an important direction in the system of training a worthy reinforcement of the working class and kolkhoz peasantry. Useful experience has been acquired in this area by the Proletarskiy Rayon in Rostov-na-Donu. Since 1975, with the active help and support of the party and soviet organs and enterprise managers, an interscholar labor training and production combine has been operating, providing vocational guidance to secondary school students in 15 fields. Each of its classrooms has as its extension a sector of an industrial enterprise where the school students master a skill and carry out production assignments under the guidance of experienced tutors. Presently the city has 11 such combines and in the next few years similar combines will be organized in all oblast cities. Useful experience in the vocational guidance of adolescents has been gained in the villages as well where over 200 students' production brigades have been set up at secondary schools.

The shaping of a Marxist-Leninist outlook in the Soviet people remains the main aspect of communist education. The oblast party organization pays great importance to their intensified study of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress. Greater attention is being paid within the political training system to the study of the socio-political and cultural development of the Soviet society, the party's Leninist foreign policy, the struggle for peace and social progress, and the exposure of bourgeois ideology and propaganda. In connection with the preparations for the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution and the nationwide discussion of the draft of the constitution we emphasize the intensified study of our party's history, economic policy and strategy at the present stage, and its role in the development of Soviet democracy. Our propaganda is becoming ever better substantiated, militant, and aggressive. This is largely explained by improvements in the qualitative structure of propaganda cadres. Today in the oblast over 90 percent of them are with higher education and with no less than three years' practical experience. It is also greatly explained by the interest which party members and all working people are showing in studying problems of Marxist-Leninist theory and of the party's and government's policy.

Bearing in mind that the solution of the complex education problems is possible only with highly skilled and ideologically mature cadres, the oblast party committee organized the theoretical training of full-time ideological workers at the Rostov Higher Party School. Every year we sponsor theoretical science conferences at which topical problems of

ideological-political, labor, and moral education are discussed. Our cadres were greatly helped by the all-union practical science conference on problems of the complex approach to ideological work, sponsored by the party's Central Committee in Rostov in 1975.

We organize zonal information-methodical seminar-conferences on a quarterly basis to which we summon the personnel of party committees and ideological activists such as propagandists, lecturers, political informants, agitators, and cultural workers. The practice of asking gorkom and raykom workers to undergo practical training at the ideological departments of the party's obkom has proved its value. This is particularly important under conditions in which ever new young cadres whose practical experience is, naturally, insufficient, are entering the realm of ideological work.

The party committees' coordination of the activities of ideological institutions and organizations plays a particular role among the measures aimed at upgrading the effectiveness of educational work. This enables them to focus their attention on main educational problems and contributes to their comprehensive solution. For example, the Rostov party gorkom approved a unified plan for the work of its propaganda, agitation, science, VUZ and secondary school departments as well as topic plans for the city newspaper, the Knowledge Society, and for cadre training; it formulated specific programs for seminars, courses, and practical science conferences.

Naturally, a great deal of persistent work remains to be done for the comprehensive approach to the communist education of the Soviet people to become fully established in the activities of all party committees and organizations. Practical experience shows that not all party workers in the oblast have mastered the art of the creative utilization of the variety of organizational, ideological-educational, and economic factors for molding in every person high political and labor activeness in the struggle for the implementation of the party's policy. Occasionally inability organically to link current tasks with long-term objectives is manifested in ideological work. Some leading economic cadres still pay little attention to political work and to the education of the people. The party organizations of a number of collectives are not involving with sufficient persistence economic specialists in ideological and political work among the people. The party organizations must pay the closest possible attention to the comprehensive utilization of all means for upgrading the effectiveness of labor and moral education and strengthening in the minds and behavior of the people the moral code of the builder of communism. That is why the Don obkom and city and rayon party committees consider it their task, on the basis of the further systematic implementation of stipulations of the 25th CPSU Congress, to help the ideological cadres and all party organizations to master to the fullest extent the art of the comprehensive approach to the ideological-political, labor, and moral education of all population groups. This is an important condition for molding the new man--the builder of communism.

DIALECTICS OF THE THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL IN CONTEMPORARY SCIENCE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77 pp 72-81

[Article by V. Shvyrev, candidate of philosophical sciences]

[Text] The Communist Party considers that the further elaboration of the theory of dialectical materialism based on the study and summation of the experience acquired in socio-production and scientific activities an important task facing Soviet philosophers. This task assumes particular importance under the conditions of the contemporary scientific and technical revolution. In the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th Party Congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that the revolution in science and technology calls for feeling a great respect for science and for the ability and desire to seek its advice and take it into consideration. Upgrading the role of science in our society presumes the thorough study of the laws governing its functioning and development. The analysis of the dialectics of the theoretical and the empirical in scientific knowledge is an essential structural part of such a study. These problems are linked both with the interaction between theoretical and empirical knowledge in the development of the various scientific disciplines as well as the processes governing the shaping of theoretical concepts in sciences in which empirical research methods continue to dominate. Such a methodological analysis is a necessary prerequisite of the solution of a number of specific problems of contemporary science.

The successful study of the dialectics of the theoretical and the empirical is possible only on the basis of the common principled positions of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. On this level the many specific terms formulated by the Marxist-Leninist classics, characterizing the general direction and basic laws of the cognitive process, and the stages and levels of knowledge, are of invaluable significance. The method elaborated by K. Marx of proceeding from the abstract to the concrete in the study of the capitalist economic system is of particularly great methodological value. We are familiar with F. Engels' view directed against empiricism which ignores the role of theoretical thought, and with Engels' assessment of the role of hypothesis and mental experimentation with idealized items which greatly outstripped the level of scientific development of his time. Their significance becomes

entirely apparent from the positions of today. V. I. Lenin's gnosiological ideas, related to the general characterization of the structure and stages of the cognitive process, enable us to understand more profoundly the dialectics of abstract thinking and live contemplation, and of theory and experiment.

Basically, the dialectical-materialistic approach rejects the absolutization of the empirical study of facts, inherent in the various positivistic directions of metaphysical absolutization, at the expense of theory (basically characteristic of early positivism), or else of theory at the expense of empiricism (as is the case of some representatives of contemporary "philosophy of science" in the west). The initial principles of dialectical-materialism in the study of the theoretical and the empirical lie, above all, in the fact that the latter are equally necessary, interdependent, and intersuppositional components or aspects of scientific knowledge, whose dialectical unity and difference represent the most important structural characteristic of science. In this case the constantly originating contradictions between the theoretical and empirical components of science are one of the factors which promote its development.

The empirical study is related, above all, to the determination of facts in the course of the observation and experimentation process. The empirical data developed as a result of observations and experimentations are the necessary base for any real, "live" scientific knowledge. The further study and synthesis of these facts and determination of relations among them lead to the appearance of empirical summations and classifications. However, as Marx emphasized, "the task of science is to reduce what is visible and seen only as a motion to the factual inner motion . . ." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 25, Part I, p 343). This problem is resolved through theoretical research which reproduces the nature of the studied reality by elaborating its logical structures. Their most developed and advanced form is scientific theory which is a complex and internally differentiated system of knowledge. Scientific laws are its elements. It presumes the use of idealized theoretical objects and models.

Therefore, the consideration of the dialectics of the theoretical and the empirical presumes the study of a variety of different forms of scientific knowledge and of their complex interaction. It also presumes the methodological presentation of facts, laws, theories, idealizations, and models. At the same time, the concepts of theoretical and empirical knowledge reveal certain essential structural scientific characteristics, developing a kind of "grid of coordinates" within which the various forms of scientific knowledge such as law and theory, and elements such as idealized objects and models could be considered. In our view this is what determines the serious methodological significance of the study of the categories of the theoretical and empirical as philosophical-gnosiological concepts in the elaboration of specific problems of scientific knowledge and the development of new means and operations for scientific research.

Considering the dialectics of the theoretical and the empirical, we must, above all, take into consideration the fact that this is a dialectics of the interrelationship among certain aspects and elements within scientific knowledge, interrelationships among types of scientific research. Therefore, this approach should be distinguished by the approach in which the experience, empiricism, and the study of real facts are related only to practical activities and are pitted against scientific knowledge as a whole. In such a case science and theoretical thinking are considered, one way or another, in terms of their external relations and functions, while experience, empiricism, are respectively taken outside the range of science and pitted against it as a whole. Within the limits of the topic considered in our article the empirical study of facts and their interrelationships, based on direct observation and experimentation, shall be considered as an internal component of science and as a prerequisite for its functioning and development. Correspondingly, we should distinguish between the problem of the relationship between the theoretical and the empirical as components of scientific knowledge and problems of the correlation between sensory perceptions and thinking as a form of direct and indirect reflection as a whole.

An insurmountable principle of dialectical-materialistic gnosiology is the thesis of materialistic sensualism, of the fact that the sensation, the perception is the source of all knowledge regarding objective reality. "All knowledge stems from experience, from sensation, from perception," Lenin pointed out ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 18, p 129). Without sensory perception no knowledge is possible whether on the level of common practical awareness, observation, and experimentation, or of theoretical research. It is equally unquestionable, however, in terms of dialectical-materialistic gnosiology, that any knowledge embodied in a language includes logical categories and a rational mental processing. Therefore, knowledge which lays a claim to objective truth mandatorily presumes the interaction of the sensory and mental mechanisms. The "live contemplation" which Lenin mentioned, formulating his thesis on the development of knowledge "from live contemplation to abstract thinking and from it to practice . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 29, pp 152-153) is, therefore, necessarily linked with a certain interpretation, or rationalization of sensory data.

Unlike the highly abstract levels of theoretical science, naturally, empirical research presumes the "live contemplation" of factual objects, studied through observation and experimentation. However, this is not to say that empirical research could be considered as a "purely sensory" level or that on the level of theoretical research we always deal with some kind of "pure rationality" free from sensory-intuitive aspects. Let us emphasize that it is precisely in theoretical research, in the work which the theoretician does with idealized objects and theoretical structures that the nature of the senses appears intensively not as a passive receiving ability but as an active, constructive, and cognitive activity, particularly in its function as fantasy, as creative imagination. As we know, Lenin highly valued their role precisely in scientific knowledge, emphasizing that "it is stupid to deny the role of imagination even in the strictest science . . ." (Ibid., p 330).

Therefore, the complex synthesis and interaction between sensory and mental mechanisms for the reflection of reality occur at both empirical and theoretical levels of scientific research. The specifics of theoretical and empirical research are related not to the fact that the former is a certain level of "pure intellect" while the second is the sensory reflection level, but the fact that empirical research is directly aimed at factual objects observed and experimented with while theoretical research is related to the study of the indirect presentation of reality.

Describing empirical and theoretical research, usually the researchers point out that the former is aimed at the study of the external characteristics and relations within phenomena based on direct experience whereas the latter brings to light the essential ties and laws of reality. Generally speaking and as a whole this is a correct definition of the nature of knowledge obtained as a result of theoretical and empirical studies. However, it is too abstract from the methodological viewpoint, as it does not reveal the entire complexity of interrelationships between empirical and theoretical knowledge within the sciences or the variety of their genetic and functional relations. A more specific methodological study should be based on precise and differentiated concepts as to what should be understood by the empirical and theoretical aspects as elements of the scientific system. Above all, we must bear in mind the use of concepts of the theoretical and the empirical in marking the historical stages of the existence of science and the development of scientific knowledge. On such a level we could speak of the empirical stage of scientific development (or simply of "empirical science"), as well as of the theoretical stage in scientific development (or simply of "theoretical science"). Taking the natural sciences as an example, biological disciplines such as zoology and botany at their descriptive and classifying stage could be taken as examples of the empirical stage of science; in physics, for example, we could take gas dynamics prior to the development of the molecular-kinetic theory, on the study of electromagnetic phenomena prior to the creation of the theory of the electromagnetic field. After the appearance of these theories the parts of physics dealing with the study of gases and electromagnetic phenomena assume a higher level of development of scientific knowledge.

The progress of theory in social science is related to the revolutionary change made by the Marxist-Leninist classics. Marx's "Das Kapital" is a model of theoretical reproduction of complex historically developing systems. As Lenin emphasized, since its appearance the materialistic understanding of history turned from a hypothesis to a scientifically proved concept ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 1, pp 139-140). The Marxist-Leninist classics developed theory in the field of the social sciences in the course of the study and summation of social practice. The Marxist-Leninist doctrine of society presumes the organic unity and interaction between theoretical research and summation, on the one hand, and the specific study of factual empirical phenomena of social life, on the other.

The modern sciences as a whole--social and natural--have taken the path of theoretical development. However, the contemporary scientific structure still includes many disciplines and individual directions which are still in the empirical stage. To a greater or lesser extent these disciplines are subjected to the theorization process. Therefore, to a certain extent, the question of transition from the empirical to the theoretical stage in the sciences has retained its significance to this day.

Yet, however high the stage of theorization science may have reached, it always presumes the need for turning to the "live contemplation" of factual phenomena. Science is not a closed realm of artificial conceptual structures but knowledge of objective reality. It has always turned to experimentation and observation. The empirical base is a mandatory component of the existence of science at any given stage in its history, unquestionably including the theoretical one, the way the stage of empirical science is a necessary element in the historical development of scientific knowledge.

The methodological difficulties are due, above all, to the fact that the solution of the problem of the "primacy" of the empirical or the theoretical aspects will be different depending on whether or not in this case we have in mind the sequence of scientific stages or the correlation between the empirical base and the theoretical apparatus at a given stage in its development. The primacy of the empirical stage of science, compared with the theoretical, is linked, above all, and directly with their historical correlation in time.

As to the interrelationship between the empirical base and the theoretical apparatus at the mature stage of theoretical science, one presumes the other. The historical aspect of the primacy of the empirical base compared with the theoretical apparatus is considered a fact and it should be a question of the functional relations among already existing scientific elements. Changes in the empirical base, as new data are accumulated, could bring about changes in the theoretical system. In this sense the gathering of data on the empirical level would be primary in terms of changes in the theoretical apparatus. On the other hand, however, certain changes in the theoretical system could take place also without the indirect influence on the part of empiricism and even direct empirical research itself. In such cases, obviously, changes in the conceptual apparatus become primary in terms of empirical research.

It is important to emphasize that the ratio between the empirical base and the conceptual apparatus in theoretical science is not static in the least. It not only does not exclude but presumes constant change and restructuring of the theoretical apparatus under the influence of new empirical data and, conversely, the development of empirical research under the influence of improvements and developments in the theoretical apparatus. Therefore, at the theoretical stage the dialectics of the interrelationship between the empirical base of science and the conceptual apparatus is also linked with

the history of scientific knowledge and with the processes of its overall changes and development. However, in the first case we are dealing with progress made by already developed theoretical science on its own basis, and with a history obeying the laws of its development. In the second we are dealing with the general history of its establishment. Thus, if we consider the natural sciences as a whole, the period of the 17th-18th and even first half of the 19th centuries is characterized by the gradual process of its theorization, whereas beginning with the second half of the 19th century we are dealing mainly with the development of the natural sciences (above all with some of its fundamental branches such as physics and chemistry) this time on their own theoretical basis.

Emphasizing thus the distinction between the empirical and the theoretical stages in science, we should not interpret empirical science in the spirit of an inductivistic concept which reduces the entire content of science to a certain combination of knowledge obtained through simple inductive summation. Such an empirical-inductivistic approach which, as we know, was firmly criticized by Engels, is consistent neither with the theoretical nor the empirical stage of science even though, we must point out, the inductivistic concept arose as a result of the exaggeration, the absolutization of the role of inductive methods precisely at the empirical stage. The point is that cognitive activities can not be imagined as a search for neutral "empirical data" with their subsequent correlation. For example, formulated at their empirical stage, the laws of Boyle-Mariott and Gay-Lussac, usually considered as model laws, established the correlation among empirically determinable (measurable) parameters of gases: pressure, volume, and temperature. However, along with the progress of knowledge on the empirical properties of gases, 17th-18th century natural science included a certain elaboration of the very concept of gases as well (see A. G. Stoletov, "Ocherk Razvitiya Nashikh Svedeniy o Gazakh. Izbr. Soch." [Outline of the Development of our Information about Gases. Selected Works]. Moscow-Leningrad 1950). A similar process could be traced in the history of the theories of electricity, magnetism, biology, and so on.

Therefore, the empirical stage of science itself presumes the existence of a certain mental, conceptual content, a "conceptual nucleus" which may not be reduced to something "empirically given," and a correlation between this mental content and empirical fact. In other words, at the stage of empirical science we already face the problem of the interrelationship between facts and a certain "extraempirical" content expressed within the conceptual apparatus. The existence of this conceptual apparatus correspondingly directs empirical research.

The history of science gives us a number of examples of such an orientation. Let us mention in particular the history of the definition of the famous Ohm Law, and others. Such experimentally established laws were always based on certain conceptual premises relying, in particular, on model concepts. Thus, the experiments which led to the discovery of Ohm's Law were based on the analogy between electric current in the conductor and the mechanism of the heat flow. That is precisely why we cannot accept without certain

stipulations as a general system for the progress of knowledge at the stage of empirical science the rigid sequence of the transition from established facts to inductive summations, classifications, empirical dependencies, and so on. In our view such an approach underestimates the basic circumstance that empirical science is always based on certain initial ideas on the subject of the research reflected in corresponding concepts and empirical research aimed at refining, concretizing, and enriching these concepts.

The empirical stage of science is distinct from the theoretical not because the latter is developed by a mental content which exceeds the limits of the direct observation of empirical facts and their interrelationships. From the methodological viewpoint it is important to determine the precise nature of this content which cannot be reduced to empirical data, the work methods to be used in handling it, and the dialectics of the interaction between the conceptual apparatus and the empirical base of science.

One of the most important tasks in science is the steady improvement of its conceptual apparatus and the elaboration of the meaning and content of scientific abstractions. This enables us to achieve an ever fuller and deeper reflection of reality. As we know, Lenin emphasized that "all scientific (accurate, serious, not foolish) abstractions reflect nature deeper, more accurately, and more completely" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 29, p 152). This capacity for a more precise and full reflection based on scientific abstractions is insured by the fact that in science, as a specific form of socio-cultural activities of a conceptual apparatus, the content and meaning of scientific abstractions become the targets of special research. It is precisely this that distinguishes science from other forms of pre-scientific or non-scientific awareness and, above all, from ordinary awareness. "The study of the nature of concepts themselves," considered by Engels a prerequisite for dialectical thinking, is inherent to one or another extent in science at any stage of its development, including the empirical. However, in its most developed forms it operates on the level of theoretical science.

The conversion from the empirical stage of science to the theoretical presumes a number of intermediary levels and phases whose study is of considerable interest to the methodological study of science (such as, for example, typology as a form of scientific theorizing, elaboration of primary conceptual models, and so on). All these stages and phases of scientific theorization are related to an intensification of activities aimed at advancing and developing the starting concepts of the respective scientific disciplines, and the gradual separation of the theoretical content. The purely theoretical stage of science begins with the appearance of theoretical structures which enable us to work with them as with idealized objects, and when the possibility arises for a progress in the consideration of the theoretical aspect of concepts relatively independent of empiricism.

The aspect of hardening, and of idealizing reality as a result of such models is occasionally emphasized by some authors. Such an aspect does occur. Yet, we must bear in mind the positive and constructive possibilities of such models which enable us to obtain, on their basis, theoretical results without directly resorting to experimentation (for example, the molecular-kinetic model of gases presumes an abstraction from the size of molecules while, at the same time, it enables us to establish theoretically the correlation among the main properties of gases).

Even though the determination of the basic characteristics of idealized objects in the methodological study of science takes place mainly on the basis of the natural sciences, their appearance is a necessary stage in the theorization of any science, naturally, in the forms specific of the various fields of scientific knowledge. Thus, developing the theory of added value, and determining the correlation between factors such as abstract and concrete labor, exchange and consumer value, and so on, Marx also developed a certain "idealized object" which became the theoretical foundation for the entire study of the capitalist production method.

It is important to emphasize that logically a theoretical model is not based on the empirical model. The lack of understanding of this aspect represents, specifically, the main error of positivism in scientific methodology, including its inductivistic variety. The building of a theoretical model marking the transition from the empirical to the theoretical stage of science is an important dialectical leap in the development of scientific knowledge, and a "break in the sequence." It is always related to the intensive efforts of scientific creative thinking. Yet, the appearance of a theoretical model is related to the internal development of empirical science. It represents a constructive answer to questions on the nature of studied phenomena already formulated within the framework of empirical science.

Naturally, a theoretical model is not a real object but a conceptual structure embodied in a certain symbolic form. The very expression of "idealized object" emphasizes the fact that it is the type of mental structure which is used for achieving certain changes based on the plan of the mental experiment: if we assume certain changes in element A, in accordance with the rules and laws familiar to us, element B should change as well. The establishment of the correlation and interdependence between the elements of the "idealized object," established through the mental experiment, represent the theoretical stipulations and laws which form the initial nucleus of the respective theoretical discipline. It could be said, therefore, that the existence of theoretical models and "idealized objects" predetermines a theoretical research program. This is yet another of the distinctions between the theoretical and the empirical stages in which "the study of the nature of concepts themselves," may take place but is not developed within a clearly established and predetermined sum total of interrelated initial stipulations of the research program.

The transition from the empirical to the theoretical stages in science and the development of mature science are a very complex and difficult process. It always presumes as a premise the use of conceptual principles and methodological stipulations, and the development of a type of style of thinking which could open new possibilities in science. Philosophical principles and categories play a leading role in this set of ideological-conceptual and methodological premises which determine the development of theoretical science. We know what guiding, heuristic role the philosophical-methodological principles of dialectical materialism played in the theoretical system of capitalist political economy created by Marx. The solution of a number of most essential theoretical problems which were the stumbling stone of Marx's predecessors such as, for example, the study of a law in its pure aspect and specific forms, the study of so-called converted aspects, and so on, is directly linked with Marx's creative application of dialectical methodological principles. In our time the development of science, particularly in the field of the study of social phenomena, in the direction of its ever greater theorization, is equally impossible on any base other than that of the principles of dialectical materialism.

The further development of the theoretical apparatus of science and the establishment of new theoretical methods and styles of thinking (probabilities, systems-structural approach) presume the philosophical interpretation of the initial categories and principles of contemporary scientific knowledge (such as, for example, a study of the forms of determinism typical of modern science). Philosophy plays a great role also in interpreting the purely methodological problems of individual sciences (general problems of the correlation between theory and experiment, criteria of the theoretical nature of knowledge, types of theoretical scientific explanation, and so on).

The development of a level of cognitive activities relatively independent of experience and empiricism at a given stage of science leads to the fact that the structure of the correlation between the theoretical and the empirical becomes more complex compared with its empirical stage. It is precisely on the theoretical stage of science that the complex dialectics of the interaction between these two components is manifested. On the one hand, it offers scientific thinking the possibility to achieve the most complete and profound knowledge of reality; on the other, it raises new serious problems concerning specific scientific studies and philosophy. Such problems are due, above all, to the fact that at the theoretical stage of science the merger, the direct link between the conceptual content of science and experimental data, is violated.

Such a situation frequently appears in the field of advanced mathematics in the natural sciences, when mathematical formalisms and models corresponding to the natural processes become the foundations of theoretical elaborations in science, and when the initial problem is no longer a search for an empirical interpretation of a theoretical physical content but the finding of a physical meaning of a certain mathematical structure. In his time the famous Soviet physicist L. I. Mandel'shtam emphasized

that whereas classical physics laid the beginning of physical theory and, subsequently, of the mathematical apparatus, for which reason the meaning of physical values was clear from the very beginning, contemporary theoretical physics has followed a different path: "today, above all, an effort is made to guess at a mathematical apparatus operating with values whose full or partial meaning is not clear in advance" (L. I. Mandel'shtam, "Lektsii po Optike, Teorii Otnositel'nosti i Kvantovoy Mekhanike" [Lectures on Optics, Theory of Relativity, and Quantum Mechanics], Nauka, Moscow, 1972, p 329). It is important to emphasize that finding a physical interpretation of the mathematical apparatus in modern physics may not be reduced to determining the simple correlation between a mathematical concept and a pre-established physical meaning, but is a complex creative and constructive process of elaboration of a physics theory.

The ability to think scientifically at the theoretical stage of science leading to the development of a conceptual apparatus which would outstrip the process of conceptual interpretations determines the active and guiding nature of theoretical research compared with empirical research. At the theoretical stage of science empirical research frequently resolves the problems formulated by the theoreticians. Thus, the experimental discovery of elementary particles such as neutrinos, positrons, mesons, and others, was accomplished later on the basis of the theoretical prediction of their existence. Naturally, it would be erroneous to absolutize the process. We must not forget that far from all sciences have reached the stage of theorization and mathematization reached by contemporary theoretical physics. However, orienting empirical research toward theory is a major trend in the development of contemporary scientific thinking. This trend clearly reveals the creative and heuristic nature of scientific knowledge and its ability to achieve an anticipatory reflection of reality in the direct practical interaction between subject and object.

Furthermore, the interaction between theory and empiricism at the stage of theoretical science mandatorily presumes a feedback from empiricism to theory. Such feedback is the most important factor in the development and advancement of the theoretical apparatus of science. The elaboration of theory without the use of empiricism, through the mental experimentation already discussed, is a separate preliminary stage in the development of theoretical science. It prevails in the course of the process of the establishment of the "initial nucleus" of the theoretical system. The subsequent process of the development of the theoretical system as a research program presumes the constant use of experimental data, their assimilation and proper enrichment, and the concretizing of the theoretical system itself. This process obeys the general laws governing the ascension from the abstract to the concrete described by Marx as a characteristic feature of theoretical thinking. Pitting the dialectical-materialistic understanding of the process of knowledge as movement against the Hegelian categories of its objective-idealistic interpretation, as we know, Marx emphasized that "in no case is this the product of a concept considered and developed outside contemplation and conceptualization but the contemplation and conceptualization reworked into a concept" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 12, p 727). This is achieved through the feedback between theory and

empiricism, through the advancement of the theoretical apparatus under the influence of the results of the empirical investigation of theory.

Therefore, the basic circumstance that empirical research is not something external in terms of theoretical thinking or the study of the nature of concepts themselves clearly shows at the stage of theoretical science. Empirical research is a necessary prerequisite for the existence of theoretical knowledge as knowledge of objective reality, for it insures the use of the apparatus of theoretical concepts in the study of reality through observation and experimentation. Empirical and theoretical research are two equally necessary and interdependent directions in scientific thinking. One of them has to do with the application of the scientific conceptual apparatus to external reality while the other deals with its development and improvement. The conflict between these two necessary aspects of scientific thinking is one of the motive forces for its development and is, essentially, a form of expression within science of the contradictions between the subject and object of knowledge and between the ideal and the physical.

The study of the problem of the theoretical and the empirical in scientific knowledge shows, therefore, that being in its specific manifestations an internal scientific problem, it is basically linked with the main philosophical problems. Using the study of this problem as an example, we have tried to prove that, in the final account, the specific methodological aspect of scientific knowledge is necessarily linked with basic philosophical-gnosiological problems whose study is the subject of dialectical materialism. Therefore dialectical materialism acts as a general methodological foundation for scientific research. The philosophical-gnosiological consideration of the theoretical and the empirical as necessary and interdependent components of scientific thinking is one of the prerequisites for its useful development.

5003
CSO: 1802

CONTINUAL CREATIVE SEARCH

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77 pp 82-90

[Article by A. Karganov]

[Text] True art is created only through creative search. The power of its social influence is acquired with the organic combination of skill with the interested, passionate, and ideological purposeful knowledge of our time and of factual processes.

The creative search of cinematographers in recent decades played a great role in mastering the contemporary possibilities of the art of motion pictures. The range of topics in Soviet cinematography has broadened. New characters have emerged on the screen with their daily problems familiar to the audience. Arguments against the superficial, showy, monumental cinematographic character, and against the simplification of life in the spirit of the "theory" of no conflict have intensified. Greater attention is being paid to the inner world of man, the complex processes of character development, to molding the socialist personality, and to its social and moral development. However, this new progress achieved by the motion pictures has not been identically successful in all directions. In the 1960's one could frequently see on the screen films in which the search for a new movie language seemed separated from concern for the audience. This hardly worried the movie workers who assumed that the motion picture must go forth looking at no one and taking nothing into consideration: a movie without an audience may be a nuisance but a movie without art is trouble . . .

Regardless of all the dangers of the esthetic "tailism," and the constant adaptation to the demands of the public, such an approach to the problem "motion picture and audience" could not gain the support of most of the real masters of the screen. Obviously, in the process of the dynamics of an art (an absolute law for its normal existence!) it is always important to take into consideration the development of the spiritual and emotional world of the masses. The history of art and its contemporary practice are familiar with cases of the cinematographer "running away" from the audience. In such cases, however, the inevitable question is always raised: where is such art "running away" from the audience going? Will it be taking a path

where the audience could catch up with it? Or else, would it take different paths, thus offering the "runaway" the doubtful pleasure of proud loneliness?

We know from the history of the motion picture that in the process of the renovation of its language and style there occur changes and discoveries which remain on the level of innovations for their own sake. Their glory, however great it might be initially, is ephemeral, for it is supported only by changing fashion. They lack the necessary information which would spiritually enrich the audience. They do not excite or affect the depth of feelings. They merely sooth one's esthetic vaingloriousness and trigger the vanity in pursuit of the exaggerated contemporaneity of cinematographic structures and audience predilections. Historically meaningful discoveries offer a promise, increased effectiveness, and relative stability. Their fruitfulness is hardly always detected at a glance. However, if they are rooted in life and meet the esthetic needs of the contemporary audience (even though not realized until the end), they find a way to the human mind and feelings. They would find such a way even though initially they may appear rather unexpected and strange, irritating through their daring innovation those who are particularly attracted to the familiar.

The attractiveness of an innovation does not have absolute stylized formulas. Any innovation, any discovery, naturally, including those which appeared in the 60's, could not claim to being universal and mandatory. Errors in the assessment of one or another step in a motion picture are made particularly frequently when its discoveries are absolutized. Absolutizing a given principle turns it into a general criterion. The automatic nature of its effect is emphasized and the role of the subject of the creative process is belittled. The fact that the same principle or system of motion picture thinking is manifested differently in different artists is either ignored or insufficiently considered even though such principles and thoughts fully reflect their positions, attitude toward art, and individual inclinations and characteristics. For example, the critics have frequently pointed out that in some cases documentaries are used to assert the truth and bring art further closer to reality. Under different circumstances they become a simple mannerism, playing at contemporaneity. In yet other cases their purpose is to justify the amateurish approach or storytelling presented as reality. It also frequently happens that even serious artists who avoid mannerisms and fashion and need no alibis whatever rely excessively on the documentary style: in their desire to achieve it they lower their search for originality and for means with which to achieve the concentration of a playwright or a director. Unable to notice this themselves, they make their art superficial--observing and accurate in the details, natural and organic in the depiction of life and its external manifestations, but shallow in terms of the study and analysis of the depicted subject, and insufficiently focused on "unraveling the poetry" of the phenomena of reality, processes, and characters.

Could it be that the present return to strict directing was caused by such an excessive emphasis on documentary pictures? Could it be that, as was frequently the case in the past, some modern directors are urging on the search for figurativeness, concentrating the screen action and its graphic texture in the "essence," in clearly and expressively organized frames and their superimposed combinations, transferring to the motion picture the purely theatrical means for setting a stage or an event? They do not reject the authenticity of depictions on the screen and take into consideration the experience related to the use of the documentary style. Yet, in their interpretation the screen is no longer a simple reflection of life.

Such an emphasis on "forced" directing marks movies such as Yu. Il'yenko's "White Bird with Black Markings," T. Abuladze's "Request," E. Shengelay's "Eccentrics," A. Mikhalkov-Konchalovskiy's "Song of Those in Love," E. Lotyan's "The Gypsy Camp is Rising to the Sky," and others. The making of such films by various national movie industries confirms the fact that a new current has developed in the movie making process, a new trend, neither all-embracing nor restricting the others yet already quite clear and strong. It is entirely understandable that the most important if not decisive factor in the perception and influence of a motion picture is the correlation between its topic--not planned but embodied, and its idea--not given in advance but convincing with the truth of art, and the vital interests, observations, and emotions of the audience. The contemporaneity of a motion picture is determined above all by the extent to which it is consistent with the social, moral, spiritual, and emotional experience of the viewer, and the extent to which it can guess the dynamics of his interests and requirements, responding not only to those of them which have already developed, but also those now being developed.

The social nature itself and ideological and esthetic trend followed by the Soviet motion picture predetermine its particular interest in our contemporary who is building a new life and molding himself as a communist personality. The topic of labor implementing the constructive and creative objectives of the Great Revolution is traditional of the Soviet cinema. Already in films made in the 1930's, such as A. Dovzhenko's "Earth," N. Ekk's "Pass for Life," F. Ermler's and S. Yutkevich's "Contrary," D. Vertov's "Three Songs about Lenin" and "Donbas Symphony," S. Gerasimov's "Komsomol'sk," I. Kheyfits's and A. Zarkh's "Member of the Cabinet," L. Lukov's "The Big Life," I. Pyr'yev's "Tractor Drivers," and F. Ermler's "The Great Citizen," it assumed a powerful and original development. The Soviet cinema is developing cinematographically virgin lands, opening to the world's screen previously unknown characters, and presenting in a new life labor which, for centuries, was considered a burden and a pain--the bitter share of anyone who had been unable to succeed and who could earn his daily bread only through exhausting physical efforts.

On the Soviet screen labor is presented as a socially conscious action capable of becoming a source of happiness and a matter of honor. The camera shows how man rises above the horizons of private ownership thinking to

discover the true meaning and purpose of labor for the sake of socialism, and see in it not only the source of his material prosperity and of social wealth but a means for social self-assertion. The motion picture shows how the yardstick of labor becomes a yardstick of human dignity, the way labor makes life interesting, meaningful, and significant. A new awareness of labor and a new attitude toward it are revealed in the process of development not as a structured value but as a reality developed by life.

The processes occurring in the mature socialist society and the activities of the party aimed at improving the scientific principles of management and at upgrading the creative activeness of the working people in the struggle for work effectiveness and quality have a major impact on today's motion picture as it addresses itself to the topics of labor and the image of the working person. The CPSU Central Committee decree "On Measures for the Further Development of Soviet Cinematography" provided the Soviet motion picture workers with a powerful impulse and wise guideline.

Should the creative method of our cinema in its contemporary movement have needed further descriptions we could add to its traditional definition the word "analytical." The motion picture is penetrating ever more deeply the complex processes of the social and economic development of Soviet society. It is studying human characters and relations as they influence such processes and are dependent on them. Both on the screen and in life many daily labor problems shift to the realm of spiritual creativity, to the realm of morality. The processes governing the development of the socialist individual, intensifying, and enriching the feeling of responsibility of the working man for everything occurring in our society and, on a broader level, for the entire course of contemporary history, are being studied with increased attention.

In the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th Party Congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that in the new works of socialist realism "ever more frequently and, above all, more profoundly we find a response to the main, the essential aspects of the country's life, a response to what has become part of the individual destinies of the Soviet people." In this context Leonid Il'ich especially singled out the production topic: "today this topic has assumed a truly artistic form. Together with heroes of literature or the stage we are living and reacting to the success of steel smelters, textile factory directors, engineers, or party workers. Even a seemingly individual case such as the question of a bonus to be awarded to a construction workers brigade assumes a broad social significance and becomes the topic of heated discussions."

Speaking of the latest motion pictures on the production topic let us name, above all, "The Prize" (scenario by A. Gel'man, directed by S. Mikaelyan), "The Old Walls" (scenario by A. Grebnev, directed by V. Tregubovich), "Reception Day for Personal Matters" (scenario by P. Popogrebskiy, directed by S. Shuster), and "Personal Opinion" (scenario by V. Chernykh, directed by Yu. Karasik).

What is their unifying feature? Above all it is the contemporary approach of the artist to life, the ability to choose within it the type of processes, situations, and conflicts which embody the truly essential trends of the scientific and technical revolution under socialist conditions.

Today's motion picture is reaching new heights in its treatment of the production topic as a result of the new rapprochement which has taken place between art and the people's life. Situations and conflicts not only taken from life but which represent the most characteristic processes and progressive trends of our time have been used as the plots of the best motion pictures. Their development and results attract the audience with their social, economic, and moral meaning; interesting for their own sake, and intensified by their presentation on the screen, they become significant. New possibilities arise for the social and moral "identification" of the viewer with the characters, becoming an organic part of the perception of the movie even when the audience sees on the screen characters representing a different professional environment, distinct from their specific production environment and personal experience.

Long experience in movie making has taught us that almost all very successful motion pictures, caused by the discovery of new topics and characters and the mastery of new vital problems, lead to extensions and imitations. Frequently we have seen on our screen (and in the theater) the appearance of similar works based on famous examples. The danger that yet another such imitation will appear is real. It was mentioned sharply and most frankly at the Third Congress of USSR Cinematographers. The problem becomes even more significant when it becomes a question of the production topic which is of basic importance to our cinematographers: we should not allow it to be depreciated by the invasion of dogmas and stereotypes.

The depiction of a person in the realm of labor creativity and within the system of relations developing in the workers collective, and the assertion of the social and moral values of existing socialism is a difficult task by virtue of its "virginity," and lack of precedence. However, it is also infinitely interesting. Resolving it, both the Soviet motion picture and the other socialist cinematographies have had no one to rely on or benefit from the use of foreign experience. They have had to rely essentially on themselves, on their own traditions. For this reason it is even more important to develop and support creative searches in this direction.

In our theoretical and critical considerations of the production topic we can not fail to consider the fact that the interest currently displayed in it is encouraged not only by the changes in the art itself which has found new forms for its presentation. In the course of developing the mature socialist society substantial changes are taking place in the social thinking of the audience. The interest of the people in the affairs of their plant, sovkhos, kolkhoz, institute, or anything taking place at other enterprises and establishments is becoming energized and intensified. Every day the understanding of our contemporary, backed and enriched by

social practice to the effect that production development determines not only his personal life or the available merchandise in the stores, but also the prosperity of the entire country, its international prestige and significance, and its role in the materialization of detente and in the struggle for peace throughout the world, is deepening.

The artistic elaboration of the topic of labor, and of the character of the working person is organically linked with the topic of morality and moral search. "Nothing enhances the individual so much," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 25th Party Congress, formulating moral education tasks, "as the active vital position, the conscientious attitude toward social duty, when the unity between word and deed becomes a daily norm of behavior." In such a broad and truly realistic understanding moral education becomes closely interwoven with political and labor education. It can not be separated from them like a lesson in the classroom with its specific subject and time limits: socialism has blended morality with politics and social and private life with the help of many ties, and has energized their interpretation.

In his time A. M. Gor'kiy wrote of the destruction of the personality under the conditions of a philistine-bourgeois existence. Socialism not only "restores" the personality but creates factual prerequisites for an unparalleled enhancement of the working person. The all-round development of the individual is encouraged and supported by the entire system through which society influences man: labor, education, and ideological and cultural-educational work. Society helps its citizens to bring closer the world of feelings to the world of thoughts in a new experience of reality and of their place within this reality. The age old aspiration of the working person to be the maker of life and its master becomes reality. He participates in the development of society not only as the object of its influence but also as the subject of the building of life. Individually he masters everything given to him by society and gives it back to society enriched: ennobling the individual, human labor, concentrating his social and moral experience and spiritual and moral qualities, ennoble society.

The truly realistic elaboration of the topic of morality and of moral searches requires the comprehensive study of such interactions. This does not mean that politics and morality, private life and social labor must be present in a full and precisely computed selection and in even proportions in any given work. However, even when the artist focuses on one thing only he can not truly penetrate into the human characters without taking into consideration the sum total of relationships between man and society.

The meaningfulness of the characters in the motion pictures "At the Lake" by S. Gerasimov, "Love of Man," "Daughters and Mothers," "Let us Survive Until Monday," "White Bim Black Ear" by S. Rostotskiy, "Red Guelder Rose" by V. Shukshin, "Afonya" by G. Danely, "Monologue" and "Someone Else's Letters" by I. Averbakh, "Lottery Drawing" by V. Men'shov, "Not Transferable Key" by D. Asanova, "A Word in Defence" by V. Abdrashidov, "Spring

"Call" by P. Lyubimov, "Podranki" by N. Gubenko, and "Sunday Night" by V. Turov is greatly determined by the fact that we consider context--the time of action, the environment surrounding the characters, and the atmosphere of life--through conflicts and human relations depicted on the screen.

In its best works on topics of morality and moral searches the Soviet cinematographers act as analysts and critics. This is a rather fruitful combination of functions, for the sentences and assessments of one or another phenomenon in life, moral virtue or defect, or deformities mean little to the audience which is tuned to the truth unless based on a profound knowledge of what is depicted, and unless the artist is able to involve the audience in the cognitive process. Ready-made truths or conclusions can not have the convincing power of those found in the course of searches, in the course of checking initial considerations and guesses through the knowledge and experience of the depicted life: the "reaching" of the truth intensifies it. Such is the mentality of the contemporary audience which can not be ignored by the motion picture. In turn, a study deprived of critical pathos can not be valuable, for its screen presentation becomes most frequently an indifferent description. Furthermore, the knowledge and depiction of something good without loving it prevents us from revealing its beauty, while the knowledge and depiction of the bad without its active rejection prevent us to understand fully the nature of this phenomenon and the danger it contains.

This combination of knowledge and evaluation has been manifested with inordinate interest in the motion pictures of V. Shukshin, in terms of scenarios, directing, and acting. His approach to life and art is drastically individual. Despite the uniqueness of his style, however, he expresses in his own way the very important methodological characteristics of the Soviet cinema.

In his works Shukshin engages in a serious and conscientious discussion with life. He addresses himself to the audience not simply as an observer but as a co-participant. No temptations and traps are necessary in attracting such an audience. Its participation is gained by the intimate dialogue, by its directness and its frankness.

It has long been noted that the constant aspiration toward simple and familiar concepts of the world is inherent in the daily awareness, including the artistic creativity which remains on the level of such an awareness. Encountering the novelty of unfamiliar phenomena, a person hastens to find similar explaining situations and to place what he has seen in the channel of already familiar patterns. The conflicting variety of life and its complex cycles are reduced to tried models and common denominators. Such a systematization of reality performs a useful service. Yet, it also frequently leads to the simplistic and artificial perception of life: concepts are converted into cliches, models lose their mobility, while common denominators conceal the living originality of phenomena, facts, and characters. In its extreme manifestations, this trend begins with a "hibernation of the

mind" which finds tranquility in familiar frozen formulas. Yet, if no such extremes are reached, the cognitive process constantly needs stimulation and excitement.

Vasilii Shukshin is a fighter for the art for the thinking man facing him with paradoxical situations which disturb the tranquil and even course of his thoughts and feelings. His works do not contain easy plots but the restlessness of the difficult search. Life's phenomena are revealed in their complexity which is always richer than the law which can encompass merely their essence. The characters of his personages frequently do not fit the frameworks and parameters of social types: Shukshin loves the uniqueness of the individual case. He loves unexpected and unusual characters and people with puzzling oddities. Nearly everyone of Shukshin's characters represents both a specific fate and the question of the purpose of man, of the meaning of human existence.

Along with motion pictures dealing with labor, morality, and moral search, frequently, as in the past, we see movies dealing with recent history-- the great exploit of the Soviet people in the struggle against fascism. Films such as "Liberation" by Yu. Ozerov, "They Fought for the Homeland" by S. Bondarchuk, "Aty-Baty, the Soldiers Went" by L. Bykov, "The Alarming Month of Veresen'" by L. Osyk, the trilogy "The Ballad of Kovpak" by P. Levchuk, "The Soldier Marched . . ." by K. Simonov and M. Babak, "The Ascent" by L. Shepit'ko, and "Twenty Days without War" by A. German are of great importance to the effective implementation by the motion picture of its educational tasks and objectives. When the screen describes the war in the language of true art it reveals to the contemporary audience the characters of those who defeated fascism, and the courageous selflessness, fearlessness, and readiness and ability to withstand all trials for the sake of victory, displayed in the difficult events of the war. Examples of idea-mindedness and patriotism, socialist internationalism, and humanism depicted in the characters on the screen, become alive to the audience.

The lessons of the war recreated by the motion picture help us to develop the historical thinking of our contemporaries. Under conditions governed by the confrontation between the two world systems and the expanded front and increased complexity of the ideological struggle these lessons assume an enhanced social, moral, and psychological value. Forgetting the past conceals many dangers. It is particularly important now that people of all generations, thinking of current affairs and concerned with current practical interests, consider their current life in the context of history. Historical thinking is the most important part of the spiritual life of the people. It helps us to see more clearly the past, understand the present more profoundly, and establish the coordinates of the future more accurately. Historical thinking pitted against narrow and superficial pragmatism and time-serving makes a person socially more experienced, more vigilant, and wiser.

Thinking of the unfading significance of the war topic in Soviet cinematography we should not ignore the important circumstance that the events and

facts of the war and the behavior of man at war provide the motion picture with most interesting material. The "play of life" enriches it with acute conflicts and clashes and with the characters of people placed under circumstances of most difficult trials, circumstances in which a person must show everything he is capable of and even more, exceeding, if necessary, the measure and limits of previously established possibilities and readiness.

The internationalism of Soviet motion pictures, imbuing pictures on workers and soldiers, is directly expressed in motion pictures dealing with the struggle for peace, the social and national liberation of the peoples, and the international solidarity of the working people.

A comparison among films following different thematic directions shows that, as in the past, far from all searches and discoveries of contemporary cinematography are immediately accepted by the audience. The study of the inner logic and context of their manifestation, and of their transformations and perspectives is very important. Today such a study assumes even greater significance, for tens of millions of new people have become, thanks to television, an audience, consumers of the "audio visual culture." Let us not be misled: many of them do not possess as yet an adequately developed ability for the aesthetic perception of its true values. There are frequent cases in which the aesthetic level of a person lags behind his political and social self-awareness. There are frequent cases in which people who can read can not see. Consequently, they are more interested, both in movies and on the television, with faultless comedies or dynamic adventure motion pictures with easily understandable topics. They show little interest in serious and truly profound pictures which require active thinking and feelings and a psychologically tense dialogue with both the author and the characters.

Yet, despite all the complexities of the interrelationship between the motion picture and today's audience, the motion picture workers must bear in mind that they are working precisely for today's audience and not for an imaginary one. They must think of the fact that the best motion pictures, even those with very complex topics, thoughts, and screen presentation of life, draw millions of people if they are made in accordance with the spiritual and emotional features of the contemporary audience and its various requirements.

The perception of a motion picture depends on the social and cultural context within which it appears. Such a perception is effected by a number of factors, not only those related to the extent to which its characters match the spiritual experience and practical observations of the audience. The impact is created by the entire structure of the work and leisure time of modern man, including the budgeting of leisure time. There is television, the press, and the radio. There is the enthusiasm, yearning, popularity, and intensiveness of sports. It would seem quite difficult to compare watching a motion picture and sitting in a sports stadium or in front of the television set during soccer or hockey games. Nevertheless, even the very initial studies of social psychology (as yet not widespread in our

country) indicate that the attractiveness of sports not only deprives the motion picture of a considerable percentage of the leisure time of the audience but has a certain impact on its orientation, tastes, moods, and demand for shows, including motion pictures. Despite the entire significance of outside influences on the perception of a motion picture, the motion picture itself develops its own audience.

The existing complexity of its relations with the public does not mean that it should abandon the search and dull the pathos of self renovation. Such a search is necessary if the art is not to become stagnant and find itself tomorrow rejected by that same audience which today grumbles at some of its innovations. However, undertaking such a search and engaging, if necessary, even in laboratory experimentation, it must always remember how necessary and important is an "experiment understood by millions of people" (this statement by Eyzenshteyn is equally valid today), and how important it is for the modern discoveries and possibilities of the motion picture to enable the mass audience to achieve a spiritual understanding and an emotional perception.

We know from A. V. Lunacharskiy's memoirs that, discussing the organization of the motion pictures industry in the country at the beginning of 1922, V. I. Lenin told the people's commissar the following: "In our country you have the reputation of a patron of the arts. Therefore, you must firmly bear in mind that the most important of all arts to us is the motion picture" ("Samoye Vazhnoye iz Vsekh Iskusstv. Lenin o Kino" [The Most Important of All Arts. Lenin on the Motion Picture], Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1973, p 164).

This definition is frequently disputed by some of our foreign colleagues, even by those who are friendly disposed toward us. The logic of the judgment of our opponents is simple: Lenin spoke of the importance of the motion picture at a time when, under the conditions of almost total illiteracy, it was the most effective means of information, education, and propaganda, and, to many people, the only "window opening to culture." Today the situation has changed radically. Illiteracy was eliminated in the course of the cultural revolution. Books became widespread and the people have begun to turn more frequently to music, painting, and the theater. This was followed by television. Its mass popularity triggered new changes in cultural "consumption": taking over a considerable share of man's leisure time it reduced the share of books and the other arts, including the motion picture. The size of the television public has long surpassed that of the movies.

In the formulation of such concepts no account is taken of the contemporary conceptual parameters and their changing content. It is self evident that in the course of our considerations and thoughts on the importance of the motion picture we should be discussing not production technology or the showing of motion pictures but cinematography as an art with its generic characteristics and features. As we know, television is a complex and

many-tiered phenomenon which can not be covered by the concept of "art" alone, for it shows a great variety of programs. Many of them do not even claim to come close to the aesthetic structures of art. Yet, there are also programs structured precisely according to the laws of art. In such a case they resemble the motion picture by virtue of their very nature: the screen influences the audience through the directness of the moving camera; this influence is increased by changes in backgrounds, cuts, and montages . . . television programs become very similar when films produced for television are shown, as they could have no rhythms or arrangements different from those used in motion pictures. They may show a different correlation among big, medium, and general shots. Yet, all these are nuances while I speak of the deep laws and principles which determine the nature and specifics of motion pictures.

Turning to the problem of relations between the motion picture and television we must also remember that television frequently shows regular motion pictures. Shown on television such pictures suffer certain aesthetic losses, for their structures have been based on different technical conditions and screen sizes (in such cases color wide screen motion pictures are the big losers). However, they gain a great deal as well, for television greatly increases the size of the movie audience.

However, the contemporary significance of cinematography does not lend itself to simple statistical computations. It is clear to anyone that the success of a good motion picture is, above all, a cultural success. We are not indifferent to the size of the audience in movie theaters and the number of people tied to the small television screen. However, we are particularly interested in the end results of the exposure of the audience to the motion picture--in the crop of thoughts and feelings it has harvested, and in what it has left in the human soul.

It is entirely understandable that the implementation of Lenin's idea of bringing art closer to the people and the people closer to art is directly linked--speaking of cinematography--with the spiritual and cultural development of the viewing public.

As we know, a motion picture synthesizes the possibilities of literature, the theater, painting, music, and the other arts, respectively changing and unifying them. It shows its synthetic nature in its universal impact on the spiritual and emotional world of man. The contemporary perception of a film is enriched by extensive reading, theater attendance, and the unparalleled popularization of music and painting . . . it is enriched by the socio-historical experience of the audience whose vital observations, impressions, and emotions invariably participate in the perception of a film.

Therefore, the popularity, accessibility, and synthetic nature of the motion picture as an art--the main features in determining its position and significance in social life--acquire today new qualities. This means that changes in the art of the motion picture itself could be truly understood

and appreciated in their new dimensions and new qualities such as modern content and thoughts on the importance of the motion picture only by considering together the spiritual and emotional development of today's audience and the sociological and psychological aspects of the perception of a film. This means that cinematography could develop normally only through its constant interaction with the public, gaining new heights in its social significance and impact.

The Tenth Moscow International Motion Picture Festival was held recently. Its participants and guests welcomed with emotion and satisfaction the message of greetings sent by L. I. Brezhnev. It indicated, yet once again, how highly our party and people appreciate the role of the motion picture in the life of society and in the struggle for peace, humanism, and social progress. Since the festival took place on the eve of the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution, in addition to traditional discussions based on the theme of the festival, there was a retrospective showing of the best Soviet pictures of the past and, immediately after the festival, an international symposium of motion picture experts and critics was held on the influence of the ideas of the October Revolution and of Soviet cinematography on the world's cinematographic process. These new encounters between foreign cinematographers and the Soviet cinema on the eve of the anniversary assumed particular importance, emphasizing the universal significance of the creative searches and discoveries of the masters of the Soviet screen.

As to the Soviet viewer, today he is exposed not only to the new works of our cinematography but to all its past achievements thanks to the power of television. The big and small screens offer him as a cinematographic chronicle the course of the revolution, and the building of socialism and communism--the history of our victories summed up in the draft of the new USSR Constitution. Today's work done by Soviet cinematographers is checked against the rich traditions of the Soviet motion picture, the high criteria of the truth of life and ideological purposefulness, and the ties with the life of the country. The time requires the use of a new measure of their responsibility to the party and the people.

5003
CSO: 1802

LOYAL KNIGHT OF THE PROLETARIAT; ON THE CENTENNIAL OF F. E. DZERZHINSKIY'S BIRTH

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77, pp 91-100

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

[Text] An unparalleled event occurred in May 1902 at the Aleksandrovsкая Central Deportation Jail near Irkutsk. Protesting the refusal of the prison's administration to inform them of their place of exile, the political prisoners expelled the guards, raised on the gates the red flag with the word "Freedom!" on it, and proclaimed the prison a republic. The governor of Irkutsk ordered that the "rebels" be deprived of food and water for the duration of the "troubles." However, the inmates held on firmly for three days and yielded only when the administration satisfied their demands. This political protest demonstration was headed by 24 year old Feliks Dzerzhinskiy, the future outstanding leader of the Communist Party and Soviet State, a member of the great galaxy of revolutionaries-Leninists.

Feliks Edmundovich Dzerzhinskiy was born on 11 September (Gregorian calendar) 1877 to a family of a member of the low Polish nobility, a teacher of physics and mathematics, in the Dzerzhinovo country seat, Oshmyanskiy Uyezd, Vilenskaya Guberniya (today Stolbtsovskiy Rayon, Minskaya Oblast, Belorussian SSR). The father died when the child was not even five years old. The mother was left to care for eight children.

Feliks's childhood was spent in the conditions of the difficult and rightless life of the people and fierce autocratic oppression. "Already then," Dzerzhinskiy wrote later, "my heart and my mind sensitively reacted to any injustice or insult felt by the people. I hated evil." In 1894 17 year old Feliks Dzerzhinskiy, seventh grade student at the Vil'nyus High School, joined a clandestine social democratic self-education circle and the very autumn of the following year joined the ranks of the Lithuanian social democratic movement, gravitating toward its leftist internationalist wing. Believing that faith in the victory of socialism "must be followed by action, and that one must be closer to the masses and learn from them," Feliks dropped out in his last year of high school and chose the path of the professional revolutionary. He dedicated his entire tireless energy and talent as a fighter to the great cause of the social liberation of the working class and the working people.

Dzerzhinskiy's revolutionary activities took place initially in Vil'no, followed by Kovno, Warsaw, and other Polish and Lithuanian cities. He disseminated the ideas of Marxism among the workers and participated in the organization of strikes and demonstrations.

In 1902 Dzerzhinskiy was elected secretary of the Foreign Lands Committee of the Social Democrats of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania and, one year later, as member of the Main Board of the SDKPiL [Social Democratic Party of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania]. He became one of the most noted leaders of the party.

Dzerzhinskiy's outstanding organizational talent was displayed already then. Local party groups were set up with his direct participation. He frequently visited various Polish and Lithuanian cities carrying out important and dangerous assignments such as rebuilding party organizations dismembered by the police. The young revolutionary properly coped with assignments such as organizing in Krakow (at that time in Austria-Hungary) the publication of the central organ of the SDKPiL CHERVONY SHTANDAR ("Red Flag") and the clandestine shipping of the newspaper into Polish territory. He was also entrusted with the party's funds.

Dzerzhinskiy actively participated in the work of congresses and conferences of the SDKPiL. He dedicated a great deal of effort to coordinate the activities of the SDKPiL and the RSDWP, supporting the idea of their organizational unification on a Marxist platform.

From an early age he showed the desire steadily to add to his knowledge. He made a thorough study of Marxist political economy and displayed great interest in problems of philosophy and the history of the revolutionary movement. As S. Bobinskiy, one of the noted leaders of the SDKPiL, recalls, Feliks Edmundovich "never allowed a slighting or simply superficial attitude toward theoretical knowledge."

From the very beginning of his revolutionary activities Dzerzhinskiy firmly adopted V. I. Lenin's ideological position. He supported Lenin's views on the significance of the political struggle of the working class, the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, and the need for the creation of a revolutionary Marxist party of a new type. He adamantly fought all manifestations of nationalism and called for the international unification of all the peoples of the country to engage jointly in the struggle against tsarism. However, like other SDKPiL leaders--R. Luxemburg, Ya. Tyshke, Yu. Markhlevskiy, and A. Varskiy--he did not share as yet Lenin's program demand of the right of nations to self-determination, believing that this right would benefit the Polish nationalist bourgeoisie. Dzerzhinskiy abandoned his erroneous viewpoint after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

In April 1906 he participated in the work of the Fourth (unifying) Congress of the RSDWP. It was then that he met Lenin for the first time and became one of his closest fellow workers. The SDKPiL and the RSDWP merged at the

congress. After the congress Dzerzhinskiy became a member of the RSDWP Central Committee as representative of the SDKPiL and an editor of its central organ. He went to Petersburg and participated in the work of the RSDWP Central Committee and central organ. He engaged in an adamant struggle against the Mensheviks, defending the principled Leninist positions on the further development of the revolution. In 1907 the Fifth (London) RSDWP Congress elected Dzerzhinskiy member of the Central Committee in absentia.

During the period of reaction and subsequent revolutionary upsurge Dzerzhinskiy firmly followed Lenin's line of safeguarding and strengthening the clandestine party organizations, combining legal with clandestine forms of work, and preparing new mass revolutionary actions. He tirelessly fought the liquidationists, otzovists, and conciliationists. He exposed Trotsky's anti-party activities, since, while proclaiming his "affiliation with no faction," in fact Trotsky supported the liquidationists. "We must declare war to death to the 'spokesman,' to the conciliationists, to the exiled intellectuals who rummage in the dirty laundry," wrote Dzerzhinskiy to Ya. Tyshke, in June 1910. In another letter addressed to the Main Board of the SDKPiL, dated the end of December 1910, he called for support for the Bolshevik RABOCHAYA GAZETA and for no cooperation whatever with Trotsky's factional newspaper. "The time has come," Dzerzhinskiy wrote, "to cut off the nose of such gas-bags. Their slighting of the ideological struggle against the liquidationists and their claims concerning their 'work' which, in my view, is futile, is causing tremendous harm to the party." He also firmly opposed the various manifestations of opportunism within the ranks of the SDKPiL.

Dzerzhinskiy's life and activities in the underground are an unparalleled exploit for the sake of the revolution. The police arrested him six times. He was sentenced to exile three times and, risking his life, three times he escaped in order to continue his heroic struggle. Feliks Edmundovich spent in jail, exile, and forced labor 11 years, or almost one quarter of his life. "This is the last day of 1908," he wrote in the diary he kept in the tenth wing of the Warsaw Citadel. "This is the fifth time that I welcome a new year in jail (1898, 1901, 1902, and 1907). The first time was 11 years ago. I matured in jail in the pains of loneliness and yearning for the world and life. Despite this, I have never questioned the justice of our cause. Now, when perhaps all hopes have been buried in floods of blood for years on end, hanging on the gallows, and when many thousands of fighters for freedom are wasting away in jails or in the snowy tundras of Siberia, I am proud. I see the huge masses already in motion shaking up the old system--the masses among which new forces are being trained for the new struggle. I am proud of being with them and of seeing, feeling, and understanding the fact that I myself have suffered greatly together with them. Here, in jail, things are frequently difficult and, at times, even frightful...Nevertheless, if I had to begin my life again I would have done the same, not because of duty or obligation. To me this is an organic need."

Dzerzhinskiy's prison diaries and the letters which he sent to his friends from jail and exile breathe cheerfulness and optimism, and unshakeable faith

in the victory of the revolution. Locked in the tsarist cells he prophetically predicted the imminence of the overthrow of the old system. "Life would not be worth living," Feliks Edmundovich wrote, "if mankind had not been illumined by the star of socialism, the star of the future."

The February revolution freed Dzerzhinskiy from the hard labor term he was serving in Moscow, in the Butyrki Jail. He was not even 40 years old but had already accumulated 21 years of revolutionary struggle.

Dzerzhinskiy joined the struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia with a double amount of energy. He addressed workers' and soldiers' meetings in Moscow almost daily, exposing the anti-people's policy of the bourgeois provisional government and the compromising attitude of Esers and Mensheviks, calling upon the masses to prepare for new, decisive battles against capitalist power. Feliks Edmundovich carried out revolutionary work in Petrograd starting with August 1917, following the Sixth RSDWP(b) Congress at which he was elected a member of the central committee. Soon after the congress completed its work Dzerzhinskiy became a member of the central committee secretariat and, subsequently, of the Petrograd military-revolutionary committee. On 16 October the RSDWP(b) Central Committee elected Dzerzhinskiy a member of the military-revolutionary center in charge of the armed uprising. At central committee meetings, with his typical enthusiasm Feliks Edmundovich supported Lenin's suggestions on the uprising and angrily condemned the capitulationists position held by Zinov'yev and Kamenev. During the armed uprising he carried out important RSDWP(b) Central Committee assignments. On 24 October the detachments of workers and soldiers sent by Dzerzhinskiy captured the main post and telegraph office.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution marked the beginning of a new stage in Dzerzhinskiy's life. He became one of Lenin's closest fellow workers in the struggle for the building of socialism and in organizing the defense of its gains. Dzerzhinskiy's talent as a party and state leader of a new, Leninist type, was revealed clearly.

At the end of October and beginning of December 1917 Dzerzhinskiy actively participated in organizing the defeat of the Kerenskiy-Krasnov counter-revolutionary mutiney, in the struggle against the sabotage by officials, and against the hostile intrigues of the bourgeois press. He organized the protection of Smol'nyy.

"The bourgeoisie, the landlords, and the rich classes," wrote V. I. Lenin to Dzerzhinskiy on 7 (20) December 1917, "are making desperate efforts to undermine the revolution which must secure the interests of the workers and the toiling and exploited masses...Extreme measures must be taken in the struggle against counterrevolutionaries and the saboteurs" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 35, p 156). The same day the Council of People's Commissars set up the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for the Struggle Against the Counterrevolution and Sabotage (VChK). This was the first historical form of Soviet State security organs. On Lenin's suggestion

Dzerzhinskiy was appointed chairman of the VChK. He headed the Cheka organs for the rest of his life.

All activities of the VChK-OGPU were carried out under the leadership of the Communist Party. The Cheka organs, Dzerzhinskiy said, must "promote the policy of the RKP Central Committee." He demanded that the direction and methods of their work be entirely consistent with the party's political line, and for all important measures to be implemented only after being discussed and approved by the corresponding party committees. "The Cheka must be the organ of the central committee," he emphasized. "Otherwise it would be harmful. It would degenerate into tsarist security or an organ of the counterrevolution." Dzerzhinskiy recommended that the Chekists always and comprehensively inform the party organizations on their work, believing that such information was a necessary prerequisite for the party's control over the activities of the VChK-OGPU.

Feliks Edmundovich himself was a model of high party-mindedness. "Despite the infinite enthusiasm of the Cheka workers," recalls V. R. Menzhinskiy, "it would have been impossible to organize the VChK-OGPU known from the history of the first proletarian revolution, had Dzerzhinskiy, with all his qualities as organizer-communist, not been a great party member, obedient and modest, to whom the party directive was everything..."

Dzerzhinskiy taught the Cheka personnel to rely in their work on the working people and, above all, on the workers, and to gain their trust and support. He pointed out that only the trust of the masses would give the Chekists "the firm confidence that they will do their work." Chekists frequently addressed soviet sessions and meetings of workers, peasants, and Red Army men, reporting on their activities. They extensively informed the working people through the press of the course of the struggle against the counter-revolution. They participated in the work of the various commissions set up by the trade unions and the other public organizations for improving the living conditions and supplies of the workers, helping the hungry population along the Volga, and so on. Dzerzhinskiy himself regularly accepted visitors, published reports on the activities of the Cheka organs, and wrote the appeals and addresses of the VChK to the population. This enabled the masses to understand better the tasks facing the VChK-OGPU organs under the complex and incredibly difficult conditions and invariably helped them. "Only the trust of the workers and peasants," Dzerzhinskiy said, "gave the strength to the VChK and, subsequently, the GPU to implement the task assigned to them by the revolution of crushing the internal counterrevolution, and expose all the conspiracies of the overthrown landlords and capitalists and their toadies."

Dzerzhinskiy demanded of the VChK-OGPU personnel the strictest observance of socialist legality. He frequently pointed out that the Chekists must be well familiar with the laws of the Soviet system. They must firmly block attempts to violate or circumvent them. They must not leave unpunished a single crime encroaching on the foundations of the Soviet governmental and social system. At the same time, they were asked to be always guided in their

work by the Soviet laws and to observe them strictly. "This is necessary," Dzerzhinskiy wrote in one of his VChK orders, "in order to avoid errors and become ourselves criminals against the Soviet system whose interests we must safeguard."

Dzerzhinskiy called for making a thorough study of the circumstances of a crime. No person whose crime has not been proved, said he, could be criminally charged. He recommended to the Chekists to make extensive use of warning and educational measures with citizens who violated the law without malice, because of their insufficient political maturity.

The best Chekists traditions are inseparably linked with Dzerzhinskiy's name. He trained the VChK-OGPU personnel in a spirit of high communist idea-mindedness, loyalty to the party and the people, love for the Soviet homeland, proletarian internationalism, tireless political vigilance, strict observance of the laws, intolerance of the enemies, and high humanism. Feliks Edmundovich frequently said that only a person with a cool head, warm heart, and clean hands could be a Chekist. "Our Chekists," noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, addressing the 25th Party Congress, "protect and develop the traditions started by Feliks Dzerzhinskiy, the knight of the revolution."

The VChK-OGPU organs defeated hundreds of conspiracies organized by the white guards, Esers, Mensheviks, anarchists, and intelligence services of imperialist countries. Counterrevolutionary organizations such as the "Alliance for the Defense of the Homeland and Freedom," the Lockhart Conspiracy, the "National Center," the "Tactical Center," P. Dux's residency, and many others were rendered harmless. The Chekists exposed enemy agents in the troops and the transportation system, and protected the state borders. The VChK-OGPU organs fulfilled their duties honorably in defending the revolutionary gains of the working people and made a major contribution to strengthening the first socialist state in the world. In January 1920 Dzerzhinskiy was awarded the Order of the Red Banner for outstanding services in organizing the struggle against the counterrevolution.

In addition to his work as chairman of the VChK-OGPU, between 1919 and 1923 Dzerzhinskiy headed the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs. He participated in the formulation of the basic concepts governing the activities of the people's commissariat, was concerned with strengthening it with party members, and organized the training of cadres for the Soviet governmental apparatus. Under Dzerzhinskiy's leadership the Chekists were able to lower considerably the crime rate in the country and guarantee public security.

In 1919, on Dzerzhinskiy's initiative, the auxiliary special purpose forces controlled by a different department merged within the internal security troops of the republic (VOKhR). They were placed under the jurisdiction of the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs. Dzerzhinskiy was appointed chairman of the military council of VOKhR troops (subsequently internal service forces). The republic's internal forces reliably protected the rear of the Red Army.

The truly tremendous contribution made by Feliks Edmundovich to the struggle waged by the Soviet State for rescuing abandoned and hungry children--the victims of World War I and the Civil War--will probably be remembered forever by the people and the history of our homeland. At that time they numbered over five million. In January 1921 the All-Russian Central Executive Committee set up a special commission for improving the life of the children, including representatives of the women's department and the agitation and propaganda department of the RKP(b) Central Committee, the people's commissariats of education, food, and health, the VChK, the workers' and peasants' inspection, the AUCCTU, and the Komsomol Central Committee. Dzerzhinskiy was appointed its chairman. On his initiative special labor communes were set up to which the abandoned children were sent and where they acquired an education and vocational training. Tens of thousands of orphans were placed in children's homes, and many were raised by the working people. Funds, clothing, and shoes were collected for the children and food trains were sent to the guberniyas where hunger prevailed. Children from such guberniyas were moved to the Ukraine, Siberia, and other "grain" areas. Thanks to the efforts of the party, the proletarian state, and the entire Soviet people, gradually child homelessness was eliminated.

After the Civil War, under the conditions of the peaceful building of socialism, the party assigned Dzerzhinskiy to leading economic work. In April 1921, on Lenin's suggestion, the All-Russian Central Executive Committee Presidium appointed him people's commissar of railroads. At that time the situation of the transportation system was catastrophic: Almost two-thirds of the locomotives and about 25 percent of the railroad cars had broken down. Dzerzhinskiy undertook this new, difficult work with a feeling of great responsibility. With the help of the party organs and the support of transportation workers and employees he was able to implement a number of important measures to restore the work of the railroads and the fleet. By the beginning of 1924, as was noted at the 13th Conference of the RKP(b), the transportation system could "meet...without particular difficulties all the requirements of the national economy." This was the high party assessment of the results of Dzerzhinskiy's almost three years' work.

On 2 February 1924 the USSR Central Executive Committee appointed Dzerzhinskiy chairman of the Higher Council of the USSR National Economy, relieving him from his duties as people's commissar of railroads but retaining him as chairman of the OGPU.

Dzerzhinskiy's talent as a major theoretician and practical worker, and as an outstanding organizer of the socialist economy was manifested particularly vividly in his positions as people's commissar of railroads and, subsequently, chairman of the Higher Council of the National Economy. He systematically supported Lenin's plan for the building of socialism in the USSR and substantiated the most important principles of the party's economic policy in reports such as "On the Metallurgical Industry," "The Forthcoming Tasks of the Metallurgical Industry," "USSR Industry--The Foundation for the Building of Socialism," and "At Command Levels," in notes submitted to the central committee, the Sovnarkom, and the Labor and Defense Council, and in a number of articles and letters.

Proceeding from Lenin's views on heavy industry as the material and technical base of socialism, Dzerzhinskiy emphasized the need for the comprehensive development of metallurgy and machine building. "Whereas today we are a Russia of wood and bast sandals," he said at the 17 November 1923 session of the Gosplan Presidium, "we must become a metal Russia. Metallurgy is our entire future."

In his reports submitted to the January and April plenums of the RKP(b) Central Committee plenums (1925), and at the 14th All-Union Party Conference Dzerzhinskiy spoke out against the opposition which called for reducing budget allocations for the development of heavy industry. He insisted on increasing the pace of development of the metallurgical industry--"the technical base of all industry, transportation, and agriculture."

Feliks Edmundovich initiated the development of new industrial sectors in the USSR: The building of diesel locomotives, tractors, airplanes, textile machinery, ships, and turbines and the development of non-ferrous metallurgy. He called for accelerating the electrification of the country and for comprehensively increasing fuel production.

In accordance with Lenin's views Dzerzhinskiy considered higher labor productivity the main and decisive prerequisite for the successful development of the socialist economy and, in the final account, for the victory over capitalism. "The entire essence of communism and of workers' power," he wrote in the article "From Words to Deeds," "lies in making labor productivity higher than under capitalism." He pointed out that higher productivity alone could raise the wage levels of workers and employees, reduce the cost of goods on the peasants' market, increase the amount of working capital needed for the expansion of production facilities, and meet the cultural needs of the population. In the summer of 1924, under the guidance and with the direct participation of Feliks Edmundovich, the theses "On Labor Productivity and Measures to Increase It" were formulated. They emphasized the need to improve the technical equipment of enterprises, mechanized production processes, improve specialization and standardization, insure the scientific organization of labor and upgrade its intensiveness, apply more extensively piece-rate wages, train skilled workers cadres, and so on.

In his public addresses and practical activities Dzerzhinskiy paid great attention to resolving the then urgent problems of socialist accumulations. He comprehensively substantiated measures for a rational management of the national economy in a number of documents (letter to A. M. Ginzburg, dated 23 October 1924, report to the Fifth All-Union Conference of Metal Workers of November 1924, order of the chairman of the Higher Council of the National Economy, dated 23 February 1926, and others). He ascribed particular importance to the following of a strict regimen of savings. "The struggle for a regimen of savings, for reducing overhead expenditures, and for maximal thrift and economy," said he, "must become the basic guiding directive for the daily work of every economic manager and for the entire industry."

Dzerzhinskiy favored strengthening the principle of one-man command in production. He directed the attention of economic managers to the need for a political approach to the solution of practical problems. An economic manager, Feliks Edmundovich said, must well understand the purpose and meaning of the economic policy of the party and the Soviet State.

Dzerzhinskiy considered the all-round development of the creative activeness of workers and employees and their increased responsibility for the work of their enterprise a mandatory prerequisite for the successful rebuilding and further upsurge of industry. "The tasks facing us," he emphasized, "could be successfully implemented only providing that such tasks become the tasks of the broadest possible proletarian masses..." Here Dzerzhinskiy noted the great importance of production-technical conferences in upgrading the initiative and collective creativity of the masses, and their more extensive involvement in production management. He paid great attention to the development of inventions and rationalizations among workers and employees.

The development of the USSR national economy, Feliks Edmundovich pointed out, must be based on science and technology. It is only by applying scientific methods that the incalculable natural resources of the country could be put into economic circulation, and that the strength, force, power, and prosperity of the country could be raised. Economic management will become truly scientific if it is based on a plan and is aimed at strengthening the alliance between workers and peasants and among all nations and nationalities in the country.

In the course of resolving economic construction problems Dzerzhinskiy ascribed great importance to improving the work of the state apparatus and of industrial and transportation management. "The foundations of the socialist economy," he wrote, "must have a super-structure of corresponding quality." Dzerzhinskiy considered the struggle for a flexible, and economical governmental and economic apparatus, for the simplification of its structure, and for the elimination of all bureaucratic growths an inseparable part of national economic efficiency.

Feliks Edmundovich actively struggled for the establishment of the Leninist style in party and state management. He was intolerant toward manifestations of bureaucracy, whitewashing, boasting, a slighting attitude toward the masses, and violations of official discipline. He demanded of every worker a conscientious and initiative-minded attitude toward his work and high personal responsibility for the implementation of his obligations.

Dzerzhinskiy considered the communist party's leadership the most important prerequisite for resolving economic construction problems. He called for the steady increase of the influence of party organizations on non-party workers and employees and for upgrading the vanguard role of the party members at all production sectors.

Dzerzhinskiy's governmental activities were exceptionally varied and intensive. He was a member of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the USSR Central Executive Committee, the Sovnarkom, and the Labor and Defense Council. While heading the VChK-OGPU, NKVD, NKPS [People's Commissariat of Railroads], and the VSNKh [Higher Council of the National Economy], he also carried out a number of other major assignments given by the Communist Party and Soviet Government. Thus, in the Civil War he was chairman of the Moscow Cheka, and the Main Committee for Universal Labor Duty, chief of the rear forces of the Southwestern Front, member of the Polish Provisional Revolutionary Committee (Pol'revkom), and head of the Polish Bureau of the RKP(b) Central Committee. In the autumn of 1920 he was appointed chairman of the Moscow Defense Committee. After the Civil War Feliks Edmundovich headed a commission for improving the life of Moscow workers, and a commission in charge of fuel and food of the Ukrainian SSR Sovnarkom. He traveled to Siberia and as representative of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Labor and Defense Council for the purpose of adopting emergency measures to organize the shipping of food and seeds, and was the chairman or member of a number of governmental commissions.

Dzerzhinskiy was always involved in tremendous responsible party work. Starting with the Fifth Party Congress, he was elected central committee member at all party congresses. Dzerzhinskiy was invariably appointed member of the Organizational Bureau of RKP(b) Central Committee starting with 1919; on June 1924 he became candidate member of the Central Committee Politburo. Feliks Edmundovich was also a member of the Central Control Commission.

Dzerzhinskiy actively participated in the international communist movement. He passionately supported the ideas of proletarian internationalism. He considered the international solidarity of the workers and the unity of action by the communists of all countries a mandatory prerequisite for the victory of communism on a worldwide scale.

Feliks Edmundovich was a delegate to the first through fifth congresses of the Communist International and fruitfully worked in its Polish commission. He greatly contributed to strengthening relations between the communist parties of Poland and the Soviet Union. He was concerned with sharing with the Polish communists the very rich experience of our party and promoted the idea of friendship between the Polish working people and the Russian and other peoples of the USSR.

Dzerzhinskiy was highly principled and systematic in the implementation of Lenin's general line of the building of socialism and creative approach to the implementation of assignments.

Feliks Edmundovich waged an irreconcilable struggle against the various opportunistic elements. Even though on rare occasions he assumed an erroneous position (in the conclusion of the Brest Peace Treaty and at the beginning of the debate on the trade unions), he always cared for party unity and abstained to oppose the decisions of the Central Committee majority. He believed that

strengthening the party's ideological and organizational unity was the most important condition for the implementation of the party's historical mission-- the building of socialism and communism. He emphasized that the preservation of a proletarian dictatorship in a peasant country "demands of the party the greatest possible ideological unity and unity of action under the banner of Leninism."

Feliks Edmundovich actively participated in the struggle against the various anti-party factional groups which tried to turn the party away from the Leninist path of the building of socialism, and followed a line of breaking the alliance between the working class and the peasantry and weakening and, in the final account, abolishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. At that time Trotskyism was the greatest danger. In his speeches at Central Committee plenums, guberniya and rayon party conferences, party aktiv meetings, and cells Dzerzhinskiy exposed the anti-Leninist nature of Trotskyism and called upon the party members to give their total trust and inflexible support to the central committee.

The uninterrupted and ever greater anti-party activities of the opposition greatly alarmed Feliks Edmundovich. In one of his last letters to V. V. Kuybyshev he expressed the fear that should they be able to become stronger "they would probably lead the party and the country to their doom..."

On 20 July 1926 Dzerzhinskiy addressed the joint plenum of the VKP(b) Central Committee and Central Control Commission with a speech on problems of economic construction. Supporting the Leninist course of socialist industrialization of the country, he sharply criticized the capitulationists views of the Trotskyites and Zinov'yevites, and their attempts to wreck the party's constructive work. This was Feliks Edmundovich's last speech. He died the same day.

In connection with Dzerzhinskiy's death the VKP(b) Central Committee and the Central Control Commission passed the appeal "To All Party Members. To All Workers. To All Working People. To the Red Army and Navy." The document described Feliks Edmundovich as one of the most outstanding and heroic party leaders, a "threat to the bourgeoisie, a loyal knight of the proletariat, most noble fighter for the communist revolution, tireless builder of our industry, eternal worker and fearless soldier in the great battles..."

In the days when the Soviet people are preparing to celebrate solemnly the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, and when a nationwide discussion of the draft of the new USSR Constitution is taking place, summing up the results of the universal-historical accomplishments achieved by our country under the leadership of the Communist Party, we recall with particular gratitude and emotion the names of the great members of Lenin's guard, the unforgettable Bolshevik cohorts who were the flower and pride of the Russian proletariat. "...Only truly bold and principle-minded people, only those who were not frightened by selfless heavy work or police persecution, those who put the happiness of the working people above everything else," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "only such people would be able to accomplish the exploits of the first, the Leninist generation of party members in our country."

Feliks Edmundovich Dzerzhinskiy dedicated his entire life to the great cause of the liberation of the working people and to the struggle for the victory of communism. He organically combined profound knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory with the ability to apply it in the solution of specific problems of the revolutionary struggle and the building of socialism. Dzerzhinskiy's life and revolutionary activities are an inspiring example of selfless service to the Communist Party and the people, to the cause of communism.

5003

CSO: 1802

LIFE INSPIRED BY THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION; IN MEMORY OF PAUL VAILLANT-COUTURIER

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77 pp 101-103

[Article by Fernand Grenie]

[Text] The revolutionary upsurge which spread over the world following the victory of the October Revolution brought to life social and political forces of unparalleled scope. With them, an entire galaxy of fighters came into the arena of revolutionary activities, preserving the proud name of the Leninist guard of the world's communist movement.

Paul Vaillant-Couturier, one of the founders of the French Communist Party, and one of the most vivid and outstanding individuals representing the Marxist-Leninist vanguard of the international working class, was a member of their ranks. With his inherent clarity and persuasiveness, Paul Vaillant-Couturier expressed his admiration for our country and its revolutionary masses. He described as "pioneers of the new life" the Bolshevik Party and its leader -- the great Lenin -- who was his ideological inspiration and human ideal.

His recollections of his meetings with V. I. Lenin contain truly touching words. "...I eagerly examine my mind," he wrote, "in order to recreate even the smallest details of these valuable incidents. Opening his books, studying his theory, ideas, and words, I immediately meet with the living Lenin once again, with his eyes, smile, and gestures... Exposure to him left the impression in the mind of a whirlwind blowing through a stifling room. It refreshed the mind burdened by prejudices and formal doctrines." Describing Lenin as a "person who shook up the entire world, and one in whose mind everything which made this world live and breathe was constantly churned over," P. Vaillant-Couturier

concluded with these words: "Lenin is the finished type of the new man; to us he is the prototype of the future."

Paul Vaillant-Couturier himself lived his inspired and equally short life in emulation of Lenin. The memory of him remains, naturally, not only in France, where, since he was editor in chief of L'HUMANITE, his name still appears on the masthead of the central organ of the French Communist Party along with those of its founder, Jean Jaures, and its director, Marcel Cachin. He has always been lovingly remembered by the Soviet people as well. They render proper honor to this outstanding son of France and loyal friend of the Soviet state.

Today, on the eve of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, we feel particular warmth on reading the sincere and touching lines of his poem "We Are Taking the Weapon of Our Victory to the Wall of Pere Lachaise:"

"The commune is continuing the battle
Not acknowledging its defeat.
The blood of the communards is a symbol
Of the commune's legacy..."

Then, quoting a line from the famous "Carmagnole," "Do you hear the thunder? Do you hear the thunder?", Paul Vaillant-Couturier wrote:

"The battleship Avrora
Trains its guns across the Neva.
A shot was fired at the Winter Palace.
Petersburg is already in the hands of the Reds.
The Russian workers, peasants, and soldiers
Restored the red color of the commune.
Under the measured tread of the heavy boots
In the year of anger and revenge
October preserved the past between two epochs."

On the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the death of Paul Vaillant-Couturier on 10 October, his fellow worker and friend, French Communist Party veteran Fernand Grenie, composed the following notes, under the title "Forty Years Ago Paul Vaillant-Couturier Was No More."

I recall that Monday, 11 October 1937. Early in the morning, I heard on the radio that "Yesterday, Paul Vaillant-Couturier died suddenly." I could not believe it. My first words were "No, this is impossible!" Tears came to our eyes. We rushed to the building which housed the French Society of Friends of the Soviet Union (DSS) at that time. All the people there looked stricken. Death had taken our beloved Paul Vaillant-Couturier from us at the age of only 45!

All of us knew him and admired the warm enthusiasm with which he dedicated himself to the noble cause of Franco-Soviet friendship.

It was he precisely, along with Henri Barbusse, who launched the Society of Friends of the Soviet Union soon after returning from Moscow, where they had gone to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the October Revolution.

What a bright life he had!

Paul Vaillant-Couturier was born in 1892. World War I made its mark on his youth: experiencing the severe trials of trench warfare and discovering the real reasons for it, he joined the Socialist Party. He was one of the founders of the Republican Association of War Veterans, the aim of which was to struggle to prevent such calamities in the future.

In 1919, he was elected to the Chamber of Deputies in Paris. In December 1920, he persuaded most of the delegates attending the congress of the Socialist Party in Tours, aided by the fiery speeches of Marcel Cachin, to vote in favor of joining the Communist International. It was he precisely who drafted and read the manifesto unanimously approved by the congress, which founded the French Communist Party.

In 1932, when I first met him, he was mayor of Villejuif, in the industrial part of Paris, editor in chief of L'HUMANITE, and a member of the Chamber of Deputies. P. Vaillant-Couturier worked extraordinarily hard. Everyone admired his various talents, combining those of the poet and the prose writer, the artist and the musician, the brilliant speaker and the talented journalist. All of the downtrodden enjoyed his warmest support.

As an orator and publicist, he struggled with tireless energy for the dissemination of the truth about the Soviet Union. In the first issue of the monthly published by the Society of Friends of the Soviet Union, "Russia Today" (January 1933), P. Vaillant-Couturier explained with the greatest possible thoroughness the difficulties in the building of socialism, which was at that time the target of the attacks of the entire bourgeois press. "The method is known," he wrote. "It is reminiscent of the story about an entomologist who, on seeing an elephant, immediately forgot about it entirely. They have outdone this pseudonaturalist by trying to make an elephant out of a flea... "But however treacherous this campaign may have been," he went on to say, "it has not been in vain, in a certain sense, precisely because it makes necessary a detailed explanation to the workers of the true reason for the difficulties encountered by the Soviet system, to rescue the working people from a simplistic and schematic idea of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. In the final analysis, it is these tremendous difficulties being surmounted by the Soviet proletariat every day precisely which will be the true measure of the tremendous and historically unique project being implemented in the USSR."

In May 1937, several months before his death, Paul Vaillant-Couturier delivered one of his unsurpassed, fiery speeches to the Fifth National Congress of the Society of Friends of the Soviet Union: "Dear friends! We are faced with the great task of countering campaigns which trigger hatred for the USSR and spread lack of understanding. We must help the USSR to build socialism. You are the heirs of the Great French Revolution and nothing revolutionary can leave you indifferent... You must combat lies. You are the bearers of the truth. Friends! This is the best time of year -- spring. The rain and the winds and the clouds cannot prevent the sun from shining. Once again the sun emerges and warms the earth. The USSR represents the spring, when the wind occasionally overtakes the clouds concealing the sun. However, the Soviet Union is going forward toward the bright summer, and we passionately wish this summer would come sooner, for the USSR, for our country, and for all the peoples of the world."

The delegates to the congress rose to their feet to welcome this speech with tremendous applause, which lasted several minutes...

Death took Paul Vaillant-Couturier shortly before a scheduled trip to Moscow, on the eve of the 20th anniversary of the October Revolution.

Cantonal elections had been scheduled for Sunday, 10 October, in France. On Saturday night, Paul Vaillant-Couturier wrote an article for L'HUMANITE, calling for the unification of all democratic forces. On Sunday morning, he was taken to the hospital, where he died at 11 P.M.

L'HUMANITE's Monday morning issue reported our crushing sadness, and also our electoral victory, as a result of which 107 French communists were elected as general councillors, as compared to 26 in the 1931 elections.

Several days later crowds of people took to the streets to accompany Paul Vaillant-Couturier on his last trip, to the Pere Lachaise Cemetery. The funeral procession, bearing wreaths, stretched over many kilometers, followed by a flood of Parisians rendering honor to Paul Vaillant-Couturier (as they had to Henri Barbusse, two years earlier), the same as had once been rendered to Victor Hugo.

In our memories, Paul Vaillant-Couturier will forever remain the embodiment of youth, the powerful force of conviction, enthusiasm, and fraternal warmth, which were felt by all those who knew him, as well as a pioneer in Franco-Soviet friendship, for which he fought with such warmth, sincerity, and ability.

5003
CSO: 1802

SELF-EXPOSURE OF MAOISM IN AFRICA

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77 pp 104-115

[Article by Yu. Alimov and L. Fedorov]

[Text] A year has passed since the death of Mao Tse-tung and the coming to power of a new leadership in China. However, the fatal influence of Maoism and the inertia it created in the country's internal development have remained unsurmounted. The direction pursued by the present Chinese leadership in their actions, which is gradually becoming clear, proves that the foreign policy which Mao Tse-tung imposed on the country has remained unchanged.

The events in China and Peking's present foreign political course show that the conclusions of the 24th and 25th CPSU Congresses and the October 1976 Central Committee Plenum on the social base of Maoism and the political face of the Maoists apply fully to those who replaced Mao and his retinue. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted recently, "The new Chinese leadership, unfortunately, is following the old...ruts." Peking's ideology and politics remain alien to socialist principles and ideals, and are a convenience only to the forces of imperialism and reaction in their struggle against socialism and peace. Maoism lies outside Marxism-Leninism, functioning as a force hostile to it, as its opposite.

In its time, the people's revolution in China provided powerful impetus for the national-liberation movement and, in the assessment of the Moscow 1960 Conference of Representatives of Communist and Workers Parties, "contributed to a tremendous extent to changing the balance of world forces in favor of socialism... and had a tremendous influence on the nations, particularly those of Asia, Africa, and Latin America." Since then, however, the situation has changed drastically, and the influence of Maoist China on these nations in the 1960's and 1970's has moved in an entirely different direction. Based on the foreign political doctrine of Sino-centrism, traditional imperialism in China, and believing that the sphere of the national-liberation movement is the stronghold best suited to the implementation of this doctrine today, Peking has focused its efforts not on the strengthening of the positions of world socialism and the development of the world's revolutionary process, but on attempts to turn the so-called "Third World" into its own sphere of influence, its own private domain.

The development of relations between China and Africa, which was selected by the Maoists as a convenient bridgehead, in their view, in the struggle for hegemony in the Third World, is particularly indicative. It is clearly believed in Peking that the fact that the peasantry predominates in the social structure of the African countries, the economic backwardness of the young nations of this continent, their as yet incomplete choice of a path for social development, and their profound dissatisfaction with their position in the world arena could a priori provide favorable ground in Africa for Maoism and for a rapprochement with China.

However, as is the case throughout the entire national-liberation movement sector, a process of self-exposure of Maoism and the Maoists has long since been initiated and is steadily developing. Guided by the old postulates and their anti-Sovietism, the new Peking leaders are obviously unable to stop it. It is legitimate, for Maoist ideology and politics conflict with the main trends in the development of the national and social revolutions.

I

"The itch is a painful ailment. When people get the itch of revolutionary phraseology, the mere observation of the disease causes intolerable pain... If the itch is presented as 'theory,' the feeling is unendurable." These words of V. I. Lenin's ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 35, pp 361-362) apply fully to Maoist ideology and propaganda as they appeared under Mao and his heirs.

The Marxist-Leninist classics have long provided a full description of the history of this disease, outbreaks of which have occurred repeatedly in the course of the revolutionary movement. "Most frequently, the revolutionary phrase is a disease of revolutionary parties under circumstances," Lenin wrote, "in which such parties directly or indirectly link, combine, and interweave proletarian and petit bourgeois elements, and when the course of revolutionary events reveals major and rapid breaks. Revolutionary phraseology is the reiteration of revolutionary slogans without regard to objective circumstances, given a certain turn of events and factual situation... This does not involve a single grain of revolutionism. It is nothing but phrasemongering" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 35, pp 343-348).

Lenin's conclusion has been fully confirmed by the development of the ideology and politics of China -- "a great kingdom of the petite bourgeoisie," as Mao Tse-tung himself described it.

Peking is doing everything possible to appear in the eyes of the African and other peoples winning their liberation as the adamant revolutionary fighter against imperialism and for social progress. The Maoists use a number of ideological and foreign political concepts to influence the young states and their peoples as they wish, concepts presented as new and revolutionary. Peking makes it seem as if it had some kind of special doctrine applicable to the African countries.

However, the first thing it is impossible to ignore is Maoism's total theoretical sterility. The ideas with which the Maoists approach the Third World turn out, if considered carefully, to be rejuvenated reiterations of old and alien ideas, while Maoism as a whole emerges as an eclectic mixture of a wide variety of pseudorevolutionary and non-Marxist views.

Both in the past and in the present, the Maoists have tried to use the high prestige of the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism, confirmed by the experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the Soviet Union, to their advantage, and to create the impression that their concepts are based on the objective laws of Marxist dialectics. However, a study of Peking's concepts merely bears out the correctness of Lenin's conclusion to the effect that "the theoretical victory of Marxism forces its enemies to deck themselves out as Marxists" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 23, p 3). However, even such a "change of clothing" cannot save the Maoists from permanent theoretical crisis. Their views on dialectics have been and remain alien to Marxism-Leninism.

The Maoists work from the primitive-simplistic idea of the dialectics of contradiction, expressed by Mao in his time as follows: "There are no colonies or semicolonies without imperialist national oppression; there is no imperialist national oppression without colonies and semicolonies." However, this is not dialectics, but sophistry. Such an extremely primitive interpretation of Marxist dialectics, as applied to the national-liberation movement, entirely distorts the Leninist theory of imperialism and the nature of current reality.

The second noteworthy thing is the frequent change of concepts and slogans and Peking's obviously contradictory actions. It would be difficult to find similar examples in history, in which a government which is essentially one and the same has changed its strategic and tactical formulations so often and drastically. Feeling the "itch of revolutionary phraseology," the Maoists are concerned not with the development of theory, but with making it fit their practical actions. In fact, they display a total lack of principle both in ideology and politics. The main trend in the evolution of Maoism is its conversion from extreme revolutionism to extreme reaction, from extremism in the struggle against the imperialists to frenzied struggle against world socialism and all anti-imperialist forces.

Let us consider specific facts. The Maoists began their ideological penetration of Africa with appeals to "implant revolutionary chaos everywhere," and with Chou En-lai's assertion that all of Africa is "ripe for revolution" (1964), and the thesis of the mandatory nature of the African peoples' initiating an immediate armed struggle not against the imperialists and colonizers alone, but against some of the governments of the young nations on the African continent as well. Such declarations were in open conflict with the objective conditions in Africa. By the end of the 1960's, the Maoists had already abandoned their extreme revolutionary appeals and hurled themselves to the other extreme by starting to support the African

reactionaries, joining anticommunists of all hues, including the South African racists. The new leaders in Peking, State Council Vice Premier Li Hsien-nien in particular, claimed that "very favorable circumstances have developed in Africa," extending this assessment to countries with reactionary pro-Western regimes, which have received considerably increased support from Peking in the past year.

Let us see what is left of the Maoist concepts now, without Mao. The first thing to be noted in studying the activities of his heirs is the continuing claim to hegemony in the Third World and frenzied anti-Sovietism.

It is well known that China's claim to hegemony has undergone certain changes. In 1958-1959, Mao Tse-tung declared quite unequivocally that "We must conquer the earth... We shall create a powerful state... We will absolutely build a great empire..." At the beginning of the 1970's, Peking's statements had become somewhat more moderate when it came to its "universal aspirations." However, it had still retained its claim to a role as the "center of the contemporary revolutionary process," the leader of the national-liberation movement, and the only state able and aspiring to defend the small and weak Third World countries. Suddenly, in 1975, as if they realized that they had been "blabbering" excessively, the Maoists proclaimed loudly that "China will never become a superpower," and that "it will lay no claim to hegemony." Today this "new principle" is being publicized noisily, with or without reason, at all levels.

In fact, great power chauvinism was and remains one of the ideological foundations of Maoism, just as the ideograms representing the universe and the celestial empire -- the symbol of the ancient Chinese empire -- have remained unchanged in the Chinese language. The claim that China has abandoned its hegemonistic aspirations and the desire to become a "superpower," and also its struggle against "hegemonism," are needed by the present Chinese leaders solely for purposes of concealment, to divert attention elsewhere, and for deception.

The people in Peking already see themselves as leaders of the Third World. They are doing everything possible to infect it with the type of Sinoism which, to use V. G. Belinskiy's words, "loves its own only because it is its own, and hates everything foreign merely because it is foreign." To begin with, the Maoists regard as "foreign" anything Soviet or socialist. The Soviet Union's international activities firmly block all hegemonistic aspirations. Today it, together with the socialist comity, is the main obstacle in the path of any pretender to world domination, wherever he may be. This is why the Maoists are concentrating their propaganda fire in the Third World on the USSR, in an effort to destroy the objectively existing anti-imperialist alliance between the national-liberation movement and the socialist comity.

Above all, the Maoists aspire to make China a part of the Third World. They hope to achieve this by constantly emphasizing the "common destiny" shared by China and the young countries and by proclaiming China to be a

developing country belonging to the Third World. In an effort to "substantiate" their exclusive "right" to maintain relations with the African countries, the Maoists have lately begun to claim to have been friends of Africa "for the last thousand years." As the newspaper JEN-MIN JIH-PAO claimed, for example, the people of China and Tanzania "began friendly relations more than a thousand years ago." However, even such false assertions are insufficient to support Peking's claim to "special relations" with the peoples of contemporary Africa.

The "common destiny" reference is based on a comparison of conditions in semicolonial China at the turn of the century and those in the African countries on the eve of their liberation and at present. However, at the turn of the century backwardness, poverty and the rightlessness of the people were not typical of China alone. In this connection, for example, it could be said that the peoples of Russia also have reason to refer to a historically common destiny with the peoples of the young African states. "Oppression and darkness as in Russia" were mentioned by Lenin in his "Notebooks on Imperialism," in analyzing the economic and social status of the Egyptian fellah ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 28, p 516).

China's classification of itself as a "poor" developing country is based on references to its presently inadequate economic development. But the fact that more than 40 percent of the budget goes for the militarization of the country and to atom bombs and missiles, not to mention other aspects characterizing Maoist great power politics, make it impossible to regard China as a "relative" of Burundi, for example, or the other African countries. The Maoists are tireless in their efforts to establish such "relationships," even on the basis of a racist unification of the "colored" peoples against the "whites." However, these attempts, which are in conflict incidentally with the views of Sun Yat-sen, who, as Lenin said, evidenced a full understanding of the insufficiency of a "racial revolution" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 21, p 401), are clearly reminiscent of the propaganda launched by militaristic Japan before World War II and, in view of the present universal condemnation of racism in all its manifestations, could not be made to "fit" as the Maoists would like.

Motivated by their hegemonistic ambitions and anti-Sovietism, the Maoists are in fact working against the process of unification of the national-liberation movement with scientific socialism, which is developing increasingly on the African continent with every passing year. Relatively recently (1962), Mao Tse-tung acknowledged that "In the field of socialist construction, we are ... blind." Nevertheless, the Maoists are teaching one and all what socialism is and how to build it, attempting to discredit the concept of noncapitalist development for the young countries as "Westernized and established for social imperialism in the Third World."

Naturally, Peking is not concerned with socialism when it attempts to impose upon the African peoples its own interpretation of the principle of "relying on one's own forces." The Maoists are not only trying to claim

for themselves priority in the proclamation of this principle, born of the practice of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the Soviet state, and to depict the development of contemporary China as the result of reliance on their own forces, deleting the aid of the USSR from the history of the Chinese revolution and China, but are also trying to undermine the cooperation between the young countries and the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and to alienate them from the world's socialist comity.

In the propaganda it directs toward Africa and the other parts of the Third World, Peking tries in general to ignore the basic contradiction of the epoch -- that between socialism and capitalism. Speculating on the great international role of the national-liberation movement, the Maoists absolutize it as "the most important force in the struggle against imperialism." From the nationalists of the past and the contemporary bourgeois ideologues, they have borrowed the antiscientific principle of dividing countries not on the basis of socio-class characteristics, but rather of wealth and territory occupied, in order to profit from pitting all the poor and small countries against all the large and rich ones, regardless of their social systems.

In recent years, Peking has begun the intensive dissemination in Africa of the notorious concepts of the "two superpowers" and "three worlds," which presume the unnatural unification of the former colonies with the former mother countries and with other neocolonial capitalist states. Peking's efforts to isolate the African and other developing countries from the socialist world mean nothing less than complicity in the strengthening of the world capitalist system, complicity with the neocolonizers. Incidentally, this was noted last July even by the Albanian newspaper ZERI I POPULLIT, which noted with full justification that "The so-called theory of the 'three worlds' poses no task whatsoever for the revolution" but is designed "to hinder the revolutionary process and defend capitalism."

Today it is even possible to assert that in the national-liberation movement sector, Maoism has merged with the imperialist and reactionary forces fighting against socialism and the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity. In fact, Peking has adopted the role of an accomplice in the anti-Soviet and anticommunist subversion of the world's bourgeoisie in the Third World.

The Maoist efforts and endeavors did not go unnoticed in the West either. Following their initial concern experienced in connection with the brief outbreak of "imperialism-gobbling" in Peking, the Western ideologues and politicians gradually realized that their fears had been exaggerated. Furthermore, the external revolutionism and anti-Soviet and antisocial nature of Maoism suit the West to perfection. As the events in Chile and Africa, Angola in particular, indicate, the imperialists do not shy away even from using the mirage of Maoist "revolutionism" for their counter-revolutionary purposes. The changed attitude of the bourgeois ideologues and politicians toward the Maoists and Maoism is the most accurate indicator of Peking's self-exposure.

This self-exposure of the "revolutionism" of the Maoists and Maoism is occurring in the national-liberation movement sector in a somewhat different and more complex way. As in the capitalist West, all types of anticommunists, anti-Soviets, and nationalist reactionaries in some countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America have now understood Peking's "revolutionism," and as if considering it "one of their own," they are promoting a rapprochement with it. Furthermore, the Maoists have learned to adapt to the ideas and moods of these circles, and are themselves easily influenced by them.

Peking's alliance with the reactionary forces is opening the eyes of the progressive national and social liberation forces concerning Maoism and the Maoists. Not all of these forces, some of which are still influenced by petit bourgeois ideas and nationalism, have entirely shed their illusions about Peking and its ideology. In their essential conceptual views, however, the progressive social strata and representatives of revolutionary democracy in Africa diverge from Maoism. They do not see in it a doctrine which would be consistent with their basic interests, and they do not plan to regard it as a manual for action. The practice of international relations and the political struggle in the world arena are contributing more than anything else to enabling the young African states to gain an awareness of the groundlessness of Maoist ideology and its incompatibility with the interests of the national and social liberation of the peoples.

II

The Maoists pretend that they are united with the African countries and peoples by common ideals and solidarity of action in international politics. Peking's hopes for hegemony in the Third World are carefully concealed, while Maoist anti-Sovietism is given priority even more openly. Thus the Maoists create the false impression that the policy of Peking is directed only against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, while Maoist China is the ally of the national-liberation movement in the struggle against the "superpowers." Whom do the Maoists hope to deceive?

It is Peking's practical activities in the world arena precisely, more than anything else, which are opening the eyes of the peoples of the African and other developing countries to the basic differences between their foreign political objectives and those of Peking, convincing them of the falsehood of its assertions of anti-imperialist solidarity with the forces of national and social liberation.

In fact, the main objective of the foreign policy of the African and the other young states is to secure international conditions for the completion of their national-liberation revolutions, economic liberation, the most rapid elimination of the harsh consequences of colonialism possible, surmounting socioeconomic backwardness, and eliminating all manifestations of discrimination and inequality in the world arena. The anti-imperialist direction of this process is objective and clear, as is the interest of the young countries in an alliance with all worldwide anti-imperialist forces

and above all, the socialist comity, and in the preservation and consolidation of peace on earth. It is precisely such an alliance and universal peace which contain one of the main prerequisites for the successful achievement of the basic foreign political objectives of the developing countries.

What is the main objective of Peking's foreign political strategy? It was and remains the securing of international positions from which to make China a "superpower" and to establish its hegemony in the Third World. Mao Tse-tung decided that by the year 2000, the industrialization and meliorization of the country had to be achieved at all costs. This course was ratified at the 11th CCP Congress held last August. The Maoists have tried and are trying to see to it that the African and other developing countries themselves acknowledge China as their leader "voluntarily," so to speak. JEN-MIN JIH-PAO claimed in January 1975 that "Sooner or later, the Third World will gain the upper hand over the superpowers, become the ruler of international affairs, and gain a position as a superpower," also letting it be understood that this can only be achieved under Peking's leadership. The Maoists are using every possible means in their relations with the developing countries to assert China's "right" to such supremacy.

Thus one cannot fail to see that the strategic objectives of the foreign policy of the developing countries are radically different from those of China. Pursuing its tactical line, Maoist diplomacy is doing everything possible to smooth this discrepancy over and to make it invisible. For example, Peking provides a certain economic aid to a number of countries on the continent in an effort to maintain its political cooperation with them for the solution of a number of problems, including international ones. On the surface, this policy seems to be aid given to the African countries and peoples for the achievement of their objectives. But if the question of why all this is being done were asked, Peking's current African policy would reveal a second purpose.

Above all, it would become clear that Peking needs a certain support from the African countries and peoples simply as one of the elements ensuring the existence of international conditions which will facilitate the implementation of its great power and hegemonistic plans. According to the Maoists, the modern world has no major revolutionary force or country on which Africa could rely other than China. The young states have no choice but to put a distance between themselves and the United States and, in particular, the Soviet Union, while moving closer to China and the small and average capitalist countries, so that along with them, they can fight the "hegemonism of the superpowers." In this connection, Peking's anti-American foreign policy is maintained only as a pretense of Maoist anti-imperialism, while the Soviet Union is represented as the principal enemy of China and the Third World, despite common sense and reality. "Essentially, the only criterion now determining the approach of the Chinese leadership to any major international problem," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has noted, "is the desire to harm the USSR as much as possible and to damage the interests of the socialist comity."

The Maoists do not conceive of the possibility of strengthening their positions in the world arena and in Africa in particular without undermining the positions of the Soviet Union. The steady growth of the prestige enjoyed by USSR in international affairs and the intensification and expansion of its cooperation with the African countries and peoples are not liked by Peking, which is evidencing zeal in its attempts to discredit Soviet domestic and foreign policy in the eyes of the African countries which might be envied even by the imperialists.

Today there is virtually no aspect of Sino-African relations or African problems which has not been considered by the Maoists through the prism of anti-Sovietism. To them this has become the center of all their interests on that continent. The Maoists are trying to defame and defile absolutely all aspects of Soviet-African relations in order to achieve a confrontation between the peoples and governments on that continent and the Soviet Union. A typical example of this is found in the JEN-MIN JIH-PAO editorial on the 14th session of the Assembly of Heads of States and Governments of the Organization of African Unity, held in July 1977. It stated that the USSR is trying to "put the African continent in its pocket," that it represents "the most serious danger confronting the African countries and peoples," and that all aspects of Soviet relations with them represent "interference" in the domestic affairs of African countries. Without the slightest twinge of conscience or shame, the newspaper describes USSR policy as "the main reason" for the fact that the racists in South Africa are still in power.

Chinese diplomacy, opposing one political idea or position or another merely because it has been formulated or supported by the Soviet Union, is acting in accordance with this wholly unforgivable slander. In practice, Peking's hegemonistic and great power hopes are most directly reflected in its vaunted solidarity with the national-liberation movement. In fact, the level of this solidarity and cooperation with specific African parties, organizations, and governments has long since been made directly dependent by the Maoists on the extent to which it aids in the implementation of their plans. In recent years, Peking's political practice has taken into ever greater consideration as well whether or not the support of one detachment of the national-liberation forces in Africa or another would interfere with the process of normalizing relations between China and the imperialist countries.

The entire experience of Maoist African policy proves that the Maoists are guided by strictly selfish and pragmatic criteria. They do not conceal the fact that they regard anti-Sovietism as the main criterion in the choice of their partners, both on the continent as a whole and within the individual African countries. Peking's solidarity with the African reactionaries and anti-Soviet forces has become practically unconditional, while in relations with the progressive national and social liberation forces friendly to the Soviet Union, it is sharply limited, and is degenerating ever more frequently into open hostility.

It would be reasonable to ask what distinguishes this "solidarity" with Africa on the part of the Maoists from the positions of the imperialists. It is becoming increasingly difficult to find any such distinction. In fact, none any longer exists.

It would hardly be necessary to provide a detailed description of all the facts on which such conclusions are based, as they are well known. To illustrate this, it would suffice to recall Peking's approval of the reprisals against the communists in the Sudan and the participants in the actions launched by the working people of Egypt in January 1977, the shameful joining of the racist and South African aggressors in Angola by the Maoists, China's subversive activities in Angola, conducted jointly with the imperialist countries, and the recently concluded military alliance of the Maoists and the West in Zaire.

Naturally, Peking's foreign policy positions in Africa are somewhat different today from what they were 15 years ago, for example. At the present time, almost all the countries on that continent maintain diplomatic relations with China. Chinese and African governmental leaders exchange visits.

What encourages the young African states to maintain relations with China? The decisive motive for most of them is the hope of receiving Chinese economic assistance. The Maoists make extensive use of this factor to strengthen their position on the continent. Whereas in the 1960's they relied mainly on ideological pressure and subversive activities in their penetration of Africa, they have in the 1970's begun to ascribe prime importance to their economic influence over the African countries. In 1975 Peking granted loans totaling more than \$2 billion to dozens of African countries. On the basis of technical and economic cooperation agreements, it promised to build about 300 agricultural, industrial, and other projects in these countries.

In the 1970's the trend toward diverting the main flow of economic aid from Asia to Africa, which had already been noted, was intensified by Peking. The African states currently account for about 80 percent of the new Chinese loans to developing countries, and Africa has moved into first place in the number of projects being built by Peking in the Third World. The same applies to Chinese military assistance. In recent years, the range of African countries receiving such aid has broadened noticeably. Peking sends more than 90 percent of its specialists working abroad to Africa.

It is no accident nor is it due to altruistic motives that Peking prefers Africa to all other parts of the Third World. The point is that it is here precisely that the absolute majority of the least developed countries in the world, as estimated by the United Nations, is to be found, and the Maoists believe that their favorable disposition can be "bought" most easily and cheaply. In practice, Peking is guided least of all by the social orientation of the developing countries. All that is asked is that such a

country be less developed than China itself, so that the latter can easily prove its superiority. Such is the criterion on the basis of which the Maoists select the African countries which will be targets for their economic expansion.

The increased Maoist "concern" for the least developed African countries might deceive someone here or there into believing in Peking's "internationalism" or "selflessness" if such countries and others failed to understand why China is undertaking such outlays. "Whereas until 1971, the main motive guiding Chinese policy was the struggle being waged with Taiwan for influence," as the Senegalese journal LE MONDE AFRICAIN, in particular, noted, "its main purpose now is to combat Soviet influence." The Maoists themselves do not conceal this. In the least developed countries, they hope to obtain greater political dividends in their anti-Soviet struggle.

The political base of Chinese aid is becoming ever clearer. The most recent striking example is seen in Sino-Egyptian relations. While Egypt was developing friendly cooperation with the Soviet Union, the Maoists were in no hurry to grant it the promised aid. However, the moment President Sadat abrogated the friendship treaty with the Soviet Union, the Maoists rushed to Cairo with offers of military assistance. Actually, it soon became clear that this move was mainly designed to create an external effect. A closer look revealed that the actual total of all types of Chinese aid to Egypt did not by any means match the anti-Soviet hullabaloo created in Cairo and Peking, and entirely inadequate for influencing the solution of the Middle Eastern problem to the advantage of the Egyptian and other Arab peoples.

What has Peking achieved in Africa? Has it been able to win any kind of exclusive position on the African continent? No, it has not, nor could it likely do so.

The young countries on this continent are interested in extensive international cooperation and are developing it year after year. It is entirely natural that this process has been extended to China as well. However, the African countries as a whole do not in any way single China out among their partners. Considering the potential which China now has and will have in the coming decades, Africa cannot rely upon it as its basic source of aid and main partner in trade and economic cooperation. The African countries make extensive use of the aid provided by other countries as well. Despite the Maoist appeals, the African countries are not limiting, but are instead steadily expanding, and are prepared to expand and intensify even further, their economic, technical, trade, and cultural cooperation with the Soviet Union and with all members of the socialist comity.

Practical experience in economic cooperation with Peking has taught the Africans to examine the noisy promises of Chinese aid realistically. They have often found that the Maoist promises involve hopes for propaganda results to a greater extent than concern for contributing to the development of the African countries. The Maoists promise a great deal but most often

fail to keep their promises, postponing fulfillment endlessly. Of the total sum of loans pledged to Africa beginning in 1956, only 32 percent has been paid out to date, and about the same percentage of the total number of projects the Maoists planned to build in the countries on this continent are accounted for by the projects they have built in 14 countries. This is further confirmed by the structure of Peking's technical aid. As of the middle of 1976, the Maoists had built only nine industrial and power plants in Africa, concentrating their aid mainly on light industry, agriculture, the infrastructure, and so-called "prestige projects" (sports stadia, palaces, bridges, and so on), from which extensive "propaganda returns" are expected. Despite their acknowledgement that such aid is useful, the Africans are developing an ever clearer understanding that it is not promising in terms of resolving the problems of industrialization and economic liberation. "Essentially, such an approach sabotages industrialization," noted the Nigerian newspaper THE WEST AFRICAN PILOT.

Nor could the Africans be satisfied with such aspects of Chinese aid as the unprofitability of the enterprises China has built, their backward production technology, and the inadequate expertise of the Chinese specialists. Despite the apparent unconditionality of such aid, it turned out to be more "conditional" in fact than that obtained from other countries. In granting it, the Maoists attempt to obtain as many commercial advantages for themselves in return as they can. As a result, the trade balance between the African countries and China is at present negative for Africa, while the influx of Chinese goods (textiles, in particular) has begun to hinder the development of light industry in Zambia and other countries on this continent.

Peking's lack of interest in accelerating the economic development of Africa is obvious. Peking needs a politically and militarily weak and economically backward Africa, which would follow the fairway of Chinese policy more readily, as the Maoists secretly hope it will.

III

Peking states that the whole Third World feels solidarity with it. Let us examine the real situation.

Past and present experience fully refutes such Maoist claims. Taking into account the long-term foreign political interests of the African peoples and governments, which are the objective basis for their reaction to the Maoist undertakings, the trends can be clearly seen to be unfavorable to Peking.

Political solidarity with Peking has not developed substantially in Africa. It was and remains extremely limited. A certain increase in sympathy for the Maoists can only be noted in countries with conservative and clearly pro-Western systems, countries which, incidentally, were hostile to Peking until recently, as well as in the few countries where the governments have abandoned the path of social progress and decisive anti-imperialist

struggle. Essentially, the rapprochement with the Maoists and their policy is based on agreement with the imperialists, reactionary nationalism, anti-communism, anti-Sovietism, and the joint struggle against progressive social forces, ideas, and trends. This process is noteworthy as a self-exposure of the true face of Maoism. This is precisely how it is regarded by the progressive forces in Africa. Naturally, however, Africa's future belongs to the progressive forces.

If we consider the overall African attitude toward the Maoists and their policies, the conclusion becomes self-evident: it clearly does not fit Peking's views on Africa's role in achieving its hopes of winning hegemony in the Third World. The few advances toward China made by individual African leaders are not the general pattern, and are made for the sake of diplomacy, most frequently for the sake of obtaining certain economic benefits from Peking. Virtually all African countries have remained plainly cautious toward Peking's ideology and politics, displaying a clear unwillingness to contribute to its great power chauvinistic policy.

Despite their natural respect for the Chinese revolution and the great Chinese people, not one of the African countries has granted Maoist China any "primogeniture" in the Third World. Peking's insistent claim to the right to act on behalf of the developing countries and its attempts to represent China as the only friend and ally of these countries, issuing prescriptions as to the policies they should pursue, have triggered irritation and resistance. Despite China's self-affiliation with the developing countries, the so-called "Group of 77," unifying these countries in the United Nations, does not accept China as a member. This is a noteworthy fact which to a great extent answers the question about the political "solidarity" of the African and other young countries with Peking.

In fact, could the African countries, the majority of them constituting an anti-imperialist force, feel solidarity with Peking, which for the sake of anti-Sovietism, is ready to conspire with the most reactionary imperialist forces at the expense of the interests of the African peoples? The objective need to complete the national-liberation revolution and economic liberation invariably leads to a clash with the former mother countries and the other imperialist states. The experience of the Middle Eastern and South African problems, and the confrontation with imperialist provocations, conspiracies, Western aggressive threats and actions, and monopoly economic pressure provide the African peoples with daily proof that world imperialism is not at all a "paper tiger," and, naturally, it is not the ally of Africa, Peking's assertions notwithstanding. The development of recent events is leading the African peoples to the need to confront it as a pro-imperialist force. Following the extremely obvious conspiracy between the Maoists and the imperialists against freedom and progress for Angola in 1975, the process of sobering up and shedding certain illusions about Maoism created in Africa by Maoist demagoguery can no longer be halted.

Emphasizing that China "is acting today in the same camp as the imperialists," NOTICIA, the Angolan daily, recently wrote the following: "Three years ago China adopted an erroneous position with regard to the revolutionary process

in Angola, and has not to this day gotten around to correcting its mistake." It is no surprise that not a single socialist-oriented country or revolutionary-democratic party can regard itself as safe from such "errors" on the part of Peking.

There is a developing awareness of the fact that Peking's anti-Sovietism represents a great threat to Africa as well. The objective need to confront imperialism and its neocolonial policy does not allow the African countries and peoples to break with their natural ally, world socialism, and, above all, the Soviet Union, as the Maoists would like them to do. Despite the anti-Soviet appeals of the Maoists and the political twists of some African countries, an overall process is steadily developing in Africa, not toward limitation but toward the comprehensive expansion of cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity.

However hard the Maoists try to defame the USSR, they are unable to undermine its prestige in Africa. The numerous statements made by African leaders and the public in connection with the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution confirm yet once again that here the Soviet Union has always been regarded as an example of the revolutionary renovation of society, a source of experience, and the bulwark of the national-liberation movement. Many revolutionary democrats firmly reject imperialist and Maoist propaganda which distorts the meaning of USSR foreign policy. "The liberation movements in Africa, Latin America, and Indo-China are all the results of the October Revolution..." said Joshua Nkomo, chairman of the Zimbabwe African National Council, for example. "That is why the Soviet Union plays such an important role. Its role and prestige are enhanced even further by its various suggestions on the settlement of problems posed by the Soviet Union in the United Nations and other international forums.... As the leading socialist country, the Soviet Union has done and is doing a great deal in the interests of the liberation of the peoples... It is the number one friend and assistant of the national-liberation movements in Africa and Latin America, and to an even greater extent, the Middle East."

The practical similarity or coincidence in the interests of the African peoples and nations and those of the Soviet Union, and at the same time, the disparity between these interests and those of Peking are manifested in the attitudes adopted toward a number of international problems. Above all, this is manifested in Africa's attitude toward the main problem of our time -- the problem of war and peace, and the respective positions adopted by the USSR and China.

It is well known that the Soviet Union heads the struggle of all peace-loving forces for detente and for the assertion of the principles of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems. In this historic struggle, the USSR takes as its basis the fact that in our time, a world war neither is nor could it be inevitable and fated.

Maoist foreign policy has been and is structured on the basis of the opposite "theory." The Maoists oppose detente between the great powers and support NATO and all other Cold War supporters. Essentially, their thesis of the fatal inevitability of war conceals the hope that war will break out. The point is that the Maoists lack confidence that China would be able to join the ranks of the "superpowers" and catch up with the United States by the year 2000 under the conditions of detente and peaceful coexistence. The Maoists consider the possibility of achieving their objective less in terms of China's own development than the artificial hindering and halting of the further development of the USSR and the United States as a result of military conflict between them.

Naturally, should war break out, the Maoists themselves would have no objection to "watching how two tigers are fighting in the valley from the mountaintop." However, they have other considerations as well. As early as 1956, Mao Tse-tung openly pointed China toward aggression. "Initially, we are simply in no position to fight," he said. "Later on, however, we will learn something, and possibly will begin to fight." In 1967, Mao's threat became more specific: "It is said that China is peace-loving," he said. "This is not true. In fact, China loves to fight." In the mid-1970's, Teng Hsiao-p'ing stated that each generation must have its war. Last July Yeh Chien-ying, China's minister of national defense, called for intensified preparations for a war which, in his words, "could break out soon, and will be a major one."

The hostility Peking feels for the USSR does not obviate the Maoist threat to other countries, including those in Asia and Africa. In any case, their participation in the imperialist actions in Angola and Zaire have already helped the Maoists lay the foundations for turning this threat into a reality.

The position adopted by the African peoples and states on problems of war and peace is dictated by totally different tasks, and it unequivocally confirms the fact that Africa is not following Peking's path. Like the Soviet Union, the African countries need peace and peaceful coexistence. They actively support the consolidation of universal peace and security and the extension of the process of detente to their own continent. They do not accept the Maoist thesis of the inevitability of a world war, but support the Soviet initiatives to prevent war. Together with the other non-aligned members of the 1976 Colombo Conference, they approved a political declaration which states frankly that "An armed conflict is not something inevitable in the world."

The position adopted by most African countries on putting an end to the arms race and disarmament sharply differs from the position of the Maoists, and is close to that of the USSR. Unlike China, most African countries, together with the Soviet Union, are signatories of the treaty banning nuclear tests in the three media, and the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. They favor the convening of a worldwide conference on disarmament. In accordance with the decisions of the Colombo Conference of

Nonaligned Countries, and with the support of the USSR, African diplomacy favors the holding of a special United Nations General Assembly session on disarmament, which Peking adamantly opposes.

The conflicting courses pursued by Africa and China are most clearly seen in the United Nations. As we know, the African and many other countries have for a number of years struggled for the restoration of the legitimate right of the PRC to United Nations membership. In the final account, China took its place in this international organization in 1971. However, Peking did not justify the hopes of the developing countries which supported it as a member of the United Nations. It began to use the United Nations rostrum for anti-Soviet activities, above all, instead of to support the interests of these countries. Quite naturally, this course led, or will lead, the Maoists to keep company with the imperialist countries, Israel, and the Republic of South Africa, or is regularly making them a part of an insignificant minority.

This can be seen most clearly in the results of the voting on the most important United Nations General Assembly resolutions.

Let us take the question of disarmament as an example. At the 28th General Assembly session in 1973, 25 African countries, i.e., the majority, and in all, 83 members of the United Nations voted in favor of the USSR proposal to reduce the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council by 10 percent and to use the funds thus saved to aid the developing countries. Only two countries -- China and Albania -- voted against it, winning no support for their position from any country, either in Africa or elsewhere in the world. At that time, 34 African countries and a total of 118 United Nations members voted with the USSR in favor of banning chemical and bacteriological weapons. The Chinese delegation was absent when the vote was taken.

At the 29th and 31st sessions, during the voting on resolutions on the banning of changes in the environment and the climate for military or other harmful purposes, the Chinese delegation adopted exactly the same position, opposing the overwhelming majority of the African and other United Nations members: in 1974, 37 African countries and a total of 126 United Nations members voted with the Soviet Union; in 1976, 26 African and a total of 96 United Nations members voted with it.

At the 30th United Nations General Assembly session, the Chinese delegation abstained from the voting on a resolution banning the development and manufacturing of new types and systems of mass destruction weapons, and was one of the two delegations which voted against a resolution on a total and universal ban on nuclear testing. Once again, most African countries stood with the Soviet Union rather than the Maoists: 35 African and a total of 112 United Nations members voted with the USSR on the first resolution, and 31 African countries and a total of 94 United Nations members voted with the USSR on the second.

The same situation prevails when it comes to basic political problems. In the votes cast at the 29th, 30th, and 31st United Nations General Assembly sessions on resolutions pertaining to the implementation of the declaration on the strengthening of international security, 41, 42, and 31 African countries, joining the Soviet Union, voted in favor of the resolutions. The Chinese delegation, which boycotted both the debates and the voting, found itself closer to the United States, which either voted negatively or abstained. The same thing occurred with the vote on the resolution on the defense of human rights in Chile. The Chinese delegation showed solidarity with the Chilean junta.

The African countries find a language in common with the Soviet Union, and obviously do not share China's position on the Middle Eastern problem. The overwhelming majority of them (34 at the 30th, and 39 at the 31st United Nations General Assembly sessions) voted with the USSR in favor of resolutions dealing with the situation in the Middle East. Most of the African countries voted with the Soviet delegation at the 31st General Assembly session in favor of a resolution calling for the signing of a world treaty on abstaining from the use of force in international relations and noninterference in the domestic affairs of other countries; 29 African countries voted in favor of the first, and 30 in favor of the second resolution. Not a single African country followed China, which voted against such a treaty.

As was the case with disarmament problems, the United Nations resolutions on political problems were approved by overwhelming majorities of votes, and in every instance, the Chinese delegation found itself in the insignificant minority either voting against, abstaining, or absent during the voting.

In an effort to alleviate the impression created by these negative facts in some way, Maoist diplomacy is pursuing a somewhat different tack on the question of United Nations votes on resolutions having to do with decolonization and socioeconomic problems. Here again however, it is concerned mainly not with really supporting the demands of African and other developing countries, but solely with somehow directing their struggle for decolonization and the reorganization of international economic relations against the USSR. However, as a rule, the Maoists are unable to lead such countries away from their real problems and to hinder the reciprocal understanding and anti-imperialist solidarity existing between the young countries and the Soviet Union.

While officially supporting the struggle of the developing countries for a new world economic order, Peking is especially active in preventing the expansion of trade and economic relations between the Third World and the socialist comity. At international economic conferences, the Maoist diplomats encourage the delegations of African and other developing countries to adopt anti-Soviet positions. We should not ignore the fact that in Africa and other parts of the Third World, there are supporters of the concept of "rich and poor nations," who make identical economic

demands of both the Western countries and the Soviet Union. However, even they are quite clearly opposed to the malicious anti-Sovietism of the Maoists, and for the most part express solidarity with the just position adopted by the USSR.

For the past few years, the developing countries have had repeated opportunities to see the differences between them and Peking on problems in the restructuring of international economic relations. According to the Maoists, a new world economic order would mean the total orientation of the economies of the developing countries toward China and the "second world," i.e., the former mother countries and the neocolonial capitalist states. With such an "order," the developing countries could not and should not cooperate with the Soviet Union. It was to this, specifically, that the Maoist speeches at the United Nations conferences on industrial development held in the spring of 1975, and the United Nations conference on trade and development held in the spring of 1976, can be reduced.

Yet this was entirely contrary to the interests of the young countries. They firmly rebuffed the Maoists by including in the charter of economic rights and duties of states approved at the 29th United Nations General Assembly session the stipulation that trade with the socialist countries be expanded. Despite the Maoists, they deemed it expedient for the charter to grant to the socialist countries trading conditions no less favorable than those usually granted to the developed market economy countries.

The open expression of political solidarity with the Soviet Union and the equally open Chinese nonsupport of the statements by African delegations to the United Nations on the touchy problem of the southern portion of Africa could be regarded as noteworthy phenomena in recent years. Neither the aid given by Peking to certain individual national-liberation organizations nor the official condemnation by the Maoists of the Pretoria and Salisbury regimes could conceal from the Africans the fact that, circumventing the United Nations sanctions, China is trading with these regimes and is even supporting them, along with the West, in their actions against the South African nations.

For example, the United Nations Security Council debate on South African aggression against Angola, which took place at the beginning of 1976, developed into a real frontal clash between the African and other nonaligned countries, on the one hand, and the Maoists, on the other. Essentially, the debates at that meeting dealt with the basic significance of the problem of the attitude toward the struggle waged by the African peoples for national independence and social progress, and their right to use the all-round aid of the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity in this just struggle. Joining the delegations of the Western countries in their malicious slander of the USSR and their denial of such rights to the Africans, the Maoist delegation was firmly condemned by the delegations from the nonaligned countries participating in this session. Many of them demanded that the Chinese delegation refrain from hindering the work of the Security Council. The delegations from Benin, Libya,

Madagascar, Mali, Nigeria, the Congo People's Republic, and Tanzania firmly rejected the Maoist attack on the People's Republic of Angola, the USSR, and Cuba. This was a clear political defeat for the Maoists.

In Africa there is a growing understanding of the fact that the Maoists are concerned less with the liberation of the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia, and South Africa than with provoking confrontations between the USSR and the United States, and between the African countries and the Soviet Union. Neither of these aims could coincide with the interests of the freedom and development of the peoples on that continent.

Every indication points to the fact that the interests of the African countries and peoples motivate them to an ever greater extent to reject the stance of "standing apart from Sino-Soviet differences." The anti-imperialist forces of the national and social revolution in Africa are realizing ever more clearly that the differences between Peking and the Soviet Union also mean differences between Peking and themselves. The hopes of the Maoists notwithstanding, these forces are making a choice which is clearly not in favor of Peking.

IV

"China is permitting gross errors in its African policy," the British TIMES noted in January 1976. "In the 15 years of China's pursuit of its African policy, the Africans have realized that Peking is merely a paper tiger. Economic aid failed to result in political influence. Its policy in Africa has been unsuccessful. Nowhere in Africa has China been able to align any government solidly with itself." Such was the assessment made of Maoist activity in Africa and its results in July 1976 by the West German newspaper FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE.

One cannot but agree with such an evaluation. It reflects the actual situation. Despite the whole "itch of revolutionary phraseology" on the part of the Maoists and the efforts to win the full trust of the anti-imperialist forces in Africa, the latter have never considered Peking as "one of their own." As was to be expected, such recognition came to Maoism from the other side of the barricade. "Existing points of contact and the partial coincidence of Western and Chinese interests in Africa create excellent prerequisites for the pursuit, to a certain extent, of reciprocally complementary directions in the next decade," was the significant conclusion in the bourgeois press (GENERAL ANZEIGER, FRG, August 1976) on the actual parallelism of the Maoist and Western policies in international affairs. To judge from the attitude of the extreme reactionaries toward the Maoists, Peking, as an "opponent," has proved to be more valuable to them than some of their allies in the capitalist world. The imperialists not only no longer fear Peking's "revolutionism" in Africa, but regard it as a valuable "assistant" in the solution of African problems. The Maoists are assigned a particular role in the southern part of the continent. "The eastern wind of the world's revolution, predicted by Mao Tse-tung, is no longer so threatening to the power of the whites in the Republic of South

Africa as the case was in the past," stated THE WASHINGTON POST in January 1977. According to GENERAL ANZEIGER, "China could replace the West" in the resolution of the problem of the southern part of Africa.

The leaders of the South African racist regime, already allied with the Maoists during the events in Angola, are now seeking an opportunity to enter into an open political alliance with Peking. Jan Marais, one of South Africa's most noted financiers, stated that "I would vote with both hands for good relations with Red China. We, they, and the Western countries have a common enemy -- the Soviet Union."

Such assessments of Maoism by the imperialist and racist reactionaries are the death sentence for Maoism and Maoist policy in Africa.

Not just isolated or accidental instances, but wholly clear trends in Maoism have questioned its basic postulates and exposed the hostility of Maoist policy not only toward the Soviet Union, but toward the national-liberation movement and the cause of universal peace and security. Maoism, against which the communist and workers' parties of the socialist and other countries are waging a struggle based on principled Marxist-Leninist positions, is becoming ever further compromised.

Naturally, the self-exposure of Maoism is a lengthy process. Under present conditions, the Maoists can still disorient and confuse some of the young countries. A temporary strengthening of Maoist influence is possible among detachments of the national-liberation movement of the African peoples, the leadership of which includes conservative nationalistic circles.

As a whole, however, the final defeat of Maoist ideology is predetermined by its inability to offer the peoples of Africa any kind of positive program for social progress. Peking hinders sociopolitical changes in Africa. It objectively leads its countries and peoples toward the capitalist way of development. Together with the intensification of the process of the growth of national-liberation revolutions into social revolutions, the class differentiations in the African countries and the ever clearer social differentiation among the countries themselves, it is becoming more urgent for Peking to answer the question as to whom it stands with or against. The practices of the previous and current Chinese leaders are giving the peoples on this continent an ever clearer answer to this most most important problem -- acceleration of the exposure of Peking's ostentatious "revolutionism." Virtually all African and other developing countries must take into account in their international policies the actual deployment of worldwide political forces, rather than the assessment of the situation promoted by the Maoists. It is not in the interests of these countries to pit themselves against the Soviet Union for the sake of adventuristic concepts. In the final analysis, an understanding of this simple truth proves to be stronger than any Maoist propaganda.

The entire baselessness of Peking's calculation that the African countries and peoples will achieve an unconditional and comprehensive development with China to the detriment of the development of their relations with the

socialist countries is manifesting itself ever more clearly in a great variety of ways. Furthermore, should China continue to support the opponents of the socialist countries in Africa, operating from anti-Soviet positions, any of its claims to being the ally of the African peoples and their progressive forces will be rejected once and for all. Such was the permanent lesson of Angola.

Therefore the problem of Sino-Soviet relations is far from a problem of relations between the USSR and China alone. It encompasses within it the basic social and political problems of our time. Reality proves that the interests of peace, freedom, and social progress for the peoples adamantly demand the normalization of Sino-Soviet relations. This is also demanded by the basic interests of the Chinese people, who, as Fidel Castro stressed recently, "have no future at all ... in their alliance with imperialism and world reaction."

The position of the Soviet Union on matters pertaining to Sino-Soviet relations is well known. It was recently reiterated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in an answer given to S. Hata, editor in chief of the Japanese newspaper ASAHI. "We are in favor of normalizing intergovernmental relations with China," L. I. Brezhnev noted. "The resumption of true good neighborly relations between our countries would be of great importance not only to the USSR and the PRC, but to the improvement of international circumstances as a whole, as well."

The normalizing of relations between the USSR and the PRC would contribute most beneficially to the further successful development of the national and social revolutions in the Third World, particularly in Africa. The Soviet people believe in the fulfillment of Sun Yat-sen's prophesy to the effect that the time will come, "in the great battle for the freedom of the oppressed peoples of the world, when the two countries will go forth hand in hand and win the victory." This time will definitely come. Neither Maoism nor the Maoists can halt the victorious march of communist ideas.

5003

CSO: 1802

SOCIETY, MAN, MANAGEMENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77 pp 116-119

[Review by Professor G. Volkov, doctor of philosophical sciences, of the book "Chelovek v Upravlenii Obshchestvom" [Man In the Management of Society] by V. G. Afanas'yev. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 352 pp]

[Text] Of late the character of man as Homo dirigen (the managing man) has attracted ever greater attention among the many characterizations of mankind such as Homo sapiens (the intelligent man), Homo agens (the acting man), and Homo creans (the creating man).

Management is a characteristic inherent in man both as a highly organized biological species and as an individual, and combination of overall social relations. After his birth man learns how to manage his body and coordinate his movements. He then masters the ability to control his behavior and relations with those around him, as well as the complex and ever expanding system of active functions in various social areas.

Human activities are guided by consciously formulated objectives. Target setting is a necessary condition and prerequisite for human activities. The ideal structuring of a project in the mind precedes its factual construction in the course of practical activities. Target setting, modeling, decision making and organization of activities aimed at the implementation of such decisions, and processing incoming data in the course of the work and correcting them in accordance with changing circumstances are all management functions inherent in man.

As a social being man is part of a broad system of social relations and operates within this system in the twin role of subject and object of management. The organizational-managerial mechanism of society is becoming ever more complex and advanced in the course of the social evolution of mankind. Under socialist conditions it assumes qualitatively new features related to the fact that the socialist structure of the society makes it possible, for the first time in history, to convert from uncontrolled management of social processes to their conscious management on the scale of

the entire society; to the fact that, again for the first time, a single management is provided for the overall social system which encompasses the production, social, and spiritual-cultural areas; and to the fact that socialist management is based on a strictly scientific foundation and is not a privilege of the elite but the daily creative work of the people's masses themselves.

It is clear that the successes achieved in the course of the building of communism decisively depend on the extent to which its management system is effective and advanced at all levels, from top to bottom, the extent to which the people's masses have been involved in this system, the extent to which their initiative, energy, collective judgment, and will are manifested in it, and the extent to which management decisions reflect the interests of individuals, collectives, and society in their organic unity.

All this gives priority to the study of social management problems by Marxist-Leninist social science. In the past decade such problems have been elaborated particularly intensively by a large group of Soviet scientists. In this area V. G. Afanas'yev has played a significant role. He has written a number of monographs on the theory of the scientific management of the socialist society.

The readers already welcomed with interest V. G. Afanas'yev's books "Nauchnoye Upravleniye Obshchestvom" [The Scientific Management of Society], "Ob Intensifikatsii Razvitiya Sotsialisticheskogo Obshchestva" [On the Intensification of the Development of the Socialist Society], "Nauchno-Tekhnicheskaya Revolyutsiya, Upravleniye, Obrazovaniye" [Scientific and Technical Revolution, Management, Education], and "Sotsial'naya Informatsiya i Upravleniye Obshchestvom" [Social Information and Social Management]. Naturally, the book under review expands this cycle, focusing the attention on man as the main element in social management.

This book, like the other major works by the same author, is distinguished by the efficient and methodical narration in which extensive data are contained within a single thought and seemingly most unrelated phenomena, linked with a single, logical thread, assume an unexpected, new interpretation. It is literally as though a mosaic is created in front of the reader in which each part of an idea may, in itself, not be striking by any particular novelty but, combined with others, offers an original, accurate, and truly convincing depiction of the problem.

V. G. Afanas'yev shows his high mastery of the method of the comprehensive and systematic study of the complex social processes. His books adequately reflect the author's style of thought: brief, clear, logical, capable of considering theoretical problems without concealing their essence behind quasiscientific judgments, but revealing this essence openly, along with the practical significance of his conclusions and the possible means and prospects for their implementation.

This is natural, for a specialist in the field of the scientific management of society cannot be a "pure" theoretician. His research is constantly stimulated by practical requirements. It is directed toward improving social inter-relationships and institutions and regulating and self-regulating mechanisms within the overall system of social relations. It is obvious, however, that practical recommendations and conclusions could be of true value only if based on a profoundly theoretical interpretation of the facts and phenomena of life.

This is adequately confirmed by V. G. Afanas'yev's book. He begins with a study of the system of human activities within the social system. Of late, a great number of works have been published in the west which try to approach the study of man from the viewpoint of the methodology of systems analysis. As a rule, their authors do not exceed the limits of "social atomism" or "methodological individualism" traditional in bourgeois social thinking.

Within these limits the individual is alienated from society and is pitted against it. The physiological, biological, and psychological principles assume pathologically exaggerated forms allegedly hostile to the social forms. In a number of other studies the social aspect turns out to be simply a projection outside the bio-psychological human characteristics. Other trends try to formalize the study of man within management systems, to dilute his social being within structures, functions, operations, models, and roles, and to depict his activities on the basis of an analogy with the functioning of complex technical systems.

Revealing the scientific groundlessness of such attempts, the author pits against them the Marxist understanding of the human individual as the product of the historical development of society and the nature of his systemic social qualities created by the social ties and relations within which he is included--economic, socio-political, and spiritual-cultural.

As the author justifiably emphasizes "we must see behind the structure man as a social being. We cannot absolutize the structure and consider it as something abstract or self-seeking. Within any structure objects, processes, and ideas play an intermediate role. The main feature of the structure is that of relations among people--social relations" (p 13).

The vulgarized concept of Marxism notwithstanding, this doctrine does not equalize at all the individual, making of it some kind of "economic man," dissolving his personality in production relations. The Marxist thesis to the effect that the human being is a "sum total of all social relations" does not reject in the least what is individual, and uniquely characteristic of the personality, and its value. On the contrary, the founders of Marxism believed that society can become humane only by proclaiming that the purpose of its entire progress is the all-round development of the individual in which the free development of each is a prerequisite for the free development of all. The more fully and actively does a person accept his social nature and everything accumulated through the wealth of the social and cultural experience of mankind, the more possibilities he has to develop the unique wealth of his own talents and capabilities.

The socialist society does not subordinate the individual to itself. It does not suppress individual aspirations, interests, and needs. It does not impose upon them forced and coercive forms of activities but, on the contrary, subordinates the entire social output to the satisfaction of material and spiritual needs. It places man under circumstances in which his interests and requirements would not conflict with those of another person or of the entire society. It enhances such needs, humanizing them, subordinating the dominating trend to the steady self-advancement of talents and gifts, and to the self-realization of creative potentials and possibilities. In this case, as the basic form of self-assertion of the individual, labor itself becomes an organic need: Not an activity pursued only by economic necessity but an activity pursued for its own sake. Whatever free forms it may assume, the activity of individuals, however, always requires an organization, a certain coordination of the actions of individuals, groups, and collectives aimed at achieving a single objective, i.e., management.

Proceeding from such fundamental stipulations, the author successfully studies the more specific aspects of his topic. He considers the objective and subjective management factors, describes their interaction and interchange, and studies the components of managerial work, of the preparations and making of decisions, the organization of their implementation, control, data processing, accounting, supervision, and summing up of results. He analyzes in detail the three levels of the system within which man operates: technological, organizational, and socio-political.

The author brings to light the essential and basic difference between socialist and capitalist management activities. Under capitalist conditions the working man is merely the passive object of management. His actions, will, and mind are manipulated. The realm of socio-political management operates here as a force hostile to the worker, standing above him, and oppressing him.

Bourgeois social thinking conceals the political nature of the management of people under capitalism consisting of suppressing the working people, exploiting them, and manipulating their minds and behavior. It tries to depict measures aimed at the political and economic oppression of the working people as "management rationalization." The alleged purpose of the so-called "social engineering" is to eliminate hitches and failures in the huge mechanism of the capitalist economic system, as well as the contradictions and crises which it experiences, and cure it from social ills with the help of a set of engineering-managerial decisions considered "social technology." According to such concepts social ties and relations could be "regulated" and "repaired" the way this is done with complex technical systems.

The Marxist-Leninist management concept stems from the fact that social relations possess a different, a higher systemic quality compared with technological relations, for which reason management decisions should be based above all on their specific nature in general and on the specifics and advantages of the socialist social organism in particular.

The author adamantly emphasizes the need to assert the true party approach and party style in the socialist management of society. He systematically promotes the idea that management cannot be approached from strictly economic or parochial, not to speak of technocratic positions: Management is a party, a political matter.

Under socialist conditions to manage does not mean in the least to suppress, to supervise, or to order. "Under socialist conditions the management of man and people means the rational organization of their work and their economic, socio-political, and spiritual life, and their upbringing in the spirit of the communist ideals and the observance of the norms of socialist law and communist morality" (p 206).

Developing this thought the author further proves that the most important task in management is to establish the optimal coordination between the condition and development of the individual and the interests of the collective and society in order to be able to regulate their reciprocal requirements. To manage man means, above all, to establish the place of the individual and of its functions, rights, obligations, and social role within the social system. To manage man means to create for everyone the most favorable conditions for the manifestation of talents and the display of initiative and creativity.

Under socialist conditions there neither exists nor could exist any sharp division between managers and managed. Society is managed by the working people themselves directly or through their representatives.

The management mechanism is the interaction between the elements of management and self-management, and between subjects and objects of managerial activities. How does this mechanism operate? What are the directions, channels, and levers of managerial influence in the socialist society? Answering these questions, the author studies the system of human behavioral factors, paying particular attention to human needs (material, spiritual, and the need to communicate and create), to the awareness of such needs expressed as interests, objectives, wishes, and aspirations, to motivations, decision making, inner mobilization, and readiness for action and, finally, to action itself. It is precisely the guided influence on such behavioral factors that is the essence of human management. Society formulates certain norms of human behavior codified in laws; directive acts and documents are drawn up for purposes of the specific management of collective activities. In addition to this, however, particularly important in the socialist society are material and moral incentives, persuasion and explanation, and political, ideological, and moral upbringing. The author discusses in detail and thoroughly forms of management relations such as discipline and responsibility, initiative (collective and private), and competition.

In the last chapter the author offers an interesting and useful formulation of the question of the interaction between management and education in the socialist society. The educated man, he emphasizes, is well acquainted with

his functions, rights, and obligations. He is conscientious and disciplined, initiative minded, and responsible. He implements managerial decisions not thoughtlessly but creatively, attuning his behavior, interests, and objectives with the interests and requirements of the collective and society. The methods of coercion or various types of disciplinary penalties are unnecessary in the management of such a person. The educated person does not tolerate command, bureaucracy, or thoughtless obedience. On the other hand, however, a well structured labor organization and effective management educate the person, developing in him high ideological-political and moral features. "...It would be difficult to overestimate the beneficial influence of a calm, efficient, and creative atmosphere, of the scientific substantiation of decisions, organization, order, and discipline on the collective or the individual person" (p 374).

In fact, nothing affects so fatally the actions and thoughts of a person as subjectivism, the formulation of unrealistic objectives for the collective, the embellishment of reality, and the absence of organization, order, and discipline. All this disorganizes and disappoints the person, triggering a scornful attitude toward his obligations, the collective, and the management, and a loss of feelings of discipline and responsibility. That is why, the author argues, a scientific organization of the work is a powerful tool for management and for raising the people in the spirit of communist requirements and principles.

The author invades areas which have been relatively ignored by the social sciences. He boldly formulates a number of new problems and suggests means for their solution. He argues openly and uncompromisingly against viewpoints expressed in domestic and foreign publications which he considers unacceptable or poorly substantiated. Naturally, he himself does not claim to be free from errors and formulates controversial views.

In our view, for example, the author groundlessly criticizes scientists who have emphasized the negative influence of conveyor belt production on man and on the content of his work and, in this connection, called for replacing it with automated production facilities. Such a substitution, as the author himself acknowledges, is dictated both by the objective logic of the development of technology as well as the need for further humanizing of labor and for upgrading its meaningfulness and required skills.

The development of automation, while creating its own problems, still unquestionably offers incomparably greater opportunities for enriching work with research and creative functions which bring inner satisfaction to the worker and which contributes to the development of his capabilities and to his self-assertion as an individual.

The author denies that this is precisely the principal merit of automation from the viewpoint of our social objectives. He considers as its principal value the shortening of the working time. However, without reorganizing the work into creative work, into a prime vital need, in itself increasing the

amount of leisure time largely loses its meaning and, naturally, cannot resolve the problems of the free and all-round development of the individual and of the total display of his capabilities and gifts.

Understandably, under the conditions of a socialist society it is not necessary to pit one against the other labor and leisure time. Our task is to comprehensively enrich both and make them more meaningful. Today the efforts of our society are directed not toward increasing the amount of leisure time for its own sake but toward its qualitative transformation in the interest of developing the individual as the result of and together with the reorganization of labor.

In our view, the claim that in the socialist society relations between managers and workers in the process of productive work management are part of the base relations seems excessively categorical and, therefore, controversial (p 267). Management relations are a particular type of relations which cannot be reduced either to basic, superstructural, technological, or technical-economic relations. They contain the elements of all of them. The manager of a shop, enterprise, or department performs political, economic, and purely organizational functions. The author himself emphasizes elsewhere that "it is impossible to provide for the economy a simple (basic or superstructural) formula for management or management relations" (p 264).

Naturally, these and other controversial problems require further clarification and study. Their very formulation in the book, however, will unquestionably contribute to their further fruitful discussion by the scientific public.

It is vitally important for the member of the socialist society, conscientiously participating in the various realms of management, to master the science of social management and to be practically guided by its principles. In this connection the new book by V. G. Afanas'yev may be of great help. It is addressed not only to scientists--specialists in this field, party workers, and economic managers--but to the broadest possible circle of Soviet readers and, we believe, will be received by them with interest.

5003

CSO: 1802

NEW RESEARCH ON THE PROBLEM OF THE SOCIALIST WAY OF LIFE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77 pp 120-121

[Review by P. Poshatayev, candidate of philosophical sciences, of the book "Sotsialisticheskiy Obraz Zhizni" [The Socialist Way of Life]. Theoretical and ideological-educational problems. By E. V. Strukov. Mysl, Moscow, 1977, 263 pp]

[Text] The new book by E. V. Strukov is concerned with a broad range of problems in the development and perfecting of the socialist way of life. In it this phenomenon is described as the most important law governing the establishment of the communist socioeconomic system. The author clarifies the methodological significance of the way of life category, defines its place within the system of such most important Marxist-Leninist social science categories as the socioeconomic system, production method, and so on.

Special attention is devoted in the book to the harmonious development of the socialist way of life. By harmony is meant the organic correlation of all aspects of method in the vital activities of the people, classes, social groups, and individuals, insuring optimal indicators of social life. Harmony in the development of the way of life is seen in the proportional correlation of all its aspects, in its inner unity, integrity, and proportionality. This is the general indicator of the qualitative aspect of the way of life and of its dynamism.

"In the future," the book stresses, "it is only through the development of socialism, growing into communism, that a harmonious way of life can be created" (p 46). Herein lies its unquestionable advantage over capitalism, which has irretrievably lost its future. The socialist way of life, under the conditions of developed socialism, is the highest form of human society, just as developed socialism appears today as the highest achievement of socialist progress.

Understandably, changes in the way of life of the people do not come about in isolation from the general process of the building of communism. They are closely linked with the resolution of the general problems in the building of communism. The comprehensive assessment of this situation

enables the author to analyze the objective prerequisites and subjective factors in the socialist way of life profoundly and comprehensively.

Objective and subjective factors exert a combined influence on the development of the way of life. The social policy of the CPSU, the concentrated expression of which is found in the documents of the 25th CPSU Congress, is based on the new possibilities for the planned perfecting of the socialist way of life. Here the party attaches particular importance to the improvement of the sum total of socioeconomic conditions predetermining the perfecting of our way of life. Using extensive factual data, the monograph reveals the significance of the material prerequisites for human activities, the sociopolitical conditions for the upgrading of the social activeness of the Soviet people, the spiritual factors in the enrichment of the way of life, and the role of scientific and technical progress in the transformation of the different aspects of social activity.

The unquestionable merit of the book is to be found in its analysis of the educational and ideological work of the party as a factor in the purposeful alteration of the way of life. This is done here, essentially, for the first time in any monograph devoted to the way of life. The role of educational work in the purposeful development of the socialist way of life is increasing constantly. The system of communist education fulfills its class, conceptual, and regulatory functions in the perfecting of the socialist way of life.

The 25th CPSU Congress made a new theoretical contribution to the general theory of communist education, setting forth the concept of a comprehensive approach to it. In the book, the comprehensive approach is examined in terms of the development of the socialist way of life. Separate chapters are devoted to ideological-political education and the development of the socialist way of life, labor activities and labor education, and the basic directions of the influence of communist morality on the way of life. Here the topical problems of conceptual orientation, international education, the social and educational importance of improvement in the quality of work on the development of the socialist way of life, the way of enhancing the role of the labor collective in its reproduction, and the ethical and socio-psychological problems in the adaptation of the individual to the changing way of life are depicted.

One must agree with the author's conclusions on the need to improve the organization of social forecasting and comprehensive socioeconomic planning for the purposes of the further perfecting of the socialist way of life. Such planning will contribute to an upsurge in the social activeness of the working people in all sectors of public life.

It is fortunate that the problems of the socialist way of life have recently been the constant center on which the attention of Soviet social science researchers has focused. The book by E. V. Strukov is a new confirmation of this. It enriches our concepts of the paths and laws governing the development of the socialist way of life and the ways and means of perfecting it.

HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE AND ITS LESSONS; THE WORKERS MOVEMENT IN THE PERIOD OF TRANSITION TO IMPERIALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77 pp 121-127

[Review by B. Likhachev of the book "Mezhdunarodnoye Rabocheye Dvizheniye. Voprosy Istorii i Teorii" [The International Workers Movement. Problems of History and Theory]. In 7 vols. Vol 2: "Rabocheye Dvizheniye v Period Perekhoda k Imperializmu (1871-1904)" [The Workers Movement in the Period of Transition to Imperialism (1871-1904)]. Editor-in-chief V. V. Zagladin. A collective of authors headed by Professor V. V. Zagladin and USSR Academy of Sciences Corresponding Member T. T. Timofeyev. Mysl', Moscow, 1976, 654 pp]

[Text] The study of the international workers movement, i.e., of the universal-historical activities of the class which holds the center of our epoch, is legitimately assuming an ever greater scale and depth. The more intensively such studies are developed, the clearer becomes their practical and vital significance in the study of the specific ways and general laws governing the revolutionary reorganization of the world. The history and theory of the international workers movement offer vivid examples of the methodologically very fruitful--inter-disciplinary--study, confidently developing as one of the main directions followed by the social sciences and by the Marxist-Leninist study of society.

Justifiably the comprehensive multiple-volume publication "Mezhdunarodnoye Rabocheye Dvizheniye. Voprosy Istorii i Teorii" (Academician B. N. Ponomarev, editorial commission chairman) plays a particular role in this connection. This fundamental study aimed at summing up the results of Marxist-Leninist thinking in this area, inevitably exceeds the framework of its immediate tasks; establishing the level reached in the scientific knowledge of the problems of the international workers movement as a whole, it is also a base for its subsequent study; furthermore, characterizing the leading force in the world's social development, it actively penetrates the ideological and political life of our time. Here the cognitive and conceptual functions blend organically within such a study which argues sharply with the ideological opponents of Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

The substantiation of such an approach to the publication was fully justified by the first volume which was published in 1971.¹ It is just as convincingly confirmed by its second volume discussed in the present review.

Let us immediately point out that in this volume as well which covers a qualitatively new period in terms of specific content, the collective of authors entirely retained and systematically implemented the methodological principles and essential lines of study formulated in the overall introduction to the work, written by B. N. Ponomarev and published in Volume 1. Briefly stated, it is a question of "providing, against the background of social development as a whole, a systematic interpretation of events and problems directly pertaining to the development of the working class, and indicate, on the basis of specific data, its growing role as a factor insuring the social progress of mankind" (Vol 1, p 8). Considering the international workers movement as a historically appeared and developing category the authors do not reduce it in the least to a sum total of its national detachments but try to determine the common laws governing the class struggle of the proletariat as a universal process in its specific-national manifestation. The consideration of historical data from such positions presumes, among others, a maximally broad territorial-geographic scope. The features common to both volumes also include a higher level of theoretical summations compared with previously published works on this subject. This characteristic is directly linked with the fact that "in recent decades," as is noted in the introduction, "the international workers movement acquired new valuable experience which makes it possible comprehensively to assess past phenomena and processes" (Vol 1, p 8).

Naturally, the methodological strictness of the analysis does not conceal in the least the specific characteristics of the class struggle of the proletariat and the vital clarity of the period considered in this volume of the tremendous and dramatic picture presented by the international workers movement in the period ranging from the Paris Commune to the first people's revolution of the imperialist epoch--the 1905-1907 Russian Revolution. On the contrary, such consistency and orderliness enable us to see and trace more clearly the natural, general features of the movements in the entire variety of their specific manifestations. As in Volume 1 the authors have been able to recreate this picture by combining scientific accuracy with the lively and interesting narration including the socio-political portrait of the worker at the turn of the 20th century, showing his high moral qualities and spiritual interests.

"Each stage in the development of the working class and its revolutionary movement is interesting and important from the viewpoint of the history of

1. See KOMMUNIST No 10, 1976. N. Lebedev, "Summing Up the Experience of the International Proletariat."

mankind." This is how the preface to the second volume begins, covering one of the decisive periods in the development of the proletariat as the hegemonist figure in contemporary social development.

What is the nature of the period under consideration and which of its problems determine its historical significance?

In 1913 V. I. Lenin wrote that after the publication of the "Communist Party Manifesto" universal history "could be clearly divided into three main periods: 1. From the 1848 revolution to the Paris Commune (1871); 2. From the Paris Commune to the Russian Revolution (1905); 3. From the Russian Revolution on" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 23, p 1). Covering the second of these periods, the volume covers the international workers movement in the epoch of transition from pre-monopoly capitalism to imperialism and, from the viewpoint of its class content, the epoch of the transformation of the bourgeoisie from a progressive to a reactionary class. The transitional nature of the epoch inevitably predetermined both the processes occurring at that time within the working class itself as well as its changing position in the world's social development. Whereas in the period preceding the one described in the volume the working class developed, as the founders of Marxism said, "from a class within itself" into a "class for itself" and, becoming aware of itself as a class, proclaimed the fact in its initial independent actions, now "processes which determined the conversion of the proletariat into the leading class of society, enabling it to undertake in practical terms the freeing of humanity from the chains of class oppression in all its forms" emerged on the foreground (p 7). This main trend in the development of the working class, i.e., its assertion as a "class for society," determined, respectively, the entire range of problems which faced the international workers movement. Their essence, the preface notes, was that the accumulation of objective and subjective prerequisites for a revolutionary blasting of the exploiting system made inevitable a qualitative leap in the elaboration of theory and politics, and in the revolutionary action itself (see p 10). The ripening of this qualitative leap, which represented the main content of the international workers movement at that period became historical necessity and the answer to it was the birth of Leninism which embodied the entire experience of the world's and, above all, of the Western European workers movement, the advent of the Leninist stage in its history.

It is not astounding, therefore, that the authors deal extensively with the working class and its struggle in our country, for the center of gravity of the world's revolutionary movement shifted to Russia while the struggle waged by the Russian working class became the decisive class experience of the world's proletariat. Naturally, this does not change in the least the general--international and internationalist--trend of the study. On the contrary, one of the main thoughts expressed in the volume, most clearly revealed precisely on the basis of Russian data, is that the conversion of the working class into a hegemonistic class of contemporary social

revolutions also means a qualitative leap in the process of internationalization of the workers movement, i.e., the ever more complete and systematic expression of its class nature. "From an objective international value the working class became a tactical international value," the preface states (p 9).

As an inseparable feature of the process of turning the working class into the leading force of social development, the increased internationalization of the workers movement is inseparably linked with its enhanced revolutionariness and, above all, with the need to surmount all kinds of opportunism. It is no accident that it is precisely at this stage in the struggle against opportunism the strengthening and assertion of the revolutionary current in the course of this struggle becomes the central problem of the entire workers movement.

During that period the birth of Leninism as the theory and practice of the proletariat's fulfillment of its universal-historical mission became the fullest and most systematic expression of revolutionary internationalism. Bearing in mind that the first half of the book, discussing the experience of the Paris Commune and describing the workers and socialist movements after it and until the beginning of the Leninist stage, we realize the clarity with which we could see in the time period covered in this volume the continuity between the two stages of the international workers movement: Marxism acts as an inviolable platform, as the foundation for the appearance of Leninism, while Leninism acts as the logical continuation and development of Marxism, as the only true and practically effective theory of the socialist revolution (see p 13). The tangible and comprehensively substantiated proof of this thought, equally directed against the historically defeated and the currently active enemies of Marxism-Leninism, is the unquestionable scientific merit of the book.

Noting the breadth and scope of the analysis it contains, we must state in general that the book does not suppress but, conversely, aptly combines separate lines of research such as the study of the specific conditions and forms of the workers movement and the purely ideological and theoretical problems of its development. This basic characteristic of the book in which fundamental science is naturally combined with the revolutionary pathos of research is clearly visible throughout the volume.

Since each of its 12 chapters covers a sufficiently broad and conceptual range of problems let us single out their most essential content.

The first of the four parts into which the work is divided--"Internationalization of the Conditions of the Class Struggle and the International Proletariat"--is exceptionally important in understanding the entire methodology of this research. Its purpose is to characterize above all the socioeconomic and general political circumstances in which the workers movement developed as well as the objective trends governing the development of the international working class itself. What were the problems facing

the international workers movement? What was the path along which it was led by the objective reality of its contemporary society? The main answer to these questions is determined by the fact that "with the advent of the imperialist stage all contradictions inherent in the capitalist system were aggravated to such a limit and extent which closely lead to the revolutionary overthrow of the rule of the financial oligarchy" (p 45).

At the same time, the study contained in Chapter 1 of the trends of political development in the capitalist world in the final decades of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries (the rightlessness of the majority of male workers, the absence--even official--of any rights for working women, cruel national oppression in many parts of the world, racial oppression, and drastic intensification of the burden of militarism--the political reality at the dawn of imperialism) convincingly proves that despite all the differences existing among the individual countries everywhere grounds existed for a broad, general democratic movement, and for a struggle for the introduction or the broadening of bourgeois-democratic freedoms, creating the necessary base for the activities of proletarian political parties and other organizations.

The working class alone could undertake the solution of these problems and act as an effective force of democratic progress, counter balancing the trend toward political reaction developing among the bourgeoisie in the course of the transition to imperialism. The objective laws governing the development of the working class itself, as is irrefutably proved in Chapter 2 (one of the best chapters in the book, representing an original study) steadily prepared it for the fulfillment of this mission. This is confirmed by the tremendous quantitative growth of the hired labor army, described in the chapter, and the changes in its composition shown in the extensive data on shifts within the structure of the proletariat, its living and working conditions, and the forms and methods of capitalist exploitation. "The development of the working class depended on its ability to resist capitalist exploitation and to struggle for changes in its living and working conditions...That is why the circumstance that it was precisely then that the working class was able to strengthen and broaden basic trade union rights and freedoms in some countries and acquire them for the first time in others is particularly important" (p 61).

Two circumstances, pointed out by the author, and offered as the specific scientific substantiation of the development of the revolutionary internationalism of the workers movement, are no less significant in proving the conclusion on the preparations made by the international working class for the fulfillment of its tasks. First, it is a question of the ideological-political development of the working class. Already then, the author writes, "The so-called workers problem became the focal point of political life" (p 99), while the main result of the social and political gains of the proletariat was that "each position gained contributed to self-development of the working class and to the broadening of its cultural and political outlook...The very fact that the workers participated in the struggle was of decisive significance...It was precisely in the course of the struggle that the trade union organizations of the working class and its political parties

were hammered out" (p 100). At the same time the prestige of the proletariat and the sympathy which the non-proletarian, toiling strata felt for it increased.

Secondly, it was precisely during these decades that the concept of "world-wide proletariat," used by Marx and Engels as their initial theoretical postulate acquired a specific content and became reality (see p 102). The "shortcomings and weaknesses of individual detachments of the international working class" created by this contradictory process, the author concludes, "could be and were surmounted only through the organization of the workers on a national and international scale and the adamant work of the revolutionary proletarian vanguard, as well as in the course of the daily and ever broadening practical struggle, enriched further and further with new experience" (p 104).

The second part of the volume entitled "First Experience in Proletarian Dictatorship and It's Significance with the World's Workers Movement," which also consists of two chapters (three and four), covers the biggest event of the revolutionary struggle in the last decades of the 19th century--the Paris Commune. The authors of these chapters have been able to single out the aspects of its experience which, as the authors justifiably emphasize, occupies an important position in the ideological treasury of the international workers movement and continues to play an essential role in the ideological struggle on the basic problems of the revolutionary process.

Analyzing the activities of the Paris Commune as the first dictatorship of the proletariat in history, the author pays particular attention to some of its aspects such as the destruction of the bourgeois state apparatus and the adoption of socioeconomic measures, particularly those aimed at strengthening the alliance between the working class and the non-proletarian, toiling strata. These chapters also assess in detail the reasons for the defeat of the Paris Commune. In addition to the fact that the peasantry had not been won over on the side of the working class, describing the events which preceded the 18 March 1871 uprising, the author analyzes in detail the revolutionary-democratic movement which developed in the autumn of 1870 in the southern part of France--in Lyons and Marseilles. He reaches the substantiated conclusion that the blame for the defeat of this movement, as the result of which, at the decisive moment, the Parisian proletariat became isolated, falls on the bourgeois radicals who are able to profit from the insufficient organization of the workers and the weakness of their leaders contaminated by anarchic views (see p 126).

Thanks to the experience of the Paris Commune Marxism became enriched with important concepts on the need for the proletariat to acquire mass allies and for combining the struggle for proletarian class objectives with the struggle for democracy; on the need to break down the military-bureaucratic bourgeois machinery as a condition creating the possibility for the adoption of differentiated approaches to the various elements of the bourgeois governmental structure. The commune gave the Marxist classics specific data on the practical aspect of the democratic nature of proletarian dictatorship.

The most important thing shown by the commune, however, as was pointed out by Marx and Engels, and which was considered by Lenin to be of prime importance in studying the lessons of the commune, which he used as a base in resolving the main problems of the revolutionary movement and, particularly, problems related to the biggest class battles, was the vital need for the organization of political parties of the working class equipped with revolutionary scientific theory. This conclusion assumed a decisive role in terms of the future of the workers movement in Russia. Yet, even then, in the 1870's, Marx and Engels focused on it all their activities within the First International, as they fought for the approval of the idea of a political organization of the working class, while opposing the views and divisive activities of the anarchists. Summing up the results of the work of the First International, the author notes that despite all Bakuninist intrigues, it was dominated by Marxist program and organizational principles.

The problem of political parties of the working class (their appearance, tactics, development of a mass base, elaboration of program documents, and so on) is the pivotal study found in the next two chapters which also cover the so-called "peaceful" period in the workers movement and the specifically Leninist stage (incidentally, it was "peaceful" in comparison with the subsequent epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, as Lenin frequently pointed out). The chapters contain sections on the activities of the socialist parties and, in particular, a very valuable analysis of their program and organizational principles, bringing to light the complex process of surmounting the petit bourgeois ideas, the history of events preceding the establishment and activities of the Second International, considered through the lens of all problems on which Lenin focused his attention (the struggle for the daily interests of the working class and the tactic of the socialist parties and, subsequently, the general political line in the pursuit in the struggle for power, a line which became the subject of sharp discussions in connection with the "Millerand case;" a section on the trade unions and on the mass struggle as a means for political struggle; finally, a section on the anti-war struggle and on the specific struggle against the danger of a world war). Let us emphasize that, relying on precise and frequently scrupulously historically accurate study, the authors do not engage in any simplifications whatever in the interpretation of these complex and unevenly and conflictingly developing processes. The assessment of the activities of the Second International, quite complex in terms of their consequences, offers a clear example of this.

Naturally, the greater attention paid to the problems of the political party of the proletariat does mean in the least that the mass movement of the working class or the development of revolutionary theory have been underestimated.

One of the merits of this work is precisely the fact that the history of the workers movement--bourgeois and reformist ideologues notwithstanding--is described here as the history of mass movements. From this viewpoint the meaningful parts of the book, frequently saturated with unfamiliar data, describing the history of the striking movement or the activities of the

various types of trade union associations and other organizations and forms of activities of the proletariat, provide not only cognitive but basic ideological and theoretical information. On a strictly factual basis the authors also resolve the general problem of the establishment of a classification for the workers movement of different countries, taking into consideration its specific national characteristics and proceeding essentially from the correlation between revolutionary and opportunistic trends. This range of problems is discussed in the important chapter on the workers movement in colonial and dependent countries and the positions of the international socialist movement on the national-colonial problem. The determination and substantiation of development laws common to industrially developed countries (establishment of the proletariat, initial steps of the proletarian movement, and so on) is achieved with the help of a variety of factual data a substantial part of which have been put together for the first time.

On the other hand, the authors invariably keep track of the immediate theoretical problems which are considered both in the course of the entire narration as well as in chapters dealing especially with them. Thus, Chapter 6--"Marxism in the Struggle Against Opportunism. Further Development of Revolutionary Theory"--will unquestionably draw the attention of the readers both by its coordinated characterization of the development of Marxism from the mid-1870's to the mid-1890's, with a number of research topics. We bear in mind in particular the essay on the dissemination of Marxism, the adoption of Marxist ideas by the masses, and the elaboration of the various aspects of Marxist theory by noted personalities of the International Workers Movement, such as A. Bebel, W. Liebknecht, P. Lafargue, G. V. Plekhanov, F. Mehring, A. Labriola, and others. We also refer to one of the important polemical sections of the book describing the reasons for and course of the ideological struggle which developed around the Bernsteinian revision of Marxism and, in this connection, the convincing description provided of Engels's revolutionary activities in the last years of his life.

Despite the extremely great variety of phenomena and processes covered in this volume, the logic of their study finds in this book its purposeful and convincing conclusion. This is the role of the chapters which consider Lenin's activities, beginning with the circumstances in which they developed and ending with the general, theoretical conclusions he drew at that time. One can easily understand how responsible the task facing the authors at this point was, bearing in mind already existing writings. This makes the fact that the solution has been successfully resolved in these chapters even more pleasing.

Without entering into their more detailed characterization, let us note at least three aspects which, in our view, would trigger a scientific and political response.

Let us begin with the question which, despite its extensive study, retains a key significance in understanding the history and theory of the socialist

revolution: The question of the laws governing the revolutionary development in Russia and, consequently, of the historical and theoretical significance of the experience of the Russian revolution. Not merely the accumulation of a variety of social and political contradictions but the very nature of their combination in the country, which determined the fullest possible concentration and the most essential and most painful antagonisms in this country, and not simply the existence of the motive forces of the liberation movement, but the type of correlation and deployment of all class forces in which it was precisely the working class that acted as the main force of the revolution was what made Russia the weak link in the world's imperialist system and the main sector of the struggle for the revolutionary reorganization of society. This profoundly legitimate nature of the ripening of the Russian revolution determined just as naturally its international significance for both European and Asian countries. "...The prospects of the world's revolutionary process largely depended on the extent to which the Russian working class would be able to resolve the historical problem which befell it" (p 332).

In turn, the very possibility for such a solution depended, in the final account, on the revolutionary level of the political party of the working class. That is why the second noteworthy aspect in the chapters discussing Lenin's activities is the characterization of the process of appearance of Bolshevism and the creation of the first proletarian party of a new type which played a decisive role in all the events of the 20th century, considered a turning point in the history of the world's revolutionary movement. The ability inherent throughout the book to build and recreate the live, historical picture based on the strict framework of main problems and studies is particularly clear here. Sections such as those describing the Petersburg period of Lenin's activities, the plan for organizing a revolutionary Marxist party, his gigantic efforts to formulate and insure the adoption of the RSDWP program, and the impressive essay on the activities related to editing Lenin's ISKRA, written essentially on the basis of prime sources, will be unquestionably welcomed with the greatest possible attention and interest. Lenin's party alone, contrary to the parties within the Second International, which continued to grow yet which developed ever more seriously the disease of opportunism which, in the final account, destroyed them, Lenin's party alone was able to head the implementation of the tasks facing the workers movement under the new historical conditions. The appearance of Bolshevism, the authors conclude, introduced radical changes in the deployment of forces in the Russian and, subsequently, the international workers movement. "Objectively, this made the Bolshevik Party the vanguard of the International Socialist Movement" (p 599).

Finally, the third aspect which must be mentioned deals with the Leninist stage in the development of revolutionary theory. In the preface to the second volume the attention of the reader is already drawn by the clear description of the theoretical problems determining the main landmarks of Lenin's contribution to the development of the international workers movement. Here it is a question, first of all, of the problems raised by Lenin on the growth of the revolutionary possibilities of the proletarian

movement and of increasing its role in social development in the new epoch and, secondly, of the all-round problem of the conditions under which the proletariat could implement its historical mission, elaborated by Lenin.

The quantitative and qualitative growth of the proletariat and, particularly, the Leninist methodology used in the study of such processes; the conversion of the proletariat into the center of gravity for all social elements opposing big capital; Lenin's formulation of the problem of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution, marking a new development in Marxism, and Lenin's interpretation of the meaning of this concept; and, finally, the discovery, along with the basic class antagonism in bourgeois society, of a new, broader social contradiction--between the monopolies and the entire people--is, most concisely, the list of problems which enable us to see the logic substantiating Lenin's conclusion on the objective growth of the revolutionary possibilities of the proletariat.

As to the necessary conditions for achieving such possibilities, here again it is a question of still current problems. The introduction of a class, a proletarian consciousness in the workers masses and the conversion of spontaneous actions into a conscientious struggle against the capitalist system; the organizational change of the proletarian vanguard into a revolutionary Marxist party, a party of a new type; and insuring unity within the ranks of the working class are major, multiple-level problems backed in the book by very rich, factual data, considered in a truly dialectical fashion with a maximal consideration of their complexity and dynamism and of the difficulties and internal contradictions which constantly arise and are resolved in the course of the universal-historical process of the working class's implementation of its mission.

It is precisely here, in the discussion of this range of problems, that vital problems are treated such as the sources of the revolutionary working class, the correlation between the living standard of the working people and their ability to wage a revolutionary struggle, the correlation between spontaneity and consciousness in the revolutionary process, and, finally, the struggle between the revolutionary and opportunistic trends in the workers movement.

We could consider as a creative success of the authors the fact that the description of Lenin's contribution to the development of Marxist theory in all its aspects, as a single international doctrine which offers the only true answer to the problems of the world's 20th century workers movement, is systematically consistent with the overall intent of the book.

History is always linked with modern times through many links even though initially and superficially invisible. The topical nature of this publication does not need extensive proof, the more so since it organically combines problems of the history and theory of the International Workers Movement. Here historical data does not "serve" ready-made theoretical conclusions and truths gained through theory do not break down with the twists of history.

The unity between the historical and theoretical approaches achieved in the book is a tangible manifestation of a problem very topical in the contemporary revolutionary movement: The correlation between general laws and specific characteristics, and the dialectics between the general and the specific in the world's social development. From this viewpoint the book is instructive above all because it indicates, on the basis of a huge amount of complex data, how the problem could be resolved in the course of the specific historical process. Guided by strict scientific requirements, it proves the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the problem. Under contemporary conditions, when the need for establishing the profound laws governing social development is increasing with the increased variety of specific circumstances and forms of revolutionary activities, the lessons of the historical-theoretical analysis of one of the most important stages in the international workers movement are of obvious value.

We can only add to this that the time separating us from that stage has not deprived in the least from their topical meaning all the major and even relatively specific problems which were resolved then. The phenomena and processes of the period of transition to imperialism, problems which arose in the international workers movement at that time, remained the subject of the close study of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, for historical experience, interpreted from contemporary positions, is always a source of enrichment of theory. Naturally, these problems remain the subjects of an acute ideological and political struggle.

The lines followed by this struggle in the past decades, a struggle lasting through this day, are concisely and clearly described in the final chapter of the volume. Singling out the three basic directions of historiography hostile to Marxism-Leninism--the social-reformist, bourgeois, and "left-wing"-opportunistic--the author proves that the arguments brought forth by the ideologues of all trends remain to this day the weapons of anti-communism. In this sense the anti-Marxist concepts of the period considered in the volume are so closely linked with our time, are so "current" that it would be expedient to describe this link even though most briefly.

The author notes that all these directions have one common feature: They have no solid or systematic methodological base. All of them are vulgar and eclectic and their seeming or even occasionally factual contradictory nature does not hinder either the fact that their main conclusions coincide or their practical "mutual aid" in their common struggle against Marxism-Leninism.

However, methodological inconsistency inevitably brings about a failure to understand the general laws and cause and effect relations within the historical process, and an inability to penetrate into the essence of specific events and phenomena. Taking as an example social reformist ideologues, the author explains, their vulgar approach leads them to ignoring the mainspring of the historical process of the period under consideration: The aggravation of the basic social antagonisms within bourgeois society in the epoch of imperialism. Yet, the logic of such a lack of understanding

leads to everything else: Imperialism is considered by them not as a stage in the development of capitalism, closely leading to a socialist revolution, but, in a Kautskian spirit, as a "political phenomenon" which broadens the field of cooperation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and even as a "direct implementation of the principles of socialism." This takes from the workers movement its entire revolutionary nature and the social reformist ideologues, without objecting to the aspiration of the working people to improve their position, firmly condemn any action of a truly revolutionary type and directly assume positions hostile to the proletariat. It is easy to understand, therefore, why it is that they consider the period which followed the Paris Commune, despite most obvious facts, a time of "dampening" of the class struggle rather than as a preparation for decisive class battles, and why not Leninism but reformism in general--despite its shameful failure it experienced only 10 to 20 years later--is depicted as the "main way" of the international workers movement. It is also understandable why social reformist ideologues, belittling the significance of the general laws of the class struggle, essentially oppose the international unity of the working class considering the international itself as no more than a sum total of national organizations.

The distorted interpretation of the history of the international workers movement, the final chapter states, is countered by Marxist-Leninist historiography by truly scientific and comprehensive research. (Thus, for example, the author notes that the international response to the appearance of Leninism and Lenin's international activities at the turn of the century, and the universal-historical significance of the creation and development of the Bolshevik Party were subjected to extensive work in the 1960's and 1970's. The merits of the revolutionary social-democrats in foreign countries were studied and objectively described. The activities of the Second International and of many workers parties and of the mass proletarian organizations of the turn of the century were properly assessed. A thorough study was made of the stages of the appearance and evolution of opportunistic currents and of the correlation and struggle between the revolutionary and opportunistic trends in the international workers movement of that time. The work offers extensive bibliographic references for all such problems.)

It is on the basis of such studies that Marxist-Leninist thinking has reached conclusions of major ideological and political importance to the workers movement of today. The main feature here is that it has gained new and convincing proof of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the leading and decisive role of the working class in the revolutionary reorganization of the world.

The present book makes a basic important contribution to the substantiation of this conclusion.

5003

CSO: 1802

FROM THE BOOK SHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 77 p 128

[Text] "Pis'ma Vladimira Il'icha Lenina k Rodnym" [Vladimir Il'ich's Letters to Relatives]. Letters to M. A. Ul'yanova, A. I. Ul'yanova-Yelizarova, M. I. Ul'yanova, and M. T. Yelizarov. Compiled by Z. A. Levina and M. Ya. Pankratova. Second edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 208 pp.

"Vo Imya Mira na Zemle" [In the Name of Peace on Earth]. The Soviet Union in the struggle for peace and cooperation among the peoples. In two volumes. Volume One: 1971-1974. A. M. Aleksandrov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 576 pp.

"Feliks Edmundovich Dzerzhinskiy." A biography. Editor-in-chief S. K. Tsvigun. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 494 pp.

"Velikaya Oktyabr'skaya Sotsialisticheskaya Revolyutsiya i Pobeda Sovetskoy Vlasti na Ukraine. Fevral' 1917 g. - Fevral' 1918 g." [The Great October Socialist Revolution and the Victory of the Soviet System in the Ukraine. February 1917-February 1918]. Chronichle of the most important historical-party and revolutionary events. In two parts. Part One: "Bol'sheviki vo Glave Trudyashchikhsya Ukrainy v Period Borby za Pobedu Velikogo Oktyabrya. Fevral'-Oktyabr' 1917 g." [The Bolshevik leadership of the Ukrainian Working People in the Period of the Struggle for the Victory of the Great October. February-October 1917]. Authored and compiled by P. L. Vargatyuk et al. Politizdat Ukrainy, Kiev, 1977, 711 pp.

"Vooruzhennyye Sily Velikogo Oktyabrya" [The Armed Forces of the Great October]. By V. G. Kolychev et al. S. A. Tyushkevich senior editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1977, 287 pp.

"Dekrety Velikogo Oktyabrya" [Decrees of the Great October]. Album. Authored and compiled by Yu. A. Akharkin and M. P. Iroshnikov. Lenizdat, Leningrad, 1977, 143 pp.

Ye. F. Yerykalov and B. N. Kameshkov. "Leninskiy TsK -- Shtab Velikogo Oktyabrya" [Lenin's Central Committee -- Headquarters of the Great October]. Lenizdat, Leningrad, 1977, 279 pp.

L. M. Zak. "Oni Predstavlyali Narod Frantsii" [They Represented the People of France]. On the history of the French internationalists, 1918-1920. Mysl', Moscow, 1977, 279 pp.

V. V. Zelenin. "Pod Znamenem Krasnogo Oktyabrya" [Under the Red October Banner]. The Yugoslav internationalists in Soviet Russia, 1917-1921. Mysl', Moscow, 1977, 253 pp.

"Ideyno-Politicheskaya Sushchnost' Maoizma" [The Ideological and Political Nature of Maoism]. By S. A. Voyevodin et al. Nauka, Moscow, 1977, 443 pp.

"Istoricheskiy Opyt Velikogo Oktyabrya i Kritika Burzhuaznoy Istoriografii" [The Historical Example of the Great October and Criticism of Bourgeois Historiography]. By a collective of authors. Edited by L. S. Gaponenko and K. V. Gusev. Mysl', Moscow, 1977, 375 pp.

"Istoriya Sotsialisticheskoy Ekonomiki SSSR" [History of the Socialist Economy of the USSR]. In seven volumes. Volume three: "Sozdaniye Fundamenta Sotsialisticheskoy Ekonomiki v SSSR. 1926-1932 gg." [Laying the Foundations of the Socialist Economy in the USSR. 1926-1932]. Nauka, Moscow, 1977, 535 pp.

V. R. Kopylov. "Zarubezhnyye Internatsionalisty v Oktyabr'skoy Revolyutsii. 1917-1918 gg." [Foreign Internationalists in the October Revolution. 1917-1918]. Mysl', Moscow, 1977, 213 pp.

Yu. A. Krasin. "Teoriya Sotsialisticheskoy Revolyutsii: Leninskoye Naslediye i Sovremennost'" [Theory of the Socialist Revolution: Lenin's Legacy and Contemporaneity]. Mysl', Moscow, 1977, 292 pp.

"Leninskaya Teoriya Imperializma i Sovremennost'" [Lenin's Theory of Imperialism and Contemporaneity]. Collective monograph. Edited by N. N. Inozemtsev, V. A. Martynov, and S. M. Nikitin. Mysl', Moscow, 1977, 454 pp.

"Marksizm-Leninizm i Pitserskiye Rabochiye" [Marxism-Leninism and the Workers of Petersburg]. From the experience of the ideological work of the Marxists-Leninists in Petersburg-Petrograd between 1883 and 1917. G. S. Zhuykov scientific editor. Lenizdat, Leningrad 1977, 368 pp.

"Marksistko-Leninskoye Ucheniye o Gosudarstve i Prave" [The Marxist-Leninist Doctrine of the State and the Law]. History of its development and the present. Edited by N. V. Vitruk et al. Nauka, Moscow, 1977, 352 pp.

"Narodnoye Khozyaystvo SSSR za 60 Let" [TheUSSR National Economy in the Past 60 Years]. Anniversary statistical yearbook. L. A. Umanskiy in charge of publication. Statistika, Moscow, 1977, 710 pp.

"Sotsializm i Yevropeyskaya Bezopasnost'" [Socialism and European Security]. Edited by O. T. Bogomolov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 303 pp.

L. E. Recabarren. "Izbrannyye Stat'i i Rechi" [Selected Articles and Speeches]. Translated from the Spanish. Compiled by I. Ye. Rybalkin. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 263 pp.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1977

5003

CSO: 1802

- END -