JPRS 74194

18 September 1979

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 10, July 1979

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

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

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

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

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

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

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

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

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.

50272-101

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	1. REPORT NO. JPRS 74194	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle USSR REPORT: TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No. 10, July 1979			5. Report Date 18 September 1979 6.
7. Author(s)			8. Performing Organization Rept. No.
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No. 11. Contract(C) or Grant(G) No. (C) (G)
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above			13. Type of Report & Period Covered 14.

15. Supplementary Notes
Translations from KOMMUNIST, theoretical journal of the CPSU Central Committee, Moscow, published 18 times a year.

16. Abstract (Limit: 200 words)

The report contains articles on political, economic, military and social developments and problems within the USSR and as they relate to communist and other countries.

17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors

USSR
Political Science
Sociology
Propaganda
Economics

b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 5C

18. Availability Statement	19. Security Class (This Report)	21. No. of Pages
Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22161	UNCLASSIFIED	156
	20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price

(See ANSI-Z39.18)

OPTIONAL FORM 272 (4-77)
(Formerly NTIS-35)
Department of Commerce

JPRS 74194

18 September 1979

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 10, July 1979

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

Results of the Brezhnev-Carter Meeting 1

The Socialist Comity is the Greatest Revolutionary Achievement 3

Great Exploit of the People
(A. Gol'tsov) 16

Words and Deeds of 'Integral' Personnel
(V. Arkhipenko) 26

In the Spirit of Internationalism and Soviet Patriotism
(L. Shapiro) 35

Leninist Concept of Law and Contemporary Scientific Knowledge
(I. Naletov) 48

Topical Aspects of the Correlation of Fundamental and Applied Research
(A. Zotov) 62

Scientific Integration under the Conditions of the Scientific and Technical Revolution
(M. Chepikov) 73

Tolstoy and the Theater
(V. Komissarzhevskiy) 86

'We Take Pride in the Memory of Our Fathers'
(V. Sedykh) 100

On Democratic Centralism and Political Pluralism
(G. Shakhnazarov) 108

CONTENTS (Continued) Page

G. V. Plekhanov's Life
(I. Mindlin) 123

Brief Review of Books
(S. Popov and V. Ivanovskiy) 131

Bookshelf 136

Journal's Mail in 1979 141

Following the Publications in KOMMUNIST 147

PUBLICATION DATA

English title	:	TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No 10, July 1979
Russian title	:	KOMMUNIST
Author (s)	:	
Editor (s)	:	R. I. Kosolapov
Publishing House	:	Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"
Place of Publication	:	Moscow
Date of Publication	:	July 1979
Signed to press	:	5 June 1979
Copies	:	947,000
COPYRIGHT	:	Izdatel'stvo "Pravda," "Kommunist," 1979

RESULT OF THE BREZHNEV-CARTER MEETING

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 79 pp 3-4

[Report on the results of the meeting between L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, and U.S. President J. Carter]

[Text] Having considered the results of the meeting between L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, and U.S. President J. Carter, held on 15-18 June 1979, in Vienna, the CC CPSU Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers entirely and fully approve the activities of the Soviet delegation headed by L. I. Brezhnev and express their profound satisfaction with the results achieved at the meeting and, above all, the conclusion of the treaty between the USSR and the United States on limiting strategic offensive armaments, the protocol to the treaty, and the other related documents, as well as the joint Soviet-American communique.

The reaching of an agreement on such matters became possible as a result of the lengthy and intensive work done by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers, and L. I. Brezhnev's personal contribution to the preparations for and holding of the meeting, for strengthening universal peace, curbing the arms race, and developing mutually profitable cooperation among countries with different social systems.

The Vienna meeting represents an important step forward to improvements of Soviet-American relations and of the entire international political climate. The full implementation of the documents initialed in Vienna opens new opportunities for putting an end to the growth of the arsenals of nuclear missile weapons and for insuring their effective quantitative and qualitative limitation. The solution of this problem would be a new step in restraining the nuclear armaments race and would open a path to substantially reducing armaments and implementing the supreme objective of the total termination of the production and the destruction of nuclear weapon stocks.

The new treaty is based on the principle of equality and identical security. It equitably balances the interests of the USSR and the United States. No

deviations from the treaty could be considered admissible. The Soviet Union is prepared to implement in full the assumed obligations. It proceeds from the fact that the other side will adopt the same approach to the problem. This will make it possible to initiate in the immediate future the next stage of SALT talks.

L. I. Brezhnev and President J. Carter also held a useful exchange of views on problems being discussed at other multilateral and Soviet-American talks on the limitation of armaments and on disarmament, currently under way. The implementation of the SALT II treaty should stimulate the fastest possible successful completion of such talks.

In the course of the encounter the positions held by the USSR and by the United States on crucial problems of the contemporary international situation were frankly compared. This includes problems on which such positions differ. The exchange of views on such matters has been useful.

The Soviet Union positively rates the fact that both sides have firmly expressed themselves in favor of the further intensification of detente. Also very important is the agreement of the parties to the effect that the positive changes which have taken place in the situation on the European continent, reflected in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, must be consolidated and developed through measures aimed at adding military to political detente. In this connection the Soviet Union ascribes great importance to making the required progress in the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

The Soviet Union deems it its duty to continue to wage a systematic and adamant struggle against the arms race, for a reduction and cessation of the production of all types of armaments, for further international detente, and for lasting peace on earth.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers deem that the Vienna meeting opens possibilities for a more systematic broadening of the field of Soviet-American cooperation on the principled basis of total equality, identical security, and respect for the sovereignty and non-interference in the domestic affairs of one another. Consistent with the basic interests of the peoples of the USSR and the United States, such cooperation strengthens the international peace.

The Vienna meeting between L. I. Brezhnev and U.S. President J. Carter and its results triggered extensive positive responses throughout the world. This indicates yet once again that Soviet-American agreements contributing to limiting the arms race, strengthening detente and consolidating the peace are consistent with the interests of all countries, of all mankind. The results of the meeting have been approved by the broad popular masses and realistically thinking state leaders.

Unanimously supporting the policy of peace pursued by our party and Soviet state, the Soviet people positively assess the results achieved in the course of the Vienna meeting. The successes of this policy give the Soviet people new strength and energy in the implementation of the great tasks of the building of communism.

5003
CSO: 1802

THE SOCIALIST COMITY IS THE GREATEST REVOLUTIONARY ACHIEVEMENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 79 pp 5-16

[Review of the book by L. I. Brezhnev "Mir Sotsializma--Torzhestvo Velikikh Idey" [The Socialist World--Triumph of Great Ideas]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 656 pages]

[Text] 1

Socialism, peace, and freedom were the slogans which the Great October Revolution inscribed on its banners. Today they have become reality in many countries following the path of building a new society. The appearance and development of the world socialist system is the most important of the international consequences of the October Revolution.

Time works for socialism, for the true revolutionaries, and for the communist ideals. More than ever before today the leading trends of social progress are determined by the increased power and international influence of the world's socialist comity. It is confirming the triumph of the great Marxist-Leninist ideas through its entire economic, sociopolitical, and ideological development.

The further strengthening of world socialism and friendship and cooperation with fraternal countries are problems of exceptional importance in the inordinately broad and varied activities of the CPSU in the international arena. Our Leninist party, Central Committee, and Central Committee Politburo are always concerned with expanding and improving relations between the Soviet Union and the members of the socialist comity. They are doing everything possible to strengthen its positions. In this tremendous collective theoretical and practical work Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, plays an outstanding role. A vivid confirmation of this fact is found in his book "Mir Sotsializma--Torzhestvo Velikikh Idey" which includes his speeches, articles, and addresses covering the period between 1964 and 1978. It includes, as the author writes, "pages dealing with the past. A great deal pertains to the current matters of the socialist world. As the reader may see, it also includes considerations for the future. We, communists, can see this future in the joint progress made by the socialist countries toward a communist

organization of society which alone could provide all the necessary conditions for the harmonious development of the individual and the full satisfaction of human needs." (p 5).

The ideals of communism find their practical implementation in the accomplishments of real socialism established in countries of three continents. The socialist world appears to all mankind as a dynamically developing social system which has achieved in practice freedom from oppression and exploitation, the rule of the working people, the development of socialist democracy, the blossoming of the culture and the upsurge of the prosperity of the broadest possible popular masses, and the equality and fraternity of all nations and nationalities. The constructive activites of the peoples of the socialist countries have yielded tremendous results. Their inspired toil, cooperation, and mutual aid, multiplied by the socioeconomic advantages of the new social system, possess a gigantic creative power. The socialist comity has become the most powerful comity of nations ever known to history. No other commonwealth of countries could be compared with it in terms of the rates of economic growth or scale and significance of social problems being resolved.

Life has fully confirmed the conclusion drawn at the 25th CPSU Congress to the effect that with the blossoming of each socialist nation and the strengthening of the sovereignty of the socialist states, their comity becomes ever closer. Ever greater common elements appear in their politics, economics, and social life. Their levels of development become gradually equalized. The process of the comprehensive intensification of reciprocal relations among fraternal socialist states raises relations among their nations to a new, higher level. It is fully consistent with their interests and class objectives.

Speaking of the future fraternal alliance among working people of different nationalities who would reject imperialist oppression, V. I. Lenin cautioned: "Such an alliance cannot be achieved immediately; we must work for it, displaying the greatest possible patience and caution to prevent failure, avoid the development of mistrust, and make it possible to surmount the mistrust left after centuries of oppression by landowners and capitalists . . . ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 40, p 43). Recalling these Leninist words, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev points out that the behest of the great leader is becoming ever more important in relations among the sovereign countries constituting the world socialist system. "In slightly over three decades," the author writes, "the socialist countries covered a tremendous distance. Along this way there were not only triumphs and victories but ruts, potholes, and errors. Yet, life irrevocably proved that the way to the set objectives was accurately chosen and that it became the smoother and shorter the closer the cooperation among socialist countries grew, and the richer their interaction became in resolving both national and international problems" (p 4).

The following thought consistently runs through the entire book: The peoples of the socialist countries are united by common basic interests. We have an

identical economic base--the public ownership of all productive capital and a planned economy, an identical state system--the rule of the working people, and a single ideology--Marxism-Leninism. We have the common task of insuring the security of the peoples and defending the revolutionary gains from imperialist encroachments. We have a single great objective--communism. The ruling fraternal communist parties have a tremendous joint capital--the international experience of revolutionary changes.

The common basic interests of the peoples of the socialist countries are the most solid foundations for their fraternal friendship. This friendship is the great strength of our comity. Mutual advice, comradely aid, and friendly participation make it possible to surmount all barriers and enable any individual country to profit most extensively and freely from the priceless achievement--the collective experience in building a new society--and, consequently, to move faster and with lesser outlays toward the historical objectives of building socialism and communism. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev considers friendship among socialist countries not only as a purely emotional category but as a broader concept, as a category which is, above all, political, manifested in the historically determined and profoundly realized line of behavior of the broadest possible popular masses. "The communists in the socialist countries," the author notes, "are justifiably proud of the fact that they gave a practical example of intergovernmental relations free from national egotism and filled with attention for the interests of foreign friends and comrades in the struggle for Marxist-Leninist ideals. Wherever the exploiting ruling classes promoted discord and alienation among nations in the course of centuries we were able to sow the seeds of friendship which yielded powerful and abundant shoots" (p 554).

Internationalism is the most important practically tried principle of communist activities and a powerful tested weapon in communist hands. There is no article, speech, or address in the collection not touching, one way or another, the topic of international interaction among fraternal countries. The great family of the members of the socialist comity lives according to the laws and norms of socialist internationalism, which is the extension and further development of proletarian internationalism. The successes of each country are inseparably linked with the strengthened power of the comity as a whole. The book by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev contains extremely rich data showing the dialectical unity and interconnection between the national and international factors governing the building of the new society. It clearly indicates the way international processes are developing on a national basis and the way, in turn, the latter favorably influence the molding and development of the national life of the individual country.

Socialist internationalism is embodied in the sincere and conscientious aspiration toward reciprocal understanding and trust, respect for mutual experience, and strict observance of the principles of autonomy and equality. Characterizing these interaction norms, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has stated that they are "entirely encompassed within a single all-embracing formula of combining the autonomy of each revolutionary detachment with their solidarity and cooperation for the sake of achieving common objectives. We support this

in our relations with all fraternal parties and socialist countries. Naturally, readiness to respect both parts of this formula which, we believe, is fully consistent with the spirit of the great international doctrine formulated by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, of the interests of each fraternal party, and of the entire communist and liberation movements is of essential significance" (p 576).

Internationalism has firmly entered the minds and lives of the fraternal peoples. Its manifestations are exceptionally varied. The great power of internationalism is confirmed by the labor competition which extensively developed in the members of the socialist comity. The familiar initiative of the collective of the Krasnyy Chepel' Combine in Hungary triggered the lively response of millions of working people. Describing it, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said: ". . . Here we are dealing with a qualitatively new phenomenon--the international movement of millions and millions of builders of the new world inspired by a single objective. This is an initiative of tremendous significance and with a great future" (p 566). The extension of this outstanding initiative--the initiative of the collective of the AvtoVAZ Association met with a warm response in our country and abroad. In honor of the 30th anniversary of CEMA the collective pledged to fulfill promptly and impeccably the orders received from fraternal countries and to develop and deepen relations with their enterprises. The decision to allocate 75% of the funds earned from the all-union communist subbotnik in honor of the 109th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birth to the aid fund for the fraternal nation victim of Chinese barbaric aggression was a vivid manifestation of the principled international position held by our party and state, and a testimony of the warm feelings of solidarity expressed by the Soviet people toward Socialist Vietnam.

In his book Comrade L. I. Brezhnev firmly rebuffs all attempts to undermine the international solidarity among the peoples of the fraternal socialist states. He exposes the anti-Marxist nature of Maoist policy and ideology. As convincingly proved in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's works, proletarian and socialist internationalism imbues all activities of the communist parties of the members of the socialist comity. This is the most important condition for the successful building of the new society, and for the struggle for peace, democracy, and social progress.

The entire sociopolitical development of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries confirms that with the broadening of the scale and increased complexity of the tasks related to the building of socialism and communism, the role of the Marxist-Leninist parties rises further and further along with the significance of their political, organizational, theoretical, and ideological activities. The strengthening of this leading role is determined by the growth of the political maturity and activeness of the masses, the development of socialist democracy, and the increased strictness of the requirements governing the management of socioeconomic processes.

Also legitimate is the increased leading role of the communist parties in shaping the entire set of interrelationships among fraternal countries. The

unbreakable combat alliance of the ruling Marxist-Leninist parties is the firm foundation, living spirit, and guiding and organizing force of the comity. Our party considers the all-round strengthening of this alliance and the strengthening of the party principle in the comprehensive cooperation among socialist countries its most important duty. The materials included in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's book offer an impressive picture of close contacts among fraternal parties, clearly showing the way the comprehensive and systematic interparty contacts help collectively to bring to light the leading trends of social development, exchange experience in building the new life, direct the process of intensification of political, economic, and ideological cooperation, determine its specific ways, pace, and forms, and formulate scientifically substantiated and practically tried guidelines which enable each country to find the proper solution to one or another complex problem.

Millions of people are involved in the all-embracing work to develop the comity of socialist countries. Friendly relations among state organs, enterprise collectives and scientific establishments, and public organizations are growing steadily.

Systematic contacts among leaders of fraternal parties and countries are a major political means for strengthening the positions of world socialism. In the course of summit meetings--bilateral and multilateral--information is exchanged on experience gained in the building of socialism and communism, the course of party construction, the state of theoretical and ideological-educational work, economic progress, and implementation of social policy. Such meetings make it possible to seek advice on all basic problems of domestic and foreign policy, jointly to develop reciprocally acceptable solutions to arising problems, and follow a coordinated line in the international arena. Important problems are considered at meetings of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee and at CEMA sessions. Traditional friendly encounters and talks held in Crimea between Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and the heads of parties and states of the socialist comity play a major role in the general practice of reciprocal relations. The repeated exchange of views on a broad range of international problems which takes place during the Crimean meetings confirms the resolve of the fraternal socialist countries to continue closely to interact in the struggle for achieving common objectives consistent with their individual national interests and the joint international interests of the entire socialist comity.

2

The book offers a profound and comprehensive study of the conditions under which the socialist countries are building the new society. Historically, it has developed that the individual countries undertook such construction under substantially different socioeconomic conditions. Naturally, this was influenced also by one or another national feature or tradition. Clearly, despite the common economic and sociopolitical foundations, the specific ways leading to the building of socialism and the specific forms of socialist social relations may show certain differences. The author points out that

there is nothing amazing or unexpected in this. As early as 1916 Lenin wrote that, "All nations will reach socialism. This is inevitable. However, not all of them will reach it in an identical fashion. Each of them will introduce a characteristic feature in one or another form of democracy, one or another variety of proletarian dictatorship, and one or another pace of socialist reorganization of the various aspects of social life" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 30, p 123).

Practical experience has confirmed today the accuracy of this Leninist prediction. The more socialist countries appear in the world, the more varied will be the methods followed in building a new society, and the richer will its specific social forms become. "The enemies of communism," the book states, "tend to depict the socialist world as something monochromatic in which everything is claimed to be standardized. Reality, which, in fact, is the substance of the collection, confirms the wealth and variety of ways and means of work aimed at the socialist reorganization of society" (p 4). The author supports this thought with a number of examples. He also shows that the socialist countries are inseparably linked through single principles, and a common socioeconomic and political base. Despite the entire variety of socialist forms and the specific national features of one or another country, this base always remains firm. The study of the common laws governing the establishment and development of socialism, found extensively throughout the collection, is of great theoretical and practical interest.

The entire socialist world is in a dynamic state. It is steadily improving, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev notes. As the new world develops a number of countries acquire greater and more comprehensive experience in its construction and in the very concept of the common laws governing the building of socialism and communism. Ideological cooperation and the combined efforts in the scientific interpretation of new phenomena and trends created by the current stage of development of the fraternal parties have been marked by great creative contribution to the treasury of Marxism-Leninism: the elaboration through the collective efforts of the CPSU and the other communist and workers' parti of the concept of the developed socialist society.

The experience acquired by our country, followed by that of the other members of the comity, confirms that laying the foundations for socialism does not offer, in itself, the possibility to undertake a direct transition to communism. Certain stages in the development of the socialist system itself must be covered before that. "We are profoundly convinced," writes Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "that whatever the specific conditi s of the countries building socialism may be, the stage of its perfection on its own grounds, the stage of the mature, the developed socialism is a necessary link in the social changes and a relatively lengthy period of development on the way from capitalism to communism" (p 602). It is precisely s ch a society that has been created in the USSR. A developed, mature socialist society is being successfully created in a number of other members of the comity.

The fact that most fraternal countries share a common historical stage and similar stages of social progress, resolving substantially similar problems,

is predetermined by the exceptional importance of the profound analysis and mastering of the collective experience of real socialism. Studying and mastering reciprocal experience, the members of the socialist comity have taken in recent years new major steps in governmental construction and the development of socialist democracy. The collective experience of socialist state construction is embodied in the new USSR Constitution as well. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said that it reflects, one way or another, aspects inherent in the constitutions of the fraternal countries the way they have adopted the previous experience of Soviet legislation. In turn, the Soviet Constitution enriches the collective experience of world socialism, which was noted by the heads of the fraternal countries, emphasizing its great importance to determining the future development of their own countries.

As collective experience proves, the most important characteristics of the process of laying the material and technical foundations for developed socialism and communism are giving priority to the intensive factors of economic growth, paying greater attention to its qualitative side, and increasing production effectiveness. Reliance on effectiveness and quality is a structural component of the entire economic strategy of the CPSU. A similar approach has been noted in the activities of the ruling parties of the other comity members. The idea that upgrading effectiveness is not a self-seeking aim runs throughout the decisions of their congresses and other party documents. Man is the center of all communist constructive activities. Today, when a developed socialist society has been built in the USSR and is successfully being built in the fraternal countries, the supreme objective of socialist production becomes, directly and immediately, the center of the practical policy of the ruling parties. Today the socialist countries are emerging on a historical level in which it becomes possible not only to put on the agenda socioeconomic tasks reflecting this objective more profoundly and fully, but to concentrate the resources of society directly on its achievement. In his speech to the 11th congress of the MSZMP, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted that, "All of us are confidently approaching the basic objectives for the sake of which the communists hoisted on the world the banner of their theory and for the sake of which socialist revolutions have been and are being made, and for whose sake the peoples of our country are at work. This means insuring material and spiritual well-being, and proper living conditions for all citizens, making the highest cultural values accessible to the broadest possible people's masses, and creating opportunities for the harmonious development of the individual. In the eyes of the working people of all countries our achievements are a convincing example of the advantages of socialism" (p 489).

The author pays great attention to problems of economic and scientific and technical cooperation among fraternal countries. The world socialist system opens extensive possibilities for realizing the advantages offered by the new production method on an international scale and multiplying the opportunities offered by the socialist organization of social production through improvements in international economic relations of a new type, relations of fraternal cooperation and comradely mutual aid. Lenin's historical prediction that, contrary to capitalism which divides the nations, socialism is "creating

new, superior forms of human community life in which the legitimate needs and progressive aspirations of the toiling masses of all nationalities will be satisfied for the first time in a state of international unity is being fulfilled . . . ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 26, p 40). Particularly indicative in this respect are the activities of CEMA, whose 30th anniversary of its foundation is being celebrated this year, and socialist economic integration.

"The key problem on whose solution our active joint efforts are focused today," notes Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "is the development of socialist economic integration. Economic integration with the active utilization of the achievements of scientific and technical progress is our common course. We are confident that it will lead the socialist countries to new victories and will strengthen even further the positions of world socialism in world economics" (p 307). The development of integration processes enhances the economic and scientific and technical cooperation among CEMA-member countries to a qualitatively new, higher level. This is specifically manifested in the increased effectiveness of the various forms of their joint planning activities, intensified production specialization and cooperation, and reciprocal trade, which is steadily increasing on this basis.

The scale of comprehensive cooperation among CEMA-member countries is rising steadily. The overall cost of jointly built integration projects is approximately nine billion transferable rubles. These projects include the Soyuz gas main, the Ust'-Ilim Cellulose Combine, the copper-nickel complex in Cuba, the Erdenet Copper-Molybdenum Combine in Mongolia, the Vinnitsa-Albertirsa power transmission line, etc.

Combining the technical and economic possibilities of integration with the advantages of the international economic relations of a new type, the CEMA-member countries are systematically promoting the steady upsurge of output and acceleration of scientific and technical progress and, on this basis, the growth of the people's prosperity.

The elaboration and implementation of long-term target programs is on the agenda, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev points out. Such programs, adopted at the 22nd and 23rd CEMA sessions, define the coordinated strategy for cooperation among the fraternal countries on a long-term basis in the most important areas of material production. Their objective is to meet the rapidly rising needs for energy, fuel, and basic raw materials, satisfy more completely demand for comestible and industrial consumer goods, raise the level of machine building, and accelerate the development of transportation. The long-term target programs for cooperation are concretized and developed through the Comprehensive Program of Socialist Economic Integration, whose basic long-term objectives were defined at the 23rd special CEMA session, held in Moscow in April 1969, on the level of the heads of fraternal parties and governments. In his greetings to those attending the 33rd CEMA session, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that "socialist economic integration has become an inviolable feature in the life of our comity, and a powerful and stable factor in the all-round progress of the fraternal countries. This is the main political result of CEMA's activities over the past 30 years and,

particularly, in the past decade, characterized by the implementation of the strategic decisions of the 23rd special CEMA session, embodied in the Comprehensive Program."

As convincingly proved in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's works, strengthening the economic cooperation among socialist countries is an objective requirement governing the further upsurge of their national economies and a natural trend in the development of the world socialist system. Thus, compared with 1948, the 1978 national income of CEMA-member countries was higher by a factor of 10; industrial production was higher by a factor of 17. The members of the socialist comity account for approximately one-third of the world's industrial output. Their industrial power is higher than that of the United States and of the combined power of the Western European countries.

In a number of addresses Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasizes that socialism provides a model for the solution of a most complex international economic problem such as the elimination of the major disparities in the levels of economic development of individual countries. In the capitalist world the gap between industrially developed and developing countries is widening. The imperialist countries and international monopolies are trying to maintain the economic backwardness of the former colonies in order to retain the possibility to exploit them. Conversely, the CEMA-member countries were able to achieve considerable successes in equalizing their levels of economic development. Those among them who had inherited from capitalism a greater economic backwardness are developing at a higher pace and are the recipients of selfless aid. Thanks to such relations the gap among CEMA-member countries in the volume of their per capita industrial output and other most important economic indicators continues to narrow.

The establishment of a mature socialist society in the USSR and the building of developed socialism in most CEMA-member countries substantially raised the levels toward which the economically less developed fraternal countries are directing their efforts. In the case of the European CEMA-member countries the main directions in the equalization of economic levels are changing. All of them are industrial-agrarian countries. Heavy industry predominates in their economies. That is why the problem of equalization is shifting to an ever greater extent to the field of improving the structure of national economic complexes through the effective international division of labor.

The equalization of the levels of economic development of CEMA-member countries is based on the advantages of their reciprocal close cooperation, which itself is based on the principles of the strict observance of national interests, the harmonious coordination of national with common interests, and the principles of reciprocal benefits and comradely mutual aid. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasizes, CEMA gave the world "a unique experience in equal cooperation among a large number of countries and in the harmonious combination of their national with international interests, and in the practical implememtation of the principles of socialist internationalism" (p 444).

Socialist economic integration favors the development of mutually profitable relations among countries with different social systems as well. Between 1971

and 1977 trade between CEMA members and industrially developed capitalist states increased, in terms of current prices, by approximately a 3.4 factor, reaching 43.7 billion rubles. Today 78 developing countries are cooperating with CEMA-member countries on the basis of international agreements.

The CEMA-member countries are in favor of extensive international economic cooperation based on total equality, mutual benefit and non-interference in domestic affairs. They are in favor of eliminating from economic relations economic dictate and political blackmail. They are practically promoting a new type of international economic relations. "This principled approach," writes Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "stems from their attachment to peace. It is an inviolable element of the policy of detente systematically and steadfastly pursued by the fraternal socialist countries in accordance with the vital interests and expectations of the broadest popular masses" (p 445).

3

The Soviet people are justifiably proud of the contribution which our country, the communist party, its Leninist Central Committee, and Central Committee Politburo are making to the great cause of the struggle for universal peace. The book depicts an impressive picture of the tireless activities of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev to implement the peace program adopted at the 24th and developed at the 25th CPSU Congress. For the first time in history the struggle for peace was raised to the level of a constitutional principle and was codified in our country's Fundamental Law.

Like the other socialist countries, the Soviet Union spares no efforts in the struggle for the solution of the most urgent and crucial problem facing mankind today: termination of the arms race and prevention of the threat of a world nuclear war. "This is the fourth decade that the skies over Europe are peaceful," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev states. "This is very important. We believe that never before has history granted the peoples on our continent such a long-lasting peace. The nations must clearly realize that this is largely and even decisively the result of the fact that one-half of Europe lives today under socialist conditions. Peace in Europe is largely the result of our common efforts and of the coordinated foreign policy of the Warsaw Pact members" (p 616).

At the conference of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact members, held last November in Moscow, its members collectively defined and codified in a joint declaration the basic directions of their foreign policy. They coordinated specific joint steps to be taken for the solution of the most important foreign political problems. The collective search for means to resolve the complex central problems of international relations enable the members of the socialist comity to formulate broad projects and effective suggestions widely supported the world over. The suggestion formulated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 2 March 1979 electoral meeting on not being the first to use either nuclear or conventional armaments sounded with great political power. This would mean, essentially, the conclusion of a non-aggression pact among the participants in the European Conference in Helsinki.

The SALT treaty recently concluded in Vienna between the USSR and the United States became possible only as a result of the lengthy and intensive work of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, USSR Council of Ministers, and, personally, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the preparations for and holding of the meeting and in the strengthening of universal peace, restraining the arms race, and developing mutually profitable cooperation among countries with different social systems.

The hegemonistic great-power course followed by the Chinese leadership, aimed at increasing international tension and undermining the unity and positions of the socialist comity, the world communist movement, and the national-liberation forces, conflicts with the interests of the cause of peace and socialism. Unscrupulously Beijing has allied itself with the most aggressive imperialist circles and other reactionary forces in the world. Through its treacherous attack on socialist Vietnam it fully exposed the aggressive nature of its policy, which is a serious threat to peace the world over.

The materials in the book clearly trace the systematic position taken by the Soviet Union and our party toward firmly rebuffing the aggressive intrigues of the Maoist leadership. At the same time, it indicates the principled line adopted by the Soviet Union aimed at normalizing relations with the PRC, based on the principles of peaceful coexistence and good-neighborly relations

The socialist way is the way to true freedom and progress. History proves that peoples fighting under the banners of national and social liberation have always found loyal friends in the socialist states. Particularly indicative in this respect is the example of Vietnam. The collection contains many passionate and inspired parts discussing that country and its heroic people. As early as 1965 Comrade L. I. Brezhnev expressed a thought which proved to be prophetic: "Those who initiated their aggression against the peace-loving Vietnamese people will achieve nothing other than shame and defeat" (p 25). The solidarity of the members of the socialist comity and the effective and active help provided by Vietnam's loyal friends made it possible for its people to win a historical victory. In this connection, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev points out that, "The Soviet people have always been together with their Vietnamese brothers. We considered and consider it our international duty to provide all-round support and aid to your struggle for peace and socialism" (p 400).

The Friendship and Cooperation Treaty concluded in November 1978 between the USSR and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is a new vivid manifestation of true comradeship uniting the fraternal socialist countries. This treaty extends the glorious traditions of the socialist comity. It serves the interests of all fraternal countries and the strengthening of their international positions.

The friendship, cooperation, and mutual aid treaties concluded between the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are most important programmatic documents clearly proving the existence of international relations of a new type: profoundly equal, based on full reciprocal respect and non-interference

in mutual domestic affairs, sincere friendship, and comradely mutual aid. They are aimed at the steady strengthening of all-round cooperation based on the inviolable principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian, socialist internationalism, systematically implemented in the activities of our Leninist party.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev proves that with the development of the socialist countries and the intensification of relations and of cooperation among them, the need for an efficient system of firm contractual foundations increases rather than declines. Contractual relations among fraternal countries are an effective political instrument for the strengthening of the socialist comity. They create an effective mechanism for the joint solution of arising problems and define reciprocal obligations and the main directions for political and economic interaction.

The treaties between the USSR and the fraternal countries insure the further development of bilateral and multilateral relations in the areas of defense and international affairs. They reflect the steadfast aspiration of the ruling Marxist-Leninist parties and fraternal states comprehensively to strengthen the socialist comity and systematically hold a course of consolidation of the world communist movement and of unification of all revolutionary forces.

The CPSU considers the treaties concluded with our friends an inviolable part of the entire system of bilateral and multilateral relations, including the Warsaw Pact, a system which makes it possible to coordinate the foreign political actions of the socialist states.

In this connection, the annulment of the Friendship, Alliance, and Mutual Aid Treaty between the USSR and the PRC cannot be considered other than an action aimed at further complicating and undermining Soviet-Chinese relations and the positions of world socialism at large.

Life itself adamantly demands that world imperialism be opposed by the powerful and united front of world socialism, the front of all supporters of peace, democracy, national independence, and social progress. Naturally, its nucleus is the world socialist system and the international communist movement which is invariably supported by the CPSU as it practically embodies in its foreign political activities the great principles of international solidarity.

The attractiveness of scientific socialism is becoming ever more tangible among the multi-million strong popular masses in countries which have rejected the oppression of colonial dependence. Under the influence of the successes of real socialism and of its life-bringing example, new favorable conditions are developing in the world for the further development of the revolutionary, anti-imperialist, and national-liberation struggles for eliminating the exploitation of the liberated countries by international imperialism. In this connection Comrade L. I. Brezhnev cites Lenin's words: ". . . No forces in the world will restore the old serfdom in Asia or sweep off the face of the

earth the heroic democracy of the people's masses in Asian and semi-Asian countries" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 23, p 3). Developing this Leninist thought, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev stated in his speech at the 10th BCP Congress that "the achievements of our countries in the building of socialism and communism inspire millions and millions of people in the former colonies and the dependent countries to build a new life. It inspires the working people in the capitalist countries to struggle for the overthrow of the power of the exploiters. The oppressed peoples consider the socialist countries their support and hope, a bulwark of peace and justice" (p 325).

The distinguishing features of the book are the summation of the collective experience of the fraternal countries, the creative Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the contemporary stage of development of the new society, and the optimistic view of its bright future. The work depicts the vivid and dynamic life of the socialist countries and the wealth of ways and means of work done by the communist and workers' parties to build a truly free society whose real aspect is presented to the readers. This pertains to real socialism, the very fact of whose existence and steady blossoming refutes all fabrications and slanders of enemies and ill-wishers.

"We are marching," writes Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "toward an epoch in which socialism, in one or another of its specific and historically determined forms, will become the dominant social system on earth, bringing with it peace, freedom, equality, and prosperity to all toiling mankind.

"This is neither utopia nor a beautiful dream. It is a factual prospect. You and I, comrades, are bringing it closer with every passing day through our toil and struggle; it is brought closer through the toil and struggle of millions of our contemporaries. This, precisely, is the continuation of what was started with the October Revolution" (p 597).

L. I. Brezhnev's book is a major contribution to the ideological arsenal of scientific communism, the further strengthening of socialist positions in the international arena, and the assertion of the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

5003
CSO: 1802

GREAT EXPLOIT OF THE PEOPLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 79 pp 17-25

[Article by A. Gol'tsov, USSR deputy minister of agriculture]

[Text] This year our entire country widely noted the 25th anniversary of the development of the virgin and fallow lands. Following the collectivization of agriculture, which was a triumph of Lenin's cooperative plan, the development of the virgin lands is one of the outstanding pages in the history of the struggle waged by the communist party and the Soviet people for the upsurge of socialist agriculture. The program formulated by the party for the development of the new lands and its successful implementation made it possible to resolve the biggest political and economic task of creating a stable base for the production of grain--our main agricultural product.

The development of the new lands was the practical manifestation of the ripe needs of the building of communism. "Expanding the areas in grain crops through the development of fallow and virgin lands in the areas of Kazakhstan, Siberia, the Urals, along the Volga and, partially, the areas of the Northern Caucasus," stated the February-March 1954 CC CPSU Plenum, "is an important and an entirely realistic source for increasing grain production within a short time."

Life fully confirmed the accuracy of the course taken by the party. In his recollections on the heroic exploit of the Soviet people, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev notes that it was precisely in the mid-1950's that "the vital need to grow grain on the virgin lands was combined with the real possibility to implement this historical task."

The communist party mobilized for the development of the virgin and fallow lands tremendous material resources and conducted tremendous political and organizational work among the masses. The party was warmly supported by the people. A great patriotic movement developed in the country.

The development of the virgin and fallow lands was the deeply felt project of the working class and kolkhoz peasantry and of the entire Soviet people. All fraternal union republics actively participated in this historical accomplishment. "The virgin lands," wrote Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "became

an outstanding page in the biography of many thousands of Soviet people. . . . The virgin land pioneers displayed the high moral qualities of the Soviet people. They justifiably became examples of selfless service to the homeland and the building of communism. These outstanding traditions are being multiplied by new generations of virgin land people."

The development of the virgin lands was a new embodiment of the Leninist ideas of the utilization of land resources in the interests of the further development of production forces. It convincingly proved the wisdom and farsightedness of our party's policy in the solution of agrarian problems. In his book "Tselina" [Virgin Land], Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out the following: "The upsurge of the virgin land was the great idea of the communist party whose implementation enabled us, thinking in terms of historical categories, to convert almost instantaneously the lifeless, remote, yet fertile eastern steppes of the country into an economically and culturally developed area."

The communists and the envoys of the Leninist Komsomol were in the vanguard of the offensive of the whole people on the virgin lands. Under most complex circumstances the party organizations promoted locally the party's general line. They resolved knowledgeably and successfully problems of the organization of production and the life of the people and carried out extensive educational and political work.

The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government took measures to supply the new farms set up on the virgin lands with the necessary equipment. Skilled cadres of agricultural mechanizers and specialists were directed to the area. Particular attention was paid to economic construction and to the creation of the necessary cultural-living conditions for the population. In the course of this time the virgin land sovkhozes became highly mechanized model farms based on contemporary methods for the organization of large-scale production.

The battle for the virgin lands was a most vivid page in mass-labor heroism. It was a course in communist upbringing and labor training. The Leninist Komsomol, our great youth, made an outstanding contribution to this project of the whole people. Following the appeal of the communist party, over 500,000 young men and women were issued Komsomol cards to the virgin land sovkhozes. They honorably carried out the party assignments and provided examples of selfless toil under exceptionally complex conditions. The demobilized Soviet Army soldiers played a great role in the development of the virgin lands. It was they who founded the Kantemirovets, Suvorovskiy, Tikhookeanskiy, Krasnoflotskiy, imeni Tamanskaya Diviziya, and other sovkhozes in the northern oblasts of Kazakhstan.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev described quite truthfully the heroic days of Komsomol members and young people, and farm managers and specialists and the truly gigantic work done by the party organs in the course of the development of the virgin lands and the setting up of sovkhozes in the area: "There is the heroism of the moment. There is the heroism of difficult periods in the life

of the entire people as exemplified by the war. There is also the heroism of daily work in which people knowingly and voluntarily assume burdens, knowing that they could be in no other place. I believe that the people of the virgin lands proved to be heroes. They withstood all the difficulties of life in the initial period and for years, patiently and firmly, settled this harsh land."

As a result of the implementation of the tremendous development program, in the first two years only (1954-1955) about 30 million hectares of virgin and fallow lands were plowed up. All in all, 41.8 million hectares were developed, including 25.5 million in the Kazakh SSR, and 16.3 million in the Russian Federation. Considerable areas of the virgin and fallow lands were plowed up in Kustanayskaya, Tselinogradskaya, Pavlodarskaya, Novosibirskaya, Omskaya, and Saratovskaya oblasts, and Altayskiy Kray.

The development of the virgin lands on such huge areas was preceeded by the extensive work of agricultural scientists and specialists. The USSR has about 100 million hectares of saline soil, two-thirds of which is in Northern Kazakhstan and Western Siberia where the bulk of the virgin lands is to be found. Studies had to be made and areas had to be selected within this sea of saline soil suitable for plowing. Land had to be allocated for the new sovkhozes. Special expeditionary units were set up to carry out such work in the different oblasts. They included soil experts, botanists, hydrologists, hydraulic technicians, and land-tenure regulators. Scientists from Moscow, Leningrad, Voronezh, Gor'kiy, various oblasts in the Ukraine, and other areas were assigned to the virgin and fallow lands. They gave great assistance to the local scientific institutions in the study and selection of the land. Thus, in the Kazakh SSR, 22.6 million hectares of arable land were selected in the spring and autumn of 1954, about 8 million hectares of them in the spring. This made it possible, even before the plowing, to earmark the boundaries and land allocations for 87 sovkhozes. The location of the new farms and the plowing of the virgin lands were not indiscriminate but based on scientific positions. Starting with 1954 a total of over 4,600 sovkhozes were set up in the virgin land rayons, including 2,800 in the Russian Federation, and over 1,800 in Kazakhstan.

The development of the new lands turned the virgin land areas of the country into big producers of grain and, particularly, of wheat. Whereas in 1953 the main areas where virgin and fallow lands had been developed had 36.1 million hectares planted in grain crops, there were 64.3 million in 1978, i.e., an increase by a factor of almost 1.8. Within that time gross grain harvests rose from 27 million to 90.5 tons, or more than tripled.

In 25 years about 1.5 billion tons of grain were grown on the virgin and fallow lands of Kazakhstan, Siberia, the Far East, the Urals, and along the Volga. This is nearly 40% of the all-union gross grain harvest for that period. In the course of 25 years the sovkhozes, kolkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises in the virgin land parts of the country poured into the graneries of the homeland 721.5 million tons of high-quality grain, i.e., nearly one-half of the all-union purchases. The marketability of grain production in the virgin land areas is quite high, about one-half, compared with one-third in the remaining parts of the country.

Grain Production and State Purchases
in the Areas of Development of Virgin and Fallow Lands

(Annual Average, Million Tons)

Period	Production	State Purchases
1949-1953	22.7	9.9
1954-1958	45.2	23.1
1964-1968	61.1	31.0
1974-1978	67.9	31.1

These figures clearly indicate that in the very first years of development of the new lands grain production and purchases doubled. Currently, with the subsequent increase in grain crop yields, the sovkhozes and kolkhozes in these rayons are producing and selling the state triple the amount of grain compared with 1949-1953.

Higher grain production and state purchases in the areas of development of virgin and fallow lands fully confirmed the farsightedness of the party's plans and their great vital strength. In the first three years of the 10th Five-Year Plan the average annual grain production in the virgin land rayons of the country totaled 78.1 million tons while state purchases totaled 37.4 million. The share of virgin land grain in the all-union production and purchases was, respectively, 36 and 45%. The highest grain harvest here was in 1978, totaling 90.5 million tons with purchases reaching 45.3 million.

The working people of Orenburgskaya Oblast made a tremendous contribution to the country's grain resources. Between 1976 and 1978 they averaged 6.6 million tons of grain; Volgogradskaya Oblast averaged about 6.6 million; Saratovskaya, 6.1 million; Bashkirskaya ASSR, 5.5 million; Altayskiy Kray, 5.2 million; Kustanayskaya Oblast, 4.9 million; and Kokchetavskaya and Omskaya oblasts, 3.2 million tons each.

The sovkhozes and kolkhozes in the areas of development of virgin and fallow lands became the principal suppliers of hard wheat to the state, without which high-quality bread cannot be baked. They also account for the bulk of the durum wheat which is a raw material for the production of semolina and pasta products. The kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the Northern Kazakhstan oblasts became the main producers of hard wheat. In the 1976-1978 period the farms in Kustanayskaya Oblast poured into the granaries of the homeland 5.1 million tons of high-grade hard wheat; those of Tselinogradskaya Oblast, 3.5 million; of Turgayskaya Oblast, 2.6 million; of Kokchetavskaya Oblast, 2.5 million; and of Severo-Kazakhstanskaya, 1.6 million tons.

The expansion of grain growing farms and the increased production of grain in the rayons of Kazakhstan, Siberia, the Far East, the Urals, and along the

Volga, created favorable conditions for the development of animal husbandry. This was dictated not only by the need to insure the ever fuller satifaction of the growing needs of the population in these areas for meat, milk, and other animal husbandry products, but the need to insure the more effective utilization of the land and of material and manpower resources, and insure the rational organization of sovkhoz and kolkhoz production.

Cattle herds in all categories of farms and virgin land rayons in the country rose from 15.9 million head in 1954 to 30.3 million in 1978, or nearly double; the number of cows rose from 6.6 to 10.9 million, or by a factor of over 1.6. The number of hogs for the same period rose from 6 to 14.1 million, or by a 2.3 factor; that of sheep and goats rose from 40.2 to 64.4 million, or by a factor of 1.6.

The increased cattle herds and their higher productivity made it possible to increase the volume of output and state purchases of animal husbandry goods considerably. Compared with 1954, in 1978 meat production in all categories of farms in the Kazakh SSR rose by a 2.7 factor; milk by a 2.6 factor; eggs by a 4.9 factor; and wool by a factor of almost 3. In the virgin land rayons of the RSFSR, within the same period of time, meat production rose by a factor of 2.4; milk, 2.2; eggs, 3.9; and wool, 2.2.

The increased production of animal husbandry goods insured a considerable increase in state purchases of such most important food products and raw materials for the food and processing industries in the country. Purchases of cattle and poultry from all categories of farms in the Kazakh SSR from the beginning of the development of the virgin and fallow lands rose by a factor of over 3.5; they almost quadrupled in the virgin land areas of the RSFSR. In 1978 the virgin land rayons accounted for about 24% of the meat, 22% of the milk, 22% of the eggs, and nearly 44% of the wool in overall volume of output of such commodities in the country.

The increased utilization of new equipment, chemical reclamation, mineral fertilizers, and soil protection technology in growing farm crops in virgin land farming are resulting in a new powerful development of all agricultural sectors.

Such data on the growth of output and state purchases in the virgin land rayons convincingly prove that the capital investments made by the state for mastering and developing the virgin land sovkhozes and kolkhozes and the strengthening of their power facilities were highly effective. They have long been redeemed through the high quantity of grain, vegetables, potatoes, and animal husbandry goods.

As early as 1954-1961, through marketable grain from the developed virgin and fallow lands alone in Kazakhstan and the RSFSR, the state recovered all its investments in agriculture in these rayons and earned a net income in excess of 3.3 billion rubles. Thus the mass development of the virgin and fallow lands in the eastern parts of the country insured the solution of the problem of producing comestible grain and had a positive impact on the entire economy.

Plowing and developing the virgin land was a priority task. The main thing, however, was comprehensively to upgrade grain crop yields in the virgin land areas. Yet, both yields and gross grain harvests in the virgin land parts of the country fluctuated sharply because of frequently recurrent severe droughts. Considerable areas were subjected to wind soil erosion which caused tangible damage. The use of the European farming system in the virgin lands played a very negative role in all this. This system proved to be unacceptable in a droughty steppe climate with its strong spring winds and dry summer winds. The systematic cultivation of the soil with moldboard plows, disc harrows, and toothed harrows rapidly loosened the soil and destroyed its natural structure, which triggered erosion processes.

Substantial shortcomings were noted also in the agro-technology used in growing grain crops in the areas of Northern Kazakhstan and Western Siberia. Spring wheat and other grain crops were planted early. The method of intermediate presowing cultivation of the soil and shallow depth of the seed (similar to the technology used in the steppe areas of the European part of the country) were used. All this resulted in a drastic lowering of yields caused by the ruinous influence of the early summer (June) drought usual to the steppe areas of Kazakhstan and Siberia.

The party established these major errors and took effective measures to improve the agro-technology used in the virgin lands. Initially measures were taken to open new and strengthen the local scientific institutions and select skilled cadres. The virgin lands required their own agricultural system, suitably adapted to the soil and weather conditions of the area, capable of protecting the soil from wind erosion and considerably weakening the ruinous effect of the drought. In his book "Tselina" Comrade L. I. Brezhnev wrote: "The party's agro-technical policy on the virgin lands could be reduced, briefly stated, to . . . establishing here the highest crop growing standards and, subsequently, create a farming system properly adapted to the droughty zone. . . . We considered as our most important matter the development of a network of scientific establishments, facing them with the task of studying domestic and world experience, and finding reliable methods to fight soil erosion." The task set by the party was successfully implemented. Scientists from the All-Union Scientific Research Grain Crops Institute, headed by VASKHNIL [All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences imeni Lenin] Academician A. I. Barayev and from a number of other experimental institutions in Northern Kazakhstan developed a soil protection farming system based on grain fallow crop rotation, a strip alternation of farm crops with fallow land, surface soil cultivation and sowing with the help of anti-erosion stubble drills, and the planting of protective field-mustard strips on the fallow lands. Scientists from that institute considerably improved grain crop cultivation technology and provided specific recommendations regarding its application in the droughty weather of Northern Kazakhstan and Western Siberia.

The developed farming system could be applied only in sovkhozes and kolkhozes where supplied with proper anti-erosion equipment. Such equipment was developed through the creative cooperation among scientists from the All-Union

Scientific Research Grain Resources Institute, scientists from the engineering institutes, and scientists from the design bureaus of machine-building plants.

In 1978, 34 million hectares in the steppe erosion-threatened parts of the country were cultivated using the moldboard-free method, keeping the stubble on the surface of the soil. This included 24.3 million hectares on which the shallow-plowing method was used, 35 million hectares planted with the help of anti-erosion drills, 4.9 million hectares with strip-sowing, and 2.4 million hectares in wind-break rows.

The use of the new farming system insured the full protection of the fields and crops from wind erosion and, in the winter, as a result of leaving the stubble on the surface, a good snow blanket formed and the melted snow was totally absorbed by the soil. All this increased the stock of productive moisture in the soil, thus reducing the adverse effect of spring and summer droughts on the crops and considerably upgraded grain crop yields. Whereas before the application of the soil protection farming system (1961-1965) grain crop yields averaged six quintals per hectare in Tselinogradskaya and Kokchetavskaya oblasts and seven quintals per hectare in Altayskiy Kray, following its application (1971-1975) grain crop yields nearly doubled.

The further upsurge of grain production in the virgin land areas of Kazakhstan, Siberia, the Urals, and along the Volga called for the development of new intensive strains of spring wheat and fodder-grain crops adapted to severe local conditions, as well as a proper seed-growing system. This problem as well was resolved successfully. Strains were developed by the All-Union Scientific Research Grain Resources Institute, the Siberian Scientific Research Agricultural Institute, and the Scientific Research Agricultural Institute of the Southeast.

Along with the familiar spring wheat strains Saratovskaya-29 and Bezenchukskaya-98, strains such as Ural'skaya-52, Shortandinskaya-25, and others are being used ever more extensively by the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the Kazakh SSR. The farms of the virgin land rayons in the Russian Federation are successfully using the high-yielding spring wheat strains Krasnokutka-6, Sibiryachka-4, Niva, and Novosibirskaya-67. The quality of the seed used has been improved considerably. In 1979, 87% of the grain crop seeds used were of first and second grade quality.

The planned intensification of agricultural production and the considerable strengthening of its material and technical base, the use of a soil protection farming system, the new high-yielding intensive local strains, and improved seed production made it possible to upgrade the stability of grain production in the virgin land areas of the country, and increase gross grain harvests as convincingly confirmed by the following data:

	Yields, Quintals per Hectare			Gross Harvest, Million Tons		
	1953	1976-1978 (Annual Average)	1978	1953	1976-1978 (Annual Average)	1978
USSR--main virgin land areas	7.5	12.2	14.1	27.2	78.1	90.5
RSFSR--main virgin land areas	7.5	13.6	16.1	21.7	53.0	62.6
Kazakh SSR	7.7	9.9	11.0	5.5	25.1	27.9

The leading farms in the virgin and fallow lands achieved particularly high results in increasing grain production. For example, the model experimental farm of the VNIIZKh [All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Grain Farming] averaged yields of 17.7 quintals per hectare in grain crops over the entire period and 20.9 quintals in 1978. The Novoural'skoye Experimental Model Farm of the Siberian Scientific Research Institute of Agriculture in Omskaya Oblast averaged, respectively, 20.3 and 20.1; Zhelannyy Sovkhoz, in the same oblast, averaged 17.4 and 19.2 quintals; the Volgo-Don Production Association, Volgogradskaya Oblast, averaged 27.8 and 34.7 quintals per hectare.

The leading tractor-crop growing brigades are raising even higher and stabler grain crops. The names of the noted virgin land brigade leaders, Hero of Socialist Labor M. Dovzhik, V. Dityuk, V. Khimich, and many others are widely known in the virgin lands and far beyond them. The practical experience of the leading brigades, sovkhozes, and kolkhozes convincingly proves what high levels in increasing grain production could be reached in the virgin lands. "The ancient steppe proved to be rich," emphasizes Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his book "Tselina." "Transformed through human toil, it gave stability to our entire agriculture, and provided a guaranteed grain production in the necessary amounts. This land is gathering strength."

The science of agriculture plays a major role in the solution of the big and complex problems of the further upsurge of virgin land farming. Presently there are 29 sectorial and complex zonal institutes, and 88 experimental stations and institute branches operating in the areas of developed virgin and fallow lands. Famous scientific centers such as the All-Union Scientific Research Grain Resources Institute, and the Altay and Siberian scientific research agricultural institutes were set up as early as 1956. The Siberian Department of VASKHNIL was set up in 1969. About 4,300 scientific workers, of whom 48 are doctors and 1,327 are candidates of sciences, are working in the scientific and experimental institutions of the virgin land areas.

The training of highly skilled agricultural specialists for the virgin lands is provided by 25 VUZ's. In 1978, 15,300 students were accepted by the full-time departments of these VUZ's, while correspondence departments accepted 10,200. All in all, they are training over 129,000 students. In 1978 about 17,000 specialists were graduated--quadruple the 1954 number.

The great attention paid to the training of higher and secondary specialists made it possible to supply the virgin land kolkhozes and sovkhozes with cadres of agronomists, zootechnicians, engineers, and technicians well acquainted with local conditions and with the scientific principles of virgin land farming and animal husbandry.

The virgin land sovkhozes and kolkhozes possess modern most productive Soviet-made equipment and are fully supplied with electric power by the state power systems. Thus, the Kazakh SSR agriculture has 35,100 K-700 and K-701 power equipped tractors and a great deal of other agricultural equipment.

The development of the virgin and fallow lands not only insured a drastic increase in the production of grain and other agricultural output but led to radical changes in the entire way of life of the rural working people. It triggered extensive industrial and cultural-residential construction in the countryside. The prosperity of kolkhoz members and sovkhoz workers rose considerably.

The example of the virgin land villages clearly shows the way disparities in the living standards of the rural and urban populations are being gradually eliminated. Well-planned virgin land settlements have been built and are under construction, based on a specially formulated general plan. All rural working people have electricity, modern communications and transportation facilities, and gas for household use. Commercial centers, cafeterias, schools, houses of culture, children's preschool institutions, and consumer services enterprises are a typical virgin land phenomenon.

The rural areas of the Kazakh SSR number 7,500 modern clubs and houses of culture, and 7,400 public libraries. Inter-kolkhoz and inter-sovkhoz rest homes and sanatoriums have been built for the rest and treatment of virgin land inhabitants. A network of paved motor vehicle roads has been built in this previously roadless area, and the length of railroad tracks has been extended considerably.

"Rise above the steppe on a airplane," states Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his book "Tselina," "and you will see not only wheat fields but the ribbons of asphalted roads, settlements, railroad tracks, power lines, elevators, big plants, factories, and cities. It was the powerful virgin land grain that brought all this to life in this formerly feather-grass area."

The achievements of agricultural science and practice make it possible to implement important measures aimed at upgrading farm crop yields. Currently improvements continue to be made in the soil protection farming system in the steppe areas. More extensive use is being made of the anti-erosion grain-growing technology, most effective under drought conditions. The plans call for fully meeting the needs of the virgin land steppe areas in the country for special anti-erosion equipment, power driven tractors, and wide scope soil processing and sowing machines and units. This will make it possible to complete field operations within optimal agro-technical periods, reduce losses to a minimum, and substantially upgrade crop yields. Measures are also

being taken to improve the structure of planted areas, include clean fallow land in the crop rotation system, and expand areas planted in new and promising strains of fodder-grain crops. Increased deliveries of chemical fertilizers, phosphoric above all, to the virgin land areas make it possible to raise soil fertility substantially.

Raising the productivity of saline soils is one of the major reserves in agricultural production. In Kazakhstan alone there are 72 million hectares of such land. Currently the scientific institutions are developing new effective methods for the use of saline soils, based on various methods for soil cultivation and chemical reclamation. Including the saline soils of the steppe zone of Kazakhstan and Western Siberia in economic circulation would enable us to increase the productivity of natural feed crops and increase cattle herd and livestock productivity.

The communist party ascribes great importance to the development of irrigated agriculture in the droughty virgin land areas with a view to increasing the production of grain and fodder crops, and obtaining guaranteed harvests. In the future irrigation systems will be built in the southern part of Barabinskaya Steppe, in Kulundinskaya Steppe, and in other parts of Altayskiy Kray. This will open new possibilities for these farming areas. Along the Volga, by 1990 the area of newly irrigated land will be expanded considerably on the basis of water reservoirs and major irrigation canals, either extant or under construction. In the eastern rayons of Kazakh SSR irrigation will be developed further on the basis of the Irtysh-Karaganda Canal. The efforts to organize liman irrigation in this area will be continued.

The scale of construction of industrial and residential projects in the farms, of storage areas and of enterprises for the processing of commodities by the corresponding industrial sectors will be expanded as well. The implementation of these and other measures would make it possible to raise to a qualitatively new level agricultural production, procurement, and processing of crop and livestock products in the country's virgin land areas.

The heroic experience gained in the development of the virgin lands clearly proves that the struggle waged by our party and the entire Soviet people was crowned by an outstanding victory. This is yet another vivid proof of the great vital force of the Leninist agrarian policy.

5003
CSO: 1802

WORDS AND DEEDS OF 'INTEGRAL' PERSONNEL

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 79 pp 26-33

[Article by V. Arkhipenko]

[Text] The Minsk Integral Production-Technical Association imeni XXV S"yezda KPSS is young. Its birth and development were in the 1960's. Production here developed at a headlong pace. The collective successfully mastered ever new types of goods. On the occasion of the centennial of V. I. Lenin's birth it was awarded the Lenin Anniversary Honor Certificate; on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the USSR it was awarded the Anniversary Honor Badge. It was awarded the Order of the October Revolution for successes achieved in the Ninth Five-Year Plan.

Integral is the true offspring of the scientific and technical revolution combined with the advantages of socialism. Here the latest equipment has been concentrated and the most modern technology and scientific organization of labor are being used. In turn, supplying the national economy with most advanced instruments, the association is assisting technical progress in a number of sectors.

Practically every worker in the association's collective is with secondary education. A group of cadre workers whose labor activities began in the difficult war and postwar years was the only exception. Approximately two-thirds of the collective consists of women. There is a large number of young people (the average age of the personnel is 29).

As a rule the Integral worker is a highly skilled person capable of executing most delicate operations. It can match the skill of Leskov's Levsha. The Integral personnel are people with varied spiritual interests. They participate in technical creativity and are lovers of books, music, theater, painting, and sports.

The characteristics of the collective and the high level of education and skills of the personnel have raised the requirements concerning the level of ideological-educational work and are inspiring the party organization in its steady search for new ways and means of work with the people and for making this work systematically more meaningful.

The decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress gave the party organizations the main directions for improving ideological work. The Integral party committee considered the comprehensive approach and insuring unity of political, labor, and moral education in accordance with the characteristics of the various groups of working people the cornerstone of its work. The role and place of each social group in the comprehensive ideological-educational process have been clearly defined in the association. This makes it possible to coordinate the work and resolve the most important problems through joint efforts.

The effectiveness of the efficient coordination and of the joint forces of the public could be proved by taking as an example the birth and dissemination of one of the most important initiatives of the collective. In the autumn of 1977 leading production workers such as assembly worker Z. K. Ostapyuk, and heroes of Socialist Labor tuning worker Ya. V. Solov'yeva and fitter V. V. Zabolotskiy, launched a valuable initiative: they pledged to fulfill their individual five-year plans in 4.5 years. Assessing their possibilities, they were joined by the brigade headed by T. M. Bezruchko and the shifts headed by foremen T. G. Baranova and A. D. Tambovtsev.

Based on the initiative of the innovators, the party committee saw a tremendous possibility for increasing output. It was decided to explain its significance in all association subdivisions and services. The initiators were first invited to have a talk with the general director. Workers and foremen described how they intended to achieve their objective and submitted effective, thought-out arguments. Their arguments and summations were the base of the poster issued by the party committee which was soon distributed among all production sectors. The public organizations joined the explanatory work. According to a coordinated plan the party, trade union, and Komsomol bureaus held meetings on the initiative. In their classes the propagandists described its nature and significance and encouraged the students to seek production reserves. Political informants and agitators and the local VOIR [All-Union Society of Inventors and Rationalizers] section actively participated in this work.

The effectiveness of the purposeful and thoroughly planned work was manifested in the fact that as early as October 1977 there were 6,000 association workers supporting the initiative. The collective of shop number 37 decided to fulfill the 5-year plan 6 months ahead of schedule. At the end of November, at a general meeting, the entire Integral collective assumed the same obligation. The Communist Party of Belorussia Central Committee approved the initiative of the Integral personnel and recommended to all republic enterprises to follow their example.

The appeal of fulfilling the five-year plan in 4.5 years firmly captivated the minds of the people. The collective completed the third year of the five-year plan two months ahead of schedule and decided to fulfill the plan for the first four years by 1 September 1979, thus already gaining four months. Now, having found additional possibilities, the association's personnel have amended their previous obligation so that they may fulfill the five-year plan not six but seven months ahead of schedule.

Such are the specific results of the activities of the Integral party organization which is successfully applying the comprehensive system for the ideological-political, labor, and moral education of the working people. The results of the application of this system may be seen also in the extensive spreading of other patriotic initiatives. Hundreds of workers have already joined the "I Request a Higher Norm!" movement. The movement is yielding great economic results, considerably raising labor productivity. Its moral significance is no less important. People who, on their own initiative, request higher production norms without additional payments are trying, above all, to contribute as much as possible to the collective and insure the common success.

The high-level civic maturity of the Integral personnel was manifested also in the following initiative: "Engineering Support for Workers' Initiative," and "For Oneself and for That Other Boy," and in the adoption by many working people of the quality self-control system.

The effectiveness achieved in the course of the comprehensive ideological-educational efforts in the association is manifested in the creative successes and healthy moral atmosphere in the collective and the patriotic feelings of the people.

The Integral party organization was among the first in the republic to discuss the CC CPSU decree "On Further Improvements in Ideological and Political-Educational Work." It began with a meeting of the party aktiv with the participation of deputy secretaries of party organizations in charge of ideological work, propagandists, political informants, and agitators, followed by meetings of primary party organizations.

On the party committee's suggestion P. P. Goydenko, general director of the association, presented a report to the aktiv. He is not only a most experienced economic manager and production organizer but an active participant in the education process and the head of the party committee's ideological commission.

The CC CPSU decree, he pointed out, is the most important party document which directs the party organizations and all ideological units and cadres steadily to improve ideological-educational work, relate it closely with specific economic, social, and political assignments, critically interpret accomplishments, and creatively seek new work methods.

Let us emphasize, the speaker went on to say, that the solution of the stressed economic problems facing the association's collective is directly dependent on the educational activities of the public organizations and the administration. All of us realize that the implementation of the plans would be impossible without the creation of a proper moral-political atmosphere and without the clear understanding by every member of the collective of his social and governmental duty. Such an atmosphere is established, above all, through the effectiveness of political and economic training and the level of propaganda-agitation and individual work with the people.

The party members who addressed the aktiv described the various directions of the ideological and political-educational work done within the association, analyzed its condition and level, and discussed unresolved problems.

"The development in the Soviet people of a scientific outlook, total dedication to the cause of the party and the communist ideals, love for the socialist fatherland, and proletarian internationalism remain the core of ideological and political-educational work," notes the CC CPSU decree. It was entirely natural for the Integral party aktiv to focus its attention on improving the systems of party training, economic education, Komsomol political education, and mass propaganda methods.

Over 14,000 members of the association are acquiring political and economic knowledge in seminars, courses, and circles headed by experienced people with a calling for educational work. For example, all propagandists within the party education system have higher education. Approximately one-third of them are graduates of the Marxism-Leninism University. The party committee is steadily perfecting the training of propagandists and providing them with effective assistance. They can always find materials for any topic in the political education office: references, method works, press clippings, and visual aids. At the seminars they are given recommendations on their next classes, the use of facts and figures, technical facilities, drawings, and charts. All this makes it possible to make class work more meaningful, varied, and more effective.

Once every five years the propagandists must be certified. This is a delicate matter requiring the scrupulous study of individual practical experience, objective evaluation, responsiveness, and tactfulness. The certification brings to light the strong and weak aspects of heads of seminars, courses, and circles. It enables the propagandists to correct their activities and eliminate shortcomings.

The summation and dissemination of the experience of the best propagandists is very useful. Regularly attending classes, the members of the method council note the most successful methods for the presentation of the material, detect the "pep" in the work of individual heads of courses and circles, study the components of their skill and, subsequently, describe all this at seminars for propagandists, in articles in the local newspaper, and in local radio broadcasts. A newsreel was produced on V. S. Kuleshov, head of a course on the foundations of Marxism-Leninism, seen by anyone engaged in ideological work in the association.

Viktor Semenovich Kuleshov, chief of shop number 27, is justifiably considered one of the most experienced propagandists. For the past 11 years he has headed the course attended by turners, milling-machine operators, and tuners. The propagandist tries to introduce each theoretical concept and item of a party decision in the minds and hearts of the audience, seeing to it that such knowledge is converted into practical accomplishments.

The students of the course in foundations of Marxism-Leninism are communist labor shock workers, excellent quality workers, and winners of the socialist

competition. These people are the true promoters of the party's policy in the collective and constant agitators in production sectors. They are always principle-minded in the solution of all problems. Thirteen people are tutoring the young workers. Kuleshov persuaded the five students without secondary education to graduate from the working youth school. These people, already past the age of 40, went back to school.

S. A. Sutupova, deputy secretary of the party organization of shop number 18 and controller for specialized work, properly described the significance of the political training of party members.

"The high purpose of ideological work," she said, addressing the aktiv, "is constantly to lead the people forward, arming them with profound knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory, and spiritually developing the individual. The party organization in our shop will continue to upgrade the level and effectiveness of political training. We shall focus our main attention on converting knowledge acquired in class into the practical activity of every student. If a propagandist, presenting the material, is able to promote in the students the desire to work and live better, we could consider that our work has not been wasted. This will be a proper response to the decree of our party's Central Committee."

A number of examples of the effectiveness of political training of the Integral personnel could be cited. In seminars, courses, and circles the students read papers, make visual aids, and carry out the practical assignments given by the propagandists. It has become the rule within the association's party organization in summing up the results of the school year to take into consideration not only the extent to which knowledge has been mastered or the quality of the papers presented, but political and labor activities. Last school year the ranks of leading production workers were swollen by yet another 200 people. The rationalization suggestions submitted by students attending communist labor courses enabled the association to save 130,000 rubles in one year. The students attending the leading experience course, headed by engineer I. I. Sokolov, requested of the administration to raise their production norms. This considerably enhanced labor productivity in the sector.

The Integral party organization proceeds from the fact that the effectiveness of political training is expressed also in the fact that students attending seminars, courses, and circles, displaying social and political maturity, promote such qualities in those around them as well. Based on the knowledge they have acquired, a number of them give talks, political reports, and speeches in brigades and sectors.

Implementing the CC CPSU decree, the party committee made it incumbent upon the primary party organizations to upgrade further the effectiveness of classes within the system of party training, economic education, and Komsomol political education. A decision was made to set up as of the new school year progressive propaganda experience courses which will teach the best methods for the presentation of the material in class, the most effective types of independent work by the students, means to upgrade their labor and socio-political activeness, and other topics.

The association's party members are doing a great deal to improve mass political work. Workers and employees are regularly informed on most important events in the country and abroad and on the course of the implementation of production assignments and of the collective's social plans. Currently the association has 570 political informants. Hundreds of party members are engaged in agitation work and reading lectures and reports.

A number of shop collectives have acquired interesting practical experience. The shop's administration and representatives of the party bureau and trade union committee mandatorily take part in workers' meetings at shifts and sections. A great variety of problems arise at such meetings. The talk may turn to the use of the equipment, relations within the collective, or living and resting conditions. It has become the rule in most shops that no question asked by a worker would be ignored. Answers to questions are provided either immediately or shortly afterwards and reports on adopted measures are discussed by each sector.

The association's party committee takes into consideration the specific nature of the various groups of workers and is continually studying public opinion. Information on requests and requirements of working people is submitted to the party committee by the bureaus of primary party organizations, propagandists, speakers, political informants, and agitators.

Addressing the party aktiv, Ye. V. Vorontsov, party committee secretary at the Transistor Plant, described the activities of propaganda-information groups which include leading plant and association workers. One of the main tasks of such groups is to study public opinion in situ and influence it actively. Visiting the workers' collective, the group members answer questions formulated in advance or during the meeting. Decisions on many such problems are made on the spot. As a rule, an atmosphere of benevolence and trust develops at such meetings. This influences the overall moral and psychological climate within the collective. From personal experience workers participating in such discussions know that their views will be considered and that the management will take the necessary measures as a result of critical remarks.

Currently the Integral party committee has undertaken to create an information-propaganda center for the association in which heads of seminars, courses, and circles, political informants, and agitators would be able to obtain the required data on life in our country and abroad, and information on their own enterprise, rayon, and city. The center will begin operations in the next few months.

At the meeting of the aktiv great attention was paid to the participation of leading cadres in ideological-educational work. In this field the Integral personnel have acquired rich experience now used by other party organizations. This experience has been largely acquired in recent years.

Studying the condition of ideological work in the association after the 25th CPSU Congress, the party committee drew the attention to the fact that not

all economic managers participate in the educational process or are properly concerned with the establishment of a favorable moral climate within their collectives. This was inconsistent with the requirements formulated at the congress concerning leading cadres, for a modern manager, whatever his work sector, must take into consideration the sociopolitical and educational aspect of production activities, and be responsive to people, their requirements, and their needs.

Foremen, chiefs of sectors, shifts, and shops, and chief specialists in the association took an attitude of party-minded responsibility toward this most important requirement and actively engaged in ideological-educational work. The party committee organized the purposeful training of managers and held a seminar for them. It has become the rule that managers of plant subunits are confirmed in their position by the party bureaus. Regularly chiefs of shifts and sectors report to the bureau on educational work and the organization of the socialist competition in their collectives. They participate in preparations for and implementation of mass political measures and report on the implementation of socialist pledges at meetings of shop trade union committees.

The past few years convincingly proved that the association's management can skillfully combine the solution of economic with political problems and lead the people through words and deeds. Currently the management personnel includes 106 propagandists, 109 lecturers and speakers, and 10 specialists heading public ideological groups.

The members of the party aktiv noted that today managers at all levels look at the solution of economic and production problems through the lens of human relations. Conflicts caused by improper relations between superiors and their subordinates are becoming ever less frequent.

Addressing the aktiv, N. Ye. Patskevich, chief of shop number 21, said:

"There no longer are managers in our collective who would say, 'My work is the plan, while educational work and propaganda is the job of the public organizations.' Today everyone understands that it is possible to upgrade production effectiveness and improve work quality only through the application of the entire set of technical, economic, organizational, educational, and social measures."

Nikolay Yermolayevich Patskevich is well known to the collective. He is a person with an inclination for social work. He is distinguished by great competence, high erudition, and the skill to work with people. He is quite approachable, values humaneness and spiritual qualities while being, at the same time, always principle-minded and exacting, and trying to develop in the people discipline, efficiency, and precision. N. Ye. Patskevich became a propagandist after the 25th party congress. Last school year the students attending his course studied the topic of "The Constitution of Developed Socialism."

A number of leading workers in the association have proved their skill to engage in individual work with the people and involve themselves in their concern and needs. They include E. I. Pogotskiy, chief of shop number 37, V. A. Kolivoshko, chief of the metrology department, V. A. Bobkov, chief of the science subunit, V. S. Anikhovskiy, head of the Komsomol-youth collective, and other party members.

Ideological conferences with the general director, the plant directors, and the chiefs of shops and departments has become good training for the leading association cadres. Based on a procedure formulated by the party committee, they are held systematically as follows: six times annually, on problems of labor and social discipline and protection of socialist property; four times annually, on problems of ideological work. The conferences are planned by the party committees, which set up commissions to work on one or another topic.

Positively assessing the acquired experience, the Integral party aktiv directed the chief specialists, and chiefs of shops, sections, and services to the further energizing of ideological-educational work.

The aktiv studied a number of aspects of ideological and political-educational work. Its participants discussed problems of lecture propaganda, political information, and oral and visual agitation. The problems discussed included the study of public opinion, the holding of workers' meetings, work at home, and the direction of the work of plant and wall newspapers. The organization of the socialist competition and work with young people were extensively discussed.

Problems of the struggle against violations of the norms of communist morality and of strenthening labor and social discipline were particularly discussed in the addresses. Such problems are never ignored by the association's party committee. On its recommendations the staff of the voluntary people's unit organized the regular publication of leaflets entitled "The Law is the Law," "The Nettle," and "The Broom," which sharply criticize all violators of the public order. The association's newspaper has a page entitled "Department of Satirical Analysis" and a section entitled "Fight Drunkenness." Each shop produces its own "flashes" and "Komsomol Beacon" bulletins. Also effective are posters entitled "Violator, What Do You Have in Mind?"

All this makes it possible operatively to expose cases of delinquencies and strengthens the power of public influence. Violators of labor and social discipline must answer charges at workers' meetings. Their actions are discussed by shop trade union committees and at comrade court sessions. For a number of years the association has practiced the method of individual sponsorship by leading production workers of problem young workers. Recently the Integral collective developed a new form of work: keeping a record book entitled "Conscience." Should public influence measures turn out to be ineffective, the violator of labor discipline must give the collective at a workers' meeting a pledge which he signs in the "Conscience" record. This is the final measure. The signer is warned that the violation of his pledge will allow the shop trade union committee to give its agreement to the administration regarding his dismissal.

Integral statistics confirm that since 1970 cadre turnover has been reduced by approximately one-half--from 11.5 to 6%. The number of labor discipline and public order violations is declining with every passing year.

Studying the experience acquired in ideological work, the members of the aktiv earmarked ways for upgrading its effectiveness, paying primary attention to unresolved problems and exposing shortcomings. It was noted, in particular, that some propaganda workers are poor in their methodological preparations. Their classes are monotonous. They are unable to interest the students. Occasionally political talks are superficial. Insufficient operativeness in the information given students attending circles and seminars may be felt. Some shops underestimate the educational role of the workers' meetings, which frequently have the same agenda: "on the results of the work in the past month and the tasks for the forthcoming one." The method of individual work with the people is poorly used. Formalism in the organization of the socialist competition has not been eliminated entirely. There are still cases of concealment of shortcomings and difficulties in the work and of adopting easy solutions in resolving practical problems.

A stern reprimand was addressed to managers who failed to react to the critical remarks published in the plant's press and failed to take measures based on the signals it carries. The members of the aktiv were informed of the fact that two managers of plant subunits had been reprimanded by the party for such an attitude toward critical remarks published in the association's newspaper.

The idea that the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Further Improvements in Ideological and Political-Educational Work" is a battle program for action for the party members and that it indicates specific ways for the elimination of shortcomings and insuring the organic unity of political, labor, and moral education, ran throughout the speeches at the party aktiv meeting. The party aktiv of the Integral Association approved the CPSU Central Committee decree entirely and fully and adopted it for action and strict implementation.

Day after day the order-bearing Integral collective is increasing its pace. It was awarded the Red Challenge Banner of the CC CPSU, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU, and Komsomol Central Committee for successes achieved in the third year of the five-year plan; it was awarded the Red Challenge Banner of the ministry and the trade union central committee for results achieved in the first quarter of 1979.

The Integral personnel are confidently marching toward the planned level of fulfilling the five-year plan in four years and five months; 65 leading production workers have already completed their individual five-year plans and hundreds of workers have completed their plan for the first four years.

These successes are clear results of extensive organizational and educational work and efficient ideological support of formulated assignments.

5003
CSO: 1802

IN THE SPIRIT OF INTERNATIONALISM AND SOVIET PATRIOTISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 79 pp 34-45

[Article by L. Shapiro, first secretary of the Jewish Autonomous Oblast CPSU committee]

[Text] It is symbolic and noteworthy that it was precisely in Russia--the country which, prior to the victory of the Great October Revolution, was the prison of the nations, that the national problem was given a solution which serves today as an example to all progressive mankind. It was already then, when the party was being created, and when the Bolsheviks were gathering their forces for the overthrow of czarism and the bourgeoisie, that they had an efficient program for the solution of the national problem, based on the principles of scientific communism. In 1905, in a 1 May leaflet, V. I. Lenin wrote: "Jews and Christians, Armenians and Tatars, Poles and Russians, Finns and Swedes, Latvians and Germans--all, all of them are marching together under the common banner of socialism. All workers are brothers and their strong alliance is the only guarantee for the good and happiness of all toiling and oppressed mankind" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 10, p 81).

Lenin's ideals of internationalism and of friendship and cooperation among the nations have been brilliantly implemented in our country. "Equality, fraternity, and the inviolable unity among the peoples of the Soviet Union," noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, in his report "The Great October and the Progress of Mankind," "have all become a fact. A new historical human community--the Soviet people--has developed. The expanding process of rapprochement among nations is imbuing all realms of life of our society." The Fundamental Law of the Soviet state reliably guarantees the equality of citizens of all nations and nationalities. The exercise of their rights, the USSR Constitution stipulates, is insured through their upbringing in a spirit of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism. Any discrimination based on national characteristics is punishable by law.

Under the Soviet system, as a result of the systematic implementation of the Leninist national policy, all union republics and other national-state formations reached an unparalleled blossoming of their economy and culture.

Within a short time they covered in their development a distance which some capitalist countries have been unable to cover in centuries. The age-old expectations of toiling Jews have also been fulfilled: For the first time in history they acquired a true homeland, becoming equal and happy in the great united family of the peoples of the USSR.

Yet, despite the obvious truth, totally ignoring the real facts of life in the Land of the Soviets, again and again the capitalist West and Israel pull out of the arsenal of the frequently defeated bourgeois ideologues the so-called "Jewish problem." Again and again all sorts of myths and fabrications are being cooked up in the Zionist propaganda kitchen concerning the allegedly calamitous situation of the Jews in the USSR, the "destruction" of Jewish culture, and the fact that citizens of Jewish nationality are being subjected in the Soviet Union to "discrimination" and are "deprived" of rights and freedoms. We well understand the objectives of the Zionists dancing to the tune of U.S. monopolists and their hypocritical calls for "reunification" in the "promised land," and their chauvinistic slogans of a "single Jewish state," far from imbued with concern the fate of the Jews, as their class interests are to talk the Soviet Jews into abandoning the socialist way of life. Through their threadbare anti-Soviet and anti-communist propaganda, the Zionists are trying to weaken, to undermine the tremendous international prestige of our homeland.

The Soviet people, the working people of the Jewish Autonomous Oblast, reject with anger and indignation the fabrications of the Zionists and the bourgeois press. The moral-political atmosphere of our oblast is good. The working people of town and country warmly and unanimously support the domestic and foreign policy of the party's Central Committee and Central Committee Politburo, headed by the loyal Leninist and zealous fighter for peace and social progress, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev. During the entire 45 years of existence of the oblast no single person here has been tempted by the Zionist promises and not one has gone to Israel. The feelings and thoughts of the working people of Jewish nationality were expressed with exhaustive fullness in the open letter published on 26 February 1970 by the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. Turning to the supporters of international Zionism, a group of pioneers--workers, kolkhoz members, and members of the intelligentsia--wrote: "What do we have in common with you, gentlemen in Tel Aviv, what are you relying on? . . . Even those among us who are already half a century old were born under the Soviet system. It was that system that gave us education, a roof over our heads, and a favorite employment. It was it, the Soviet system, that gave us more--we became people among other people. The Soviet Union is the country where we were born and where we are raising our children. It is our true and only homeland and we do not need a different one."

These words, coming from the bottom of the heart, show pride in our great multinational fatherland. They vividly express the patriotism and profound social optimism of the Soviet people. These words reflect the aspiration of the oblast working people actively to participate in the building of a communist society shoulder to shoulder with all working people in the country.

The entire history of the creation, establishment, and development of the oblast offers convincing proof of the groundlessness of the fabrications of Zionists and bourgeois propaganda on an alleged unequal status of the Jews in the Soviet Union. It as though these disreputable gentlemen are speaking and writing about czarist Russia where the toiling Jews, indeed, were the most persecuted people. They were forced to live in the "pale," and had no political or civil rights. They were forbidden to hold government positions or own land. The lot of the Jewish poor--small artisans and craftsman--was a rightless, a poor existence and dreams of a better lot. Their situation was vividly and truthfully reflected in the works of Shalom Aleichem, the classic of Jewish literature, whose works have been published in the Soviet Union in mass editions in Russian and other languages. The Great October Socialist Revolution radically changed, turned upside down the entire way of life of these people rejected by society, taking them to the path of building a new life. The homeland of the victorious October Revolution gave statehood to the Jews.

In 1924 a Land Settlement Committee for Jewish Workers--KOMZET--was set up under the USSR Central Executive Committee Soviet Nationalities Presidium. It was headed by Petr Germogenovich Smidovich, the noted party and state leader, after whom one of the big rayons in our oblast was named. In the summer of 1927 a representative scientific expedition headed by Professor B. L. Bruk, was sent to Dal'nevostochnyy Kray, in the area of the basins of the rivers Bira and Bidzhan. Three of its groups--soil-botany, water reclamation, and statistical-economic--were assigned the task of studying the area and establishing its suitability for resettlement. On KOMZET's request, the overall leadership of the expedition was assumed by the outstanding scientist Academician V. R. Vil'yams.

The conclusions drawn by the expedition were most encouraging. "Despite the difficulties related to the development of Birobidzhanskiy Rayon," the report stated, "it is most favorable for purposes of planned resettlement. The extensive possibilities provided by the geographic location of the rayon, which is within the basin of the Pacific Ocean, the tremendous capacity of surrounding markets, the important location of the rayon in an outlying area which is as yet to be conquered in the sense of laying in it the foundations of Soviet construction, are fully harmonious with environmental conditions."

Having studied the expedition data, KOMZET decided to ask the USSR Central Executive Committee Presidium to assign Birobidzhanskiy Rayon to KOMZET and begin work on settling on the land toiling Jews. A similar decision was passed by the OZET Presidium--the society for the land settlement of toiling Jews. Meetings held in many cities and sites in the Ukraine and Belorussia led to the approval by the working people of this choice, following which, on 28 March 1928, the USSR Central Executive Committee Presidium passed the decree "On Assigning to KOMZET, to Meet the Requirements of the Extensive Settlement of Toiling Jews of the Available Land in the Amur Belt of Dal'nevostochniy Kray." The document stipulates that "given favorable results of the extensive settlement of said rayon by toiling Jews the possibility exists to organize on the territory of said rayon a Jewish national administrative-territorial unit."

So, the foundations of the youngest oblast within our multinational homeland--the Jewish Autonomous Oblast--were laid on a land reddened during the civil war by the blood of the fighters for the people's happiness, on the soil of the legendary Volochayevka. In May 1928 the first group of new settlers arrived in the Birobidzhanskiy Resettlement Rayon. People came from the Ukraine, Belorussia, and the central oblasts of the Russian Federation. They came to build here cities, factories and plants, and establish kolkhozes and sovkhozes. They came to find their destinies in this rich and generous area. And they fulfilled their destinies there. The state supplied the resettlers with everything necessary and, with the tremendous help of the working people throughout the country, the new rayon was developed rapidly and successfully. On 20 August 1930 the USSR Central Executive Committee Presidium passed a decree on organizing the Birobidzhanskiy Rayon within the Dal'nevostochniy Kray. Four years later, on 7 May 1934, the Soviet Government decided to reorganize the rayon into the Jewish Autonomous Oblast, granting it all the rights stipulated by Soviet legislation for autonomous oblasts within the Russian Federation.

The broad masses of Jewish working people welcomed this decision with tremendous satisfaction. Hundreds of letters and congratulatory telegrams were sent to KOMZET and OZET. There was a growing flow of requests to move to Birobidzhan. In May 1934, at a meeting with a delegation of workers from Moscow enterprises and Jewish press workers, Mikhail Ivanovich Kalinin, USSR Central Executive Committee chairman, said: ". . . The reorganization of Birobidzhan into an oblast is the result of the wishes of the Jewish masses. . . . This organization is no mere statement. In general, it was not intended as a declaration or as beautiful words, but was based on practical considerations--to intensify the building of socialism in the oblast."

Both in those distant years and now our oblast has remained the target of constant malicious Zionist attacks. It has been subjected to their numerous newspaper and journal articles and radio and television programs. Gross falsification of facts and unconcealed anti-Sovietism are the weapons of Zionist ideologues who, with a zeal worthy of emulation for the better, are trying to slander our reality and claim that white is black. What are the "works" by bourgeois scribblers worth, bearing titles such as "In the Birobidzhan Swamps," "A World Without Hope," "A Cursed Land," and so on. Such dirty pasquinades trigger in the oblast's working people indignation and scorn and nothing else.

With the constant attention and concern of the communist party and the Soviet Government, and with the help of the fraternal peoples and all union republics, our oblast has become an area of large-scale industry, mechanized agriculture, and high cultural standards. It has created an electrical engineering industry, agricultural machine building, an ore-mining industry, and a construction materials industry. Enterprises belonging to other economic sectors have been built. The output of our factories, plants, and combines--rice and silage harvesting combines, tin, lime, bricks, paper, timber, furniture, clothing, shoes, and many others--goes to many republics, krays, and oblasts in the country, and abroad.

The Dal'sel'mash Plant--the base of agricultural machine building in the Far East--is known far beyond the boundaries of the oblast. Other leading collectives are those of the Khinganolovo Combine, the Teploozersk Cement Plant, the Birobidzhan Hosiery-Knitted Goods Factory, and the plant for power transformers. With every passing year the capacities of the construction industry and the volume of industrial, housing, and consumer construction are rising.

Radical changes have taken place in agriculture as well. Meadows and pastures spread where once the steppe covered tens of kilometers. Thousands of tractors, combines, trucks, and other machinery are at work in the sovkhoz and kolkhoz fields. All agricultural enterprises are electrified and the main processes in crop growing and animal husbandry have been mechanized. The rural working people are steadily increasing the output of fields and livestock farms. Since 1934 the gross grain harvest has nearly quadrupled. Vegetable crops have increased by a factor of 10 and potato crops by a factor of 12. Within that period cattle herds have increased by a factor of nearly eight.

The oblast working people have achieved great successes in cultural construction as well. The state is allocating tremendous funds for the development of public education, health care, culture, and consumer and trade services to the population. The oblast has tens of general educational schools, secondary special schools and vocational-technical schools, hundreds of houses of culture, clubs, movie theaters, and public libraries. The creation in the city of Birobidzhan, the oblast center of the Jewish Autonomous Oblast, of a professional Jewish chamber music theater and philharmonic orchestra is proof of the concern shown by the party and government for the blossoming of national culture. Birobidzhan also has a Russian and a Jewish people's theater, and amateur performances have become widespread in labor collectives. The oblast has nurtured talented writers and poets. Two oblast newspapers are published: BIROBIDZHANER SHTERN, in Yiddish, and BIROBIDZHANSKAYA ZVEZDA, in Russian. Announcers working for the oblast television and radio broadcasting committee broadcast daily in the two languages. All settlements in the oblast have radio reception facilities and the absolute majority of the population can watch Moscow telecasts through the Orbita System.

The selfless toil of workers, kolkhoz members, and members of the intelligentsia has been rated highly by the communist party and Soviet Government. In 1967 our oblast was awarded the highest award of the homeland--the Order of Lenin--for successes in the development of the national economy and culture. In 1972, the oblast was awarded a second high award--the Order of the Friendship among the Peoples--for great merits in strengthening the fraternal friendship among Soviet peoples and achievements in economic and cultural construction. The Birobidzhan Knitted Goods Factory was awarded the Order of the Labor Red Banner. It was also awarded the title of Communist Labor Collective along with the Zavety Il'icha Kolkhoz; the Teploozerovo Cement Plant and the Birsk Apiculture Sovkhoz were awarded the Honor Badge Order.

As an equal among equals, our oblast shared with the entire country the joys of peaceful toil and the trials of the war years. Even though the Great Patriotic War was being waged thousands of kilometers away from the shores of the Amur, Khabarovskiy Kray immediately became part of the war camp. Like the entire Soviet people, the oblast working people rose to the defense of the gains of the October Revolution. The oblast party organization sent to the active army over half of its membership. Thousands of party and Komsomol members volunteered for the front. In the battles of Moscow, Leningrad, Stalingrad, and Kursk, and in the battles against the Japanese militarists, the oblast working people increased the military glory of the Far Eastern people's army men and the Amur guerrillas. Over 7,000 oblast residents were awarded USSR orders and medals for bravery, courage, and heroism displayed in the Great Patriotic War. Fourteen of our fellow countrymen were awarded the title Hero of the Soviet Union.

The exploit of Aleksandr Matrosov, who blocked with his body the embrasure of an enemy pill box, was repeated by Iosif Romanovich Bumagin, worker at the Dal'sel'mash Plant, of Jewish nationality. The workers' settlement of the oblast center has been named after this hero and his name has been taken by the best pioneer units.

The oblast working people helped the homeland to win the victory over the hated enemy and, in the rear, in plants, factories, fields, and livestock farms. They shipped to the front ammunition and uniforms, and collected gifts and warm clothing for the Red Army soldiers. Over 90 million rubles from personal savings were contributed to the defense fund and to the manufacturing of combat equipment. The homeland highly rated the labor efforts of the workers, kolkhoz members, and employees, and their selfless aid to the front. Over 3,000 people were awarded orders and medals of the Soviet Union.

The revolutionary, combat, and labor traditions of the Far Eastern people are a powerful source for the communist, patriotic, and international upbringing of the working people.

Zionist propaganda is flooding the world with fabrications on all sorts of oppressions of the Jews in the Soviet Union. The example of our oblast easily refutes this slander. Along with the other autonomous oblasts it has its representatives in the superior state organs--the supreme soviets of the USSR and the RSFSR. Thirty percent of local soviet deputies are citizens of Jewish nationality.

Members of many nationalities live and work in the oblast like a single family. Along with Russians, Ukrainians, Belorussians, and other peoples, Jews fruitfully work in all economic sectors. Many of them have earned the high prestige and recognition of the working people through their selfless toil and active participation in social life. Rakhil' Gedal'yevna Geller, soldering worker at the power transformers plant was elected deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of Nationalities, at the recent election. Khaya Abramovna Karasik, a seamstress at the Birobidzhan Textile-Clothing Factory,

was awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labor. Saveliy Borisovich Grinberg, head of a construction brigade at the Birobidzhanstroy Trust, was awarded the Order of Lenin. Construction worker David Yakovlevich Gleyzer is the bearer of the orders of the October Revolution and Labor Red Banner. The Birobidzhan City Committee for the Defense of the Peace is headed by honored RSFSR school teacher Vera Yakovlevna Gleyzer, a bearer of the Order of Lenin.

As elsewhere in the country, in our oblast the status of a person in society is based not on national affiliation, blood lines, or wealth. Selfless toil for the glory of the homeland and active participation in the administration of the state and in public life are the only yardsticks for civic merit. Riva Yevseyevna Vishchinikina, a veteran of the kolkhoz movement, is the head of a vegetable-growing brigade at the Zavety Il'icha Kolkhoz. She is the bearer of governmental awards and has been a deputy to the USSR Supreme Council. One of the teams in the brigade headed by this noted worker of Jewish nationality is headed by the Ukrainian Hero of Socialist Labor Mariya Petrovna Brakhmanova. Mechanizer Nikolay Timofeyevich Matsyshin, a Russian, was the first person in the oblast to be awarded the Order of Labor Glory, both classes. The labor of brigade worker Feyga Levbovna Fayman was rewarded by the orders of Lenin and of the Badge of Honor.

It was she, the daughter of kolkhoz truck gardener Leyb Reznik, who, at a time when the Zionists were once again shouting about the "persecution" of Jews in the Soviet Union, published an open letter in the journal SOVETSKAYA ZHENSHCHINA to the then head of the Israeli Government, Golda Meir. Describing the achievements of the kolkhoz and the happy life of its multi-national family, Feyga Leybovna ended her letter as follows:

"So, you are telling us that all of us are Jews and are related by blood and language. . . . Zionist ravings! Nothing relates us! We have nothing in common with you! Even though speaking the same language, we do not understand one another, for we belong to different classes and are on opposite sides of the barricade.

"We are spokesmen for the interests of the working people, and for the ideas of peace and internationalism. You speak for the interests of international imperialism, Zionism, and anti-communism. Therefore, there can be no point of agreement between us . . . ."

This was a proper rebuke! It was as though these words have been written just now, when the entire world is expressing its indignation on the separate deal recently made, with United States complicity, between Tel Aviv and Cairo at the expense of the vital interests of the people of Palestine and all Arabs. This unnatural alliance serves the reactionary forces aimed against freedom-loving nations.

Let us mention yet another small international collective. Recently, all of us, particularly the oblast's young men and women, learned with satisfaction that the head of the Komsomol-youth brigade of the Birobidzhan Power

Transformers Plant, Vladimir Vul'fson, was awarded the 1978 Lenin Komsomol Prize. The brigade, which bears the high title of Collective imeni 60-Letiya Velikogo Oktyabrya, consists of 12 people. They are electricians. Tat'yana Kol'tsova, who goes to night school, is the only one without completed secondary education. Leonid Sheyman, Vladimir Ioffe, and Mikhail Novak, joined the brigade after graduating from a secondary technical school. Currently Natasha Khrenkova, the sisters Zina and Roza Mendel'son and the brigade leader are broadening their knowledge by attending the night section of the machine technical school. Leonid Sheyman is a correspondence student at the Khabarovsk Polytechnical Institute.

Could these boys and girls have dreamed of such a life had there not been the Great October Revolution?!

Individuals of Jewish nationality hold many senior positions within the apparatus of the oblast party committee and departments and administrations of the oblast soviety executive committee. Jews are also heads of big enterprises, construction organizations, etc. The only plant in the country producing self-propelling caterpillar combines is headed by candidate of technical sciences E. G. Lipovetskiy. The power transformers plant is headed by L. M. Kogan; Ya. A. Shnayderman heads the shoe factory, while F. Sh. Glikshteyn heads the Zavety Il'icha Kolkhoz-Millionaire. This list could be extended. What remains, then, of the groundless claims of the Zionists that the Jews are discriminated against in the USSR?

What can we say of the hypocritical complaints of the Zionists concerning the "decline" of Jewish culture? A while back the premiere of the opera by Yu. Sherling "White Bridle for a Black Mare," based on the works of Shalom Aleichem, was performed in Birobidzhan. The performance of the chamber music theater, in Yiddish, was warmly welcomed by the audience. Performances by the young creative collective enjoyed great success in Khabarovsk, Vladivostok, Riga, Vil'nyus, Minsk, and elsewhere.

Boris Miller, editor of journal SOVETISH GEYMLAND ("Soviet Homeland"), Roman Shoykhet, member of the USSR Union of Writers, Grigoriy Rabinkov, the oldest literary worker in the oblast, and others write and publish their novels, stories, and poems in Yiddish. Books by local literary workers are published by the central and Far Eastern publishing houses, in the journal DAL'NIY VOSTOK, and in kray and oblast newspapers. The oblast Library imeni Shalom Aleichem and other oblast libraries have a large stock of publications in Yiddish. Many Jewish classics and Soviet plays are part of the repertory of the Jewish people's theater. Broadcasts in Yiddish, including musical and literary drama works, account for a considerable percentage of the oblast radio broadcasts. Local composers have composed a number of outstanding songs on our city and its population, and on the happy and joyful life of the Soviet people.

It is as though reality itself removes the grounds from under the feet of all and any abusers. The very existence of our oblast and the achievements of its working people in the fields of economics and spiritual life confirm the

total triumph of the Leninist national policy. Apparently, however, this is immaterial! The hatred of the enemies of the Land of the Soviets is not abating. They are intensifying their ideological diversions against the homeland of the October Revolution, the Soviet people, and the communist party. The Maoist dissidents are acting together with the sinister reactionary forces--the Zionists and bourgeois propaganda.

However, all anti-Soviet intrigues are doomed to failure. Together with the entire Soviet people, the working people of the Jewish Autonomous Oblast will continue firmly to rebuff slanderers of all hues and shades and international Zionism, the loyal servant of imperialism.

The instructions of the 25th CPSU Congress on intensifying the struggle against all manifestations of hostile ideology are particularly topical to the oblast party organization. Headed by the party's instructions, the oblast, city, and rayon party committees and primary party organizations are intensifying their ideological-educational work among the working people and the dissemination of the ideas of Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism, friendship among the peoples of the USSR, and the Soviet way of life. They are enhancing the political vigilance of the people, promoting in them intolerance of hostile ideology and of nationalistic prejudices.

We consider upgrading the effectiveness of all ideological-political activities of the party organizations and the shaping of Marxist-Leninist outlook in all party members and working people among the most important tasks. This is taken into consideration in the formulation of long-term and current plans by party committees, ideological institutions, and mass information media. The age, professional, and social characteristics of the various population categories are strictly taken into consideration.

Attention is always focused on the upbringing of ideological cadres and on equipping them with the skills to wage an offensive ideological struggle. Groups of lecturers and speakers specializing in problems of the struggle against Zionism and bourgeois nationalism have been set up at party committees and the board of the oblast, city, and rayon organizations of the Knowledge Society. The oblast party committee sponsors seminars and method consultations for lecturers and speakers. We are greatly assisted by the personnel of the CC CPSU Propaganda Department, and the scientists of the CC CPSU Academy of Social Sciences who come to the Far East as members of propaganda groups. They address the ideological aktivs of enterprises, sovkhozes and kolkhozes. The aktivs are helped by factual materials and method developments provided by a group of lecturers of the oblast party committee. Of late a new method has been introduced in ideological work: sending agitation trains to the various oblast rayons. They consist of lecturers, cultural and educational workers, and amateur collectives.

Political training plays a considerable role within the system of ideological work of the party organizations. Party and Komsomol members, and non-party people acquire a strong ideological training in theory seminars and political courses. They gain the knowledge needed in the struggle against hostile

propaganda. In this case particular attention is paid to the study of Lenin's theoretical heritage and of the CPSU national policy. Problems of patriotic and international education are included in the curriculums of seminars attended by the party-economic and ideological aktiv. Here problems of the contemporary ideological struggle are studied. Criticism of international Zionism and Maoism is particularly emphasized.

The propaganda of the Soviet way of life and the achievements of our homeland in building communism and the exposure of enemy ideology largely determine the activities of the groups of speakers, voluntary party committee lecturers, and lecturers of the Knowledge Society. A total of 135 people lecture on such topical problems. The same problems are discussed by 156 of the 557 political informants specializing in international topics. Constant attention is being paid to the training of such cadres and to upgrading their methodological skill. The city of Birobidzhan sponsors a permanent seminar for lecturers and courses for political informants operate in many enterprises.

The holding of single politics days improves the organization of the political information of the working people. During such days--held on a monthly basis--leading personnel of the oblast, city, and rayon, party, soviet, trade union, and Komsomol organs, enterprise directors, and secretaries of primary party organizations address the working people of labor collectives, presenting political reports and information.

The struggle against bourgeois ideology means also to promote the ideas of socialism and communism and the advantages of our system and way of life, and to raise the Soviet people in the spirit of the revolutionary, combat, and labor traditions of the party and the people. In this work we assign a special role to party and Komsomol veterans, and veterans of the civil and Great Patriotic wars, and the oblast pioneering workers. They speak to the people in labor collectives and youth community houses, and meet with secondary and university students and students attending vocational technical schools.

Monumentary propaganda is of great importance. The oblast has a number of memorable sites related to the heroic struggle for Soviet power in the Far East. A monument stands at the Iyun'-Koran' Mound commemorating the legendary Volochayevka Battle. Here boys and girls joining the Komsomol are ceremoniously awarded their Komsomol cards, and the red kerchiefs of the pioneers are tied around their necks. Thousands of people visit the memorial every year. It is the site of meetings and lessons in courage.

Over 17,000 young people are actively participating in the all-union march to sites of revolutionary, combat, and labor glory of the Soviet people. Marches to sites the combat operations of the Ivan Pavlovich Schevchuk guerrilla detachment, and agitation-ski runs along the combat path of the people's revolutionary army have become traditional. In the past three years alone the participants in such marches have identified over 200 previously unknown names of soldiers in the civil and Great Patriotic wars. A total of 67 monuments, obelisks, and memorial markers have been placed with the active participation of the "red pathfinders."

School faculties and Komsomol and pioneer organizations comprehensively encourage the interest of the young people in the heroic history of our kray and oblast. Boys and girls have established numerous contacts with war and labor veterans, shock workers of the first five-year plans, and initiators of the kolkhoz movement. A total of 137 museums, and combat and labor glory rooms and corners have been organized on the basis of materials collected by the pathfinders. They have become centers for the patriotic education of the growing generation.

People's museums have been organized at many enterprises. They contain exhibits describing the history of the factory or plant, the best members of the collective, and production leaders and innovators who are bearers of governmental awards and other distinctions for their selfless toil. Komsomol meetings, dedications as workers, and meetings between young people and veterans take place in these museums.

A socialist competition has been launched for the right to earn the prizes named after noted oblast people. For example, Leninskiy Rayon has instituted a prize named after the noted corn grower and Hero of Socialist Labor V. Ye. Pazdnikov. In Birobidzhanskiy Rayon, the best livestock breeder is awarded a prize named after Hero of Socialist Labor M. I. Pokatylo, a famous milkmaid in our kray. The best rayon mechanizer is awarded a prize named after the bearer of the Order of Glory, Hero of Socialist Labor, V. I. Peller.

The labor and heroic-patriotic education of the young people is combined with a variety of forms of mass defense and sports work. Pre-draftees attend universities for future soldiers. Here lectures are delivered on political topics, feature and training motion pictures are shown, and meetings are organized with war veterans and excellent workers in combat and political training. The army subunits sponsor open-door days at which the young people become familiar with the soldiers way of life. Many enterprise collectives and secondary school and university students maintain close sponsorship relations with border troops. The traditional military-sports relay race for the prize named after Hero of the Soviet Union Ivan Strel'nikov, annually sponsored on the eve of Border Troops Day, has become very popular among the oblast working people.

The activities of the oblast party organization to bring up the working people and the students in the spirit of the revolutionary, combat, and labor traditions of the Soviet people are most closely linked with international education. International friendship clubs have been organized in schools, secondary specialized schools, and a number of industrial enterprises. Movie festivals, theoretical conferences, literary evenings, debates, and other mass measures are sponsored. The peace movement also serves the objectives of international upbringing.

The oblast working people received with anger and indignation the news of China's aggression against socialist Vietnam. They expressed their full support of the declaration by the Soviet Government and, together with the entire nation and progressive mankind welcomed the victory of the Vietnamese people who expelled from their country the uninvited guests.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's outstanding books "Malaya Zemlya," "Vozrozhdeniye" [Rebirth], and "Tselina" [Virgin Land] play a tremendous role in the education of our people. These are exceptionally powerful works. They are valuable not only because the recreate the heroic past of the Soviet people with a great vital truthfulness, but also because they teach us how to look into the future. They have become a textbook of life for party and ideological workers and for millions of Soviet people.

The creative intelligentsia plays a noteworthy role in the patriotic and international education of the working people and in the struggle against bourgeois ideology. In the past few years alone the Khabarovsk publishing house and the Moscow Sovetskiy Pisatel' publishing house have published several books by local literary workers. The most significant among them are "Na Polnom Khodu" [Full Speed Ahead] and "Yasnost'" [Clarity] by B. Miller, "Rodnaya Zemlya" [Native Land] by R. Shoykhet, and "Zemlyaki" [Fellow Countrymen] by G. Rabinkov. These works depict in a vivid artistic manner the history of the establishment and development of our oblast and the happy life of our fellow countrymen. The Leninist friendship among nations is the principal idea governing the poetic and literary-publicistic anthologies of the works of local writers, poets, and journalists.

The main topic of the mass information media--the oblast newspapers and radio broadcasting system--is the specific depiction of the Soviet way of life. The newspapers have sections entitled "The Soviet Union is Our Homeland," "That is How We Live," "In the Fraternal Family of the Peoples of the USSR," "We Live in the Far East," "Two Worlds--Two Destinies," "In the Socialist Countries," "Zionism Without a Mask," etc. The newspapers and the radio provide extensive coverage of the competition among the working people of the USSR, Khabarovskiy Kray, and our oblast for the ahead-of-schedule fulfillment of plans for economic and social development in the 10th Five-Year Plan, and the friendship among the peoples of the Land of the Soviets. Materials are published as aids to propaganda workers, agitators, and political informants, including articles, reviews, and notes on new books exposing Zionist and Maoist doctrines.

Under the guidance of the kray and oblast party organizations, the oblast working people are adamantly implementing the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and the July and November 1978 Central Committee plenums. They are working to upgrade the effectiveness of public production and the quality of all work. Also programmatic to us are the instructions and recommendations formulated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the course of his trip to Siberia and the Far East.

In the 10th Five-Year Plan the oblast's national economy has been developing at a fast pace. Extensive systema[illegible]k is being done on the technical retooling of industrial and agricu[illegible]enterprises and construction organizations, and for upgrading publi[illegible]roduction effectiveness and production quality. A number of labor collectives have taken up the Rostov initiative of "Let Us Work Without Laggards!" The party, trade union, and Komsomol organizations have focused their attention on the struggle for saving fuel and energy resources, metals, and raw and other materials.

In the first three years of the five-year plan the volume of industrial output rose 17.8%. The entire growth was the result of higher labor productivity. The assignment of the first three years of the five-year plan for basic technical and economic indicators was fulfilled ahead of schedule, on 18 December 1978.

The oblast is implementing an extensive program for industrial, cultural-consumer and housing construction. The volume of construction and installation work has exceeded the level of the first three years of the Ninth Five-Year Plan 27%. A number of new enterprises were built and old ones reconstructed. Schools and hospitals, clubs, culture houses, public libraries, commercial centers, and consumer and communal service projects were built. About 300,000 square meters of comfortable housing were commissioned.

Agriculture has been developed further. Between 1976 and 1978 over 100 million rubles were invested in it. Compared with the average annual output of the preceding five-year plan, in the 1976-1978 period the volume of gross output rose one-third. The national economic plan for the first three years of the five-year plan was fulfilled for grain, vegetable, cattle, poultry, milk, eggs, and honey procurements. Our oblast reached the level planned for 1980 for milk procurements. For the third consecutive time Birobidzhanskiy Rayon has been awarded the Red Challenge Banner of the CC CPSU, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU, and Komsomol Central Committee as winner in the 1978 all-union socialist competition.

The first half of the fourth year of the five-year plan has been completed successfully. Socialist competition for ahead-of-schedule fulfillment of state plans and socialist obligations in 1979 has developed with new strength. As always, party members, and leading production workers and innovators are in the vanguard of the competition.

The mood of the oblast's population is characterized by calm, confidence, labor enthusiasm, and loyalty to the cause of the communist party. Fired with Soviet patriotism, they proved yet once again their solidarity with the CC CPSU through their unanimous vote for candidates for deputies to the USSR Supreme Soviet. The oblast working people express their feelings of warm thanks and gratitude to their party and the Soviet Government for their constant concern for the development of production forces in the Far East and for upgrading the prosperity of the Far Eastern people.

The oblast party organization is continually improving all ways and means for the communist education of the working people. The CC CPSU decree "On Further Improvements in Ideological and Political-Educational Work," currently extensively discussed by the oblast's party organizations, will play an exceptionally important role in this, and in the further enhancement of the quality and effectiveness of all ideological activities. We consider as one of our most topical tasks the intensified struggle against hostile ideology. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's instructions expressed in the CC CPSU Accountability Report to the 25th party congress are our manual for action: "Neutrality and compromises cannot exist in the struggle between the two outlooks. This requires high political vigilance, active, operative, and convincing propaganda work, and timely rebuff of hostile ideological diversions."

5003
CSO: 1802

LENINIST CONCEPT OF LAW AND CONTEMPORARY SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 79 pp 46-57

[Article I. Naletov, candidate of philosophical sciences]

[Text] Lenin's concept of scientific law, based on the fundamental stipulations of K. Marx and F. Engels, and on some of the rational ideas expressed by Hegel and Feuerbach, as the scientific predecessors of Marxist philosophy, play an important role in his tremendous philosophical legacy. Lenin's great attention to the problem of substantiation of the laws at the turn of the 20th century was determined, above all, by the need to study the laws of capitalism in the new historical period, the struggle against bourgeois ideology and revisionism on the subject of the objective nature of the laws governing social development, and the inevitability of the socialist revolution. A number of methodological problems related to the substantiation of scientific laws were posed by the revolution in the natural sciences at the turn of the 20th century. The sharp break of concepts and theories it triggered created in the bourgeois and petit bourgeois mind a growing scepticism toward the possibilities of science and a doubt as to the reliability of its postulates, as well as relativism and subjectivism which Lenin countered with irrefutable proof of the power of science, unshakable confidence in the fruitfulness of the alliance between dialectical-materialistic philosophy and the natural sciences, and infinite faith in the creative human genius capable of changing reality.

The philosophical problems related to the study of the structure of scientific laws, their substantiation, and their use to explain certain essential characteristics, are no less topical today. The more dynamic the social processes today become and the bigger the discoveries changing contemporary scientific concepts and representing the essence of the conceptual and scientific and technical revolution occurring in the world become, the more tangible becomes the significance of Lenin's ideas which are the pivot of the dialectical-materialistic concept of the law. The further development of knowledge under the new conditions would be inconceivable without the determination of its inviolable foundations and without strengthening its theoretical foundations which, precisely, are the laws governing science.

The Leninist concept of the scientific law is presented, above all, in brief yet exceptionally accurate definitions in his "Philosophical Notebooks" which express the variety of its various sides. The opposite nature of materialistic and idealistic views of the scientific law and of causality and necessity are depicted with extreme clarity in the work "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism." In the broad meaning of the term, however, the content of Lenin's concept is far from covered by these works. In virtually all his works, whatever the specific problems they may discuss, Lenin turned to the categories of the law, to necessity and accident in the study of social phenomena and processes, the solution of economic problems, and the exposure of the sophistry of the social chauvinists and revisionist criticism, thus using dialects as a powerful weapon for the theoretical analysis and practical solution of the vital problems of the socialist revolution.

Exposing the nature of World War I and proving its legitimate nature in the epoch of imperialism, Lenin wrote, for example, that "war is no accident. It is not a 'sin,' as the Christian priests believe . . . , but an inevitable degree of capitalism . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 26, p 41). Studying the different attitudes toward that war shown by the German revolutionary (leftist) social democrats and social chauvinists, Lenin clearly proved the conflict between the dialectical understanding of the need and the law, and their metaphysical interpretation from which the apologetic nature of the policies of the latter stemmed. Analyzing the correlation between the general and the particular in the socioeconomic development of different countries and the forward movement of the peoples, Lenin also continually notes the dialectics of necessity and randomness. The general is not identical with the necessary, the way the single is not the same as the accidental. Each phenomenon, however, carries within itself the elements of both the accidental and the necessary. That is why, showing the common features, science, unquestionably, comes closer to the understanding of the laws. ". . . In social science (as in science in general)," Lenin wrote, "it is a question of mass phenomena rather than isolated cases" (ibid, vol 26, p 250). That is precisely why in the study of social phenomena containing mass processes, it becomes particularly important to find the necessary relations and ties to explain random phenomena.

The profound logical-methodological analysis of the categories of the law, and of necessity, and randomness was provided by Lenin in "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism." Thus, the tremendous potential of dialectical logic he accumulated in preparing his "Philosphical Notebooks" became most important elements of the dialectical-materialistic methodology of scientific knowledge and revolutionary action, and a firm base in the struggle against all forms of bourgeois outlook.

The elimination of the old theories caused by new discoveries in physics proved the groundlessness of the metaphysical view of the knowledge of the laws of nature. However, the crisis of the old scientific foundations became the reason for bourgeois philosophers to reject the objective nature of laws

in general. Both "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism" and the "Philosophical Notebooks" create, under such circumstances, a single front in the struggle for the dialectical-materialistic understanding of the scientific law, opposing any idealistic or metaphysical interpretation.

Lenin emphasized particularly adamantly in both works the objective content of the categories of the law and of necessity. The laws of science, according to Lenin, are a reflection in the human mind of the objective processes occurring in the material world. "The world is a legitimate movement of matter and our knowledge, as the highest product of nature, can only reflect this legitimacy" (ibid, vol 18, p 174). The basic stipulations of dialectical-materialistic philosophy are of invaluable importance to the development of contemporary science and the criticism of the numerous concepts of the law widespread in contemporary bourgeois philosophy.

2

Of late the topic of the scientific law is constantly discussed in Western philosophical literature. However, the overwhelming majority of works by Western authors on problems of the scientific law are imbued with profound scepticism and agnosticism to the same extent as at the turn of the century, having become chronic in bourgeois philosophy precisely at that time. One or another subjectivistic approach to the nature of the scientific law and its explanatory and prognosticatory role in science is used to support conclusions on the alleged unreliability of scientific knowledge, the unsteadiness of the foundations of scientific laws, the impossibility to engage in their objective investigation, and the senselessness or limited applicability of the categories of the law in the social sciences.

True, it should be noted that in a number of aspects the concept of the law as presented in contemporary bourgeois philosophy (it will be a question, above all, of the so-called "philosophy of science") differs from the positions of Machism and even of the logical positivism of the 1930's and 1940's. Initially it seems directed against empiricism, so typical of such bourgeois schools of philosophy. The concept of the law as developed by authorities of the contemporary "philosophy of science" as K. Popper, A. Ayer, E. Nagel, K. Hempel, R. Braithwaite, P. Cos, J. Mecci, and others calls, above all, for a rejection of the inductivistic viewpoint typical of empirio-criticism and logical positivism, according to which science begins with observations of the similarities and differences among individual phenomena and ends with the formulation of universal summations built on a purely inductive foundation. The empirio-criticism and positivism of the 1930's and 1940's expressed such an understanding of the law in its most radical aspect, essentially not singling out laws among the numerous empirical (accidental) summations of a universal type (of the "all crows are black" type). The purpose of the latest concepts is to find distinctions among them. Distinguishing between accidental and nomic (expressing a scientific law) universal summations, E. Nagel, for example, considers the specific nature of the latter in the fact that they could be interpreted as strictly universal propositions unrelated to a limited space-time interval (see E. Nagel, "The

Structure of Science," London, 1961, pp 56-67). Popper tries to find this distinction in the terminological structure, one series of which is described as strictly qualitative, while another is numbered or individual (see K. Popper, "A Note on Natural Laws and So-Called 'Contrary-to-Fact Conditionals,'" in "Philosophical Problems of Causation," Encino, California, and Belmont, 1974, p 45). Thus, whatever the pathos of the contemporary representatives of the "philosophy of science" opposing inductivism, their model for the substantiation of the law is also based only on the universality criterion.

Another of its characteristic features is the very paradoxical combination of empiricism with conventionalism. The principle of verification, raised by the logical positivists, presumed the rightfulness of the purely empirical confirmation of a scientific law. Pointing out its limitations, the contemporary representatives of the "philosophy of science," Popper in particular, support another criterion for the substantiation of the scientific law (and all other forms of scientific knowledge)--the falsification criterion. Popper's main idea to assert the deductive method of its substantiation. Not relying on inductive summation, on the basis of few facts the scientist takes a decisive step leading to conclusions, formulates daring guesses which virtually assume the right of a convention. ". . . I am unlike the positivist," K. Popper writes, "by claiming that basic suggestions are not founded on direct experience but, from the logical viewpoint, represent a form of acceptable action and free decision" (K. Popper, "The Logic of Scientific Discovery," London, 1959, p 109). Yet, both Machism and logical positivism, suggesting that the substantiation of a law should begin with an inductive summation, also supported the view that at least a considerable part of its content is based on a conventional agreement. Poincare, for example, repeatedly emphasized the empirical origin of scientific laws and did not allow the possibility of their existence outside experience. Yet, he also claimed that as science develops, experimentally confirmed, the law subsequently operates as a convention. Mach as well, acting, generally speaking, from the positions of radical empiricism, was forced to introduce the principle of the "economy of thought" to provide an additional conventionalist justification of the law.

The essence of their concepts was expressed by Lenin most accurately: "It is entirely obvious that the new terms do not change in the least the old and very old philosophical line of agnosticism, for the essence of Poincare's 'original' theory is reduced to the negation (even though far from systematically) of objective reality and of the objective laws of nature" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 18, p 170).

Thus, at the first glance, the empiricism of the logical positivists and Machists, on the one hand, and the logicalism of the representatives of the "philosophy of science," on the other, may seem conflicting. However, this does not mean in the least that they are mutually exclusive. Even though we have witnessed of late a rather sharp polemic between supporters of empiricist and deductivistic concepts of scientific knowledge, they show more similarities than differences in resolving their main problems. Furthermore, this reveals the obvious support of Hume's and Kant's agnosticism on the part of bourgeois philosophers.

Concerning Avenarius, who claimed that in human sensations one can only follow one event after another, for which reason the need for any kind of movement would be inconceivable without the acceptance of an outside force, Lenin wrote: "We are faced with Hume's viewpoint in its purest aspect: Sensation, experience do not indicate to us any necessity" (ibid, vol 18, p 162). A similar conclusion imposes itself in assessing the methodology of the contemporary "philosophy of science." Its supporters categorically reject the psychological interpretation of necessity either as a habit in the acceptance of the regularity of events (Hume) or as the "probable expectation of consequences" (Avenarius), appearing to support an anti-Hume concept. However, critically assessing various aspects of the doctrines of Hume and the Machists, they consider as a whole as entirely correct Hume's analysis with its reduction of the laws to the level of a regular following of events (i.e., to universality), and to a rejection of objective necessity. On this subject the statements of Popper, Braithwaite, Ayer, and other Western philosophers are entirely identical. The idea of natural necessity, as Ayer claims, for example, does not help us to substantiate our belief in the existence of the laws of nature and does not provide an explanation of the nature of these laws: ". . . Even if the process of identification of the element within the system requires a turn to other elements, there will be no two elements regarding which one could say that they are necessarily linked. This is precisely what Hume's arguments require" (A. Ayer, "The Central Questions of Philosophy," London, 1973, p 144). Necessity, as presented by Popper, is merely a label useful for the verbal distinction between scientific laws and accidental universality. No other label could be so adequate, since here there could not be even a question of a logical necessity.

Assessing the concept of law in contemporary "philosophy of science," the attention is drawn, above all, to the fact that whatever the individual approach may be to the substantiation of a scientific law, characteristic of bourgeois philosophers is the absolutizing of individual aspects of the cognitive process. Mach's and Avernarious's radical empiricism and, subsequently, logical positivism are being replaced by a model for the substantiation of laws which clearly overemphasizes the role of deductive methods. Nevertheless, their weakness is not explained in the least merely by their inability to see the problem in its most general view and encompass all its aspects, but by the subjectivistic solution given to the basic gnosiological question. It was this that Lenin considered the main fault of the concept of law in bourgeois philosophy. ". . . The subjectivistic line taken on the matter of causality," he wrote, "and the derivation of the natural order and necessity not from the external objective world but from the mind, logic, etc., not only separates the human mind from nature and not only pits the mind against nature, but makes nature part of the mind instead of considering the mind a particle of nature" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 18, p 159).

In contemporary bourgeois philosophy this trend acquires a clearly expressed form of agnosticism, particularly when the methodological models used by Popper, Nagel, and Hempel are applied to the analysis of social processes.

The contradictions which result from the use of positivistic models for the substantiation of the law are the nutritive ground for the extensive dissemination of subjectivism, relativism, and agnosticism in bourgeois science. In virtually all their works the representatives of contemporary Western sociology and "philosophy of history," pertaining to the problem of the law, to one or another extent, repeat the disconsolate arguments of positivism: It is impossible inductively to substantiate a law. It is impossible to interpret the law as a logical necessity; any counter measure can refute a law and any law can be no more than a hypothesis, and so on.

Do scientific laws indeed have such weak foundations? Do the problems facing contemporary science give serious grounds for scepticism? If such is not the case, where does the scientist draw confidence in the reliability of the knowledge expressed by scientific laws?

A scientific law is distinct from the empirical summation which has a universal form, however broad it may be, above all because of its stability and irrefutability. In terms of empirical summation, there neither is nor could there be any confidence that, sooner or later, it would not be refuted, for the possibility that an event which would contradict this summation is always present. It is a characteristic feature of the scientific law that it is not rejected by the scientists this way and, as a rule, retains the previous faith in it, even if it faces conflicting examples. This characteristic of the law is a very "uncomfortable" fact facing the various types of relativists, for it confirms precisely the existence of the "stock of durability" of scientific knowledge who absence they deplore.

The great stability of the scientific law is something in the nature of a testing stone for the empiricist and deductivist concepts. Neither can explain the particular hypothetical and explanatory power of a scientific law compared with an empirical summation. The resistance of a scientific law facing conflicting facts indicates that its content is not covered by the sum total of explainable and predictable empirical laws based on it. Consequently, it cannot be substantiated through their simple enumeration, however impressive such enumeration might be. Yet, what is the origin of this non-empirical meaning which ascribes the law a special explanatory and hypothetical power? Let us cite several variants of the answer to this question typical of the representatives of the contemporary "philosophy of science": The non-empirical content of the law is related to the special cognitive position of the scientist (A. Ayer), to the logical necessity which is acquired by a given law derived from another, more general law (K. Popper and R. Braithwaite), to the specific function of the law in scientific knowledge (A. Nagel), etc. Hence the stability of the law is explained by the same factors.

It is obvious, however, that such an approach does not explain anything. It merely shifts the question from one level to another. "The result," Lenin wrote on the subject of Mach's ideas expressed in his "Mechanics," "that it is possible and necessary to seek a certain necessity in addition to the uniformity of the environment, i.e., of nature! Where to look for it is the secret

of idealistic philosophy, which is afraid to acknowledge that man's cognitive ability is a simple reflection of nature" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 18, p 165). Equally mysterious are the explanations of the nature of the scientific law offered by A. Ayer, K. Popper, R. Braithwaite, E. Nagel, and others, referring to some kind of "special position of the scientist," the "special function of the law," and so on. This is no accidental analogy but a direct inheritance of the traditions whose roots can be easily found in the philosophy of Hume and Kant.

K. Popper's deductivistic methodology is aimed at the fact that whereas the inductive method cannot offer a firm guarantee of the veracity of a law, the problem could be resolved otherwise. Relying on the universally known simplicity of the deductive conclusion and drawing from a formulated hypothesis all possible consequences, according to Popper the scientist must deliberately try to refute them. Concepts from which no empirically controllable consequences could be derived are proclaimed by Popper non-scientific, while the hypothesis whose consequences are refuted is considered false and must be rejected. Hypotheses which have withstood such trials have the right to life and are given a particular trust (even thought it always remains no more than a form of assumed knowledge). Popper's absolutization of the criterion of falsifiability leads the scientist along a very tricky path where he may meet extreme paradoxes. Suffice it to say that its use, as suggested by Popper, would mean a rejection of the most basic foundations of scientific knowledge.

For example, the law of the conservation of energy would have an absurd fate. It should have been abandoned in the 1930's, when a "leak" of energy was noted in the beta decay. It was precisely this, among other things, that N. Bohr suggested. In his Faraday lectures he formulated the following idea: ". . . Considering the contemporary condition of the atomic theory, we could say that we have no arguments whatever, empirical or theoretical, in favor of the observance of the law of the conservation of energy in the case of a beta decay and can only face complications should we attempt to satisfy the requirements of this law." Nevertheless, the persistent aspiration of the scientist to defend the accuracy of this law won, even though many years had to pass before its explanatory and hypothetical rights could be "restored." Now, according to the deductivists, it should be classified as "unscientific," since it failed to acquire a "dose" of refutals due any scientific law.

The weakness of the deductivistic concept of the scientific law becomes particularly obvious whenever there is an attempt to explain the conceptual stability of probability laws. We know that they do not possess universality in the sense stipulated by positivistic methodology. The prerequisite of universality requires that a law be applicable to any area of the universe at all time, or else applicable to any phenomenon of a specific class. Yet, this cannot be said of probability laws. Ever since Mendel, for example, formulated the laws of heredity, they have been confirmed with the help of a number of organisms ranging from the elephant to the cod, and from algae to oak trees. Yet, Mendel's laws have a feature which distinguishes them from the laws of physics such as those of Ohm, Boyle-Mariotte, Hooke, etc. They

merely tell us of the probable advent of one or another event (the gene is transmitted with a 50% probability), rather than its inevitability. Even in animal populations on earth the breakdown of hereditary characteristics is not entirely consistent with Mendel's laws.

Therefore, within the frameworks of deductivistic and inductivistic models of the scientific law, the question of the reasons for irrefutability and of the particular explanatory and hypothetical power of scientific laws remains unanswered. The orientation to the universality criterion can bring here nothing but disappointment. The reason for such failures and the related general pessimism concerning the reliability of scientific laws may be found in the scorn displayed by the representatives of contemporary "philosophy of science" for the criterion of objective necessity.

3

The essential significance of the criterion of necessity in the substantiation of a scientific law has long been proved by the classics of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Marx directly linked the concept of the law with objective necessity (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 25, part I, p 246). Lenin emphasized the importance of bringing closer to each other in Hegel's "Science of Logic" of concepts such as law, necessity, durability, homogeneity. He wrote: "The concept of the law here comes closer to the concepts of 'order' (Ordnung), homogeneity (Gleichformigkeit), and necessity . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 29, p 167). The acknowledgment of objective necessity unquestionably resolves the main question, that of the nature of the scientific law, indicating its most essential characteristic and the most important part of its content. At the same time, a number of questions remain requiring a profound philosophical study and presuming the further development of the Marxist-Leninist concept of the scientific law as applicable to the tasks of contemporary science.

We must admit that our philosophical publications have not as yet given a convincing answer to the questions of correlation between necessity and universality, the reasons for the particular explanatory and hypothetical power of the law, etc. In our view, the simple reiteration of universally acknowledged definitions of necessity and law, locked in a logical circle, does not contribute to their satisfactory solution. Such an approach cannot provide the scientist with any kind of useful methodological recommendations. It does not bring to light the very process of appearance of the scientific law, i.e., its nature. Nor does such an approach resolve the problem of the correlation between universality and necessity within the structure of the law.

Ascribing necessity as pertaining exclusively to a scientific law creates the impression that this category does not apply to the individual object or phenomenon and is linked merely with the theoretical level of knowledge. One way or another, such definitions separate the accidental from the necessary, thus violating one of the basic principles of dialectial materialism--the interconnection, the correlation among these categories. Whatever phenomenon

we may consider, even a most insignificant one on the surface (the falling of an apple from a tree), it should be considered, in accordance with this principle, as both an accidental and a necessary phenomenon, from one or another specific respect. In this case we could speak only of the extent of necessity of a phenomenon (or of the extent of its randomness), regardless of whether the law it obeys is known or unknown. Thus, the falling of the apple is necessary in terms of and to the extent to which it depends on other events. The measure of necessity in this phenomenon is determined by the fact that, first of all, the apple has ripened properly (internal condition); secondly, the fact that it is experiencing the earth's gravity as a more significant mass (external condition). It is a random phenomenon in terms of a change in lunar phases; it is random in terms of the wind (even though it depends more strongly on this factor), since sooner or later, the apple would fall even in totally calm weather as a result of the reasons we mentioned.

The unbreakable unity between necessity and accident will be expressed, therefore, considerably more accurately if we define necessity as a measure of dependence and accident as a measure of the independence of phenomena. In other words, a phenomenon or a characteristic is necessary to the extent to which it depends on other phenomena and characteristics; it is random to the extent to which such a correlation is absent.

Compared with the other, this definition has the advantage that it is not directly linked with the concept of the law and encompasses as necessary (or random) both the internal and external conditions of the considered phenomenon. It is applicable to the description of a separately considered phenomenon or event, thus indicating the logical independence of necessity and universality. Such a definition of the categories of necessity and accident, furthermore, clearly indicates the method for "translating" them into the language of specific scientific research.

In accordance with this definition, the main task of any scientist substantiating a scientific law is, while using the experimental and theoretical means specific to each science, to single out the necessary relationship among the other conditions, and assess qualitatively and quantitatively the significance of random, of non-essential factors in the application of the studied law. To achieve this, he must find reciprocally dependent or relatively independent events, characteristics, and facets of phenomena and processes occurring within a given material field. Characteristic of human knowledge in general, Lenin noted, is the fact that " we reject a number of characteristics as random. We separate the essential from the seeming and pit the one against the other" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 29, p 321).

The very term of "exclusion of randomness," expressing one of the important aspects in the substantiation of a scientific law, reminds us of the past neglectful attitude displayed by the scientists toward this category. Until quite recently the purpose of science was considered to be the study of "pure necessity," and the elimination of randomness as an unnecessary "skin." Let us point out that, to a certain extent, the desire to find a precise and

simple explanation and make a prediction based on laws determine such an attitude, even though many perspicacious researchers always gave considerable thought any deviation from the basic law. The development of quantum mechanics and the physics of the microworld, and the penetration of the idea of probability in chemistry, biology, geography, and other sciences has clearly proved of late that that which we describe as the "exclusion" of randomness should be considered only as the abstract division of two inseparably linked sides of objective reality.

"Man," Lenin wrote, "cannot encompass-reflect-depict all nature completely with its 'direct integrity.' He can only forever come close to this, developing abstractions, concepts, laws, a scientific picture of the world, and so on, and so forth" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 29, p 164). A scientific abstraction is not in the least an arbitrary operation performed by the researcher, or a form of his spontaneous creative activity. Lenin repeatedly emphasized the objective determination not only of the content of our knowledge but of all abstractions developed in the course of scientific research. From the objective viewpoint the abstraction of a scientific law is based on the fact that the extent of the influence of conditions within which the studied dependence takes places is insignificant: Random factors either have an entirely different qualitative nature or are not intensive enough to be taken into consideration. Without such conditions the implementation of the law is impossible. Nevertheless, they do not determine the nature of the studied process and could be ignored for the sake of one or another practical purpose.

Taking into consideration the complex dialectical nature of the correlation between necessity and randomness, substantiating a scientific law we must not expel randomness from theory in general, after separating "pure" necessity, but take its role precisely into consideration (however insignificant it may seem) and express it in a proper experimental, conceptual, or mathematical form. The question of how to resolve this problem is too complex to be described in this article. Furthermore, it would draw us away from its main topic. In any case, it is clear that the systematic "exclusion" of randomness in the process of the substantiation of a scientific law presumes, above all, a substantiation of assumptions (prerequisites) characterizing events and factors as random.

In terms of stability and irrefutability of a scientific law the problem of its postulates is particularly important. These postulates, based on experimental data, and on theoretical or even philosophical considerations, could be relatively simple: For example, in the case of Kepler's laws, it is postulated that only central forces operate on the planet, that there is virtually no external influence on the bodies within the solar system, that matter is absolutely continuous, and so on. In the case of statistical laws the postulates become more complex, requiring the development of a specific program for a representative selection of data. Thus, the Hardy-Weinberg statistical law which governs some aspects of heredity is applicable only in the case of the random crossing ("panmixing") of a population of organisms multiplying sexually, providing that this population is sufficiently big, which would enable us to consider it infinitely big, if we take only the intrachromosome genes into consideration, etc.

In some studies the "exclusion" of randomness through corresponding assumptions is achieved without particular difficulty, in such a way that this "operation" does not substantially distort the objective process. Here the scientist is given the possibility to provide a simple explanation of and to predict events. However, such abstractions cannot be achieved without substantial "casualties" in the study of an entire series of phenomena (in particular, the ones still encountered today in the fields of quantum mechanics, genetics, meteorology, and other sciences studying complex systems). The possibility for an accurate prediction of the behavior of an individual object frequently becomes such a "casualty." In this case randomness can be "excluded" only by ignoring its "fate." Whatever the case, it is clear that the determination of the law includes two aspects: the determination of the necessary nature of the studied dependence and the substantiation of assumptions (stipulations) which determine the share of randomness in the studied process. Such a "double" substantiation of a scientific law not only separates the necessary from the random sides but also defines the boundaries within which the law becomes effective and only within which its effect could be determined without error. It is natural, therefore, that without determining the necessary nature of the studied dependence it would be difficult to speak of the universality of a law, for the latter requires, first of all, a precise definition of the class of objects and phenomena obeying said law and, secondly, the conditions which make its effect possible. In our view, the correlation between necessity and universality as the basic criteria of a scientific law is determined precisely by this circumstance.

Proof of the necessary nature of the dependence gives grounds to hope that it will be recurrent (within the limit of its boundaries) and truly strictly universal, since taking into consideration the postulates indicating deviations from the general trend, either possible or admissible from the practical viewpoint, no conflicting factors would refute this law. Therefore, the postulates of a scientific law guarantee it a particular stability within the structure of scientific knowledge and a particular hypothetical and explanatory force force compared with empirical generalizations.

In any seeming case of violation of the law, revealed through an erroneous prediction or misinterpretation, responsibility for this is borne, above all, not by the formulation of the scientific law itself but, precisely by its postulates. Separating randomness from necessity in the process of substantiation of the scientific law, they act, metaphorically speaking, as "bodyguards," protecting the law from any excessively hasty criticism or relativism. If the accuracy of the law and the effectiveness of predictions and interpretations based on it have already been established in a more or less broad physical area, it would be stupid to question the nature of said law when coming across conflicting situations. It would be far more sensible--as fully confirmed by the practice of scientific research--to review its postulates.

For example, the study of the properties of gasses, following the discovery of the Mendeleyev-Clapeyron Law indicated that they did not always strictly obey the law. Did this mean that the law had to be rejected? No! It became

clear that the apparent violation confirmed merely the fact that the postulates which had been accepted in the case of the "ideal" gas laws did not take into consideration the effect of the force of attraction among molecules. The Van der Waals equation for real gasses was formulated in such a way that it took these forces as well into consideration. On the basis of the other postulates the equation, nevertheless, preserved the main content of the Mendeleyev-Clapeyron Law governing "ideal" gasses. Therefore, any violation of the determined law is an indication that we have crossed the border of its subject area and that its postulates must be revised in order to determine whether or not it could be expanded or that we have simply come across an essentially new phenomenon not covered by said law.

Such an approach to the study of a scientific law enables us to understand the dialectics of the opposite sides of its substantiation in scientific knowledge: the possibility of change, and the refining of its content and boundaries of the object area of its action, on the one hand, and the trend toward the preservation and strengthening of its main content, on the other. Thus, the stability of the law cannot be absolute. Like all other knowledge, it contains an element that is relative, transient. In this sense, the dialectical-materialistic concept of the scientific law, relying on the principles of Leninist methodology, opposes both contemporary relativism and conventionalism, as well as dogmatism which scorns the role of specific conditions and random factors in the implementation of any law.

Dialectics can present most accurately within its concepts the real contradictions of scientific knowledge. Noting this property of the dialectical (in this, Hegelian) understanding of the law, Lenin wrote: "This is an outstanding materialistic and outstandingly apt ('ruhige') definition. The law covers the quiet status, for which reason the law, any law, is narrow, incomplete, and approximate" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 29, p 136). The stability of the scientific law expresses, in its conceptual form, the objective fact that "the law is the durable (remaining) part of a phenomenon"; "(the law shows what is identical in any phenomenon)"; and "the law represents the calm reflection of phenomena" (ibid).

The inevitability of the use of abstractions and postulates in the course of the substantiation of a law leads, essentially, to the fact that its structure directly relies not on the inductive accumulation and generalization of individual factors but on a model of the studied phenomenon. Even laws which, initially, may appear as models of empirical proof are correlated, in reality, with individual and specific phenomena only through models of objective processes. The relative independence and indirect attitude toward empirical facts explains the stability of the laws in the development of scientific knowledge even in times when it is subjected to sharp reversals.

The fact that the establishment of a scientific law is always related to abstracting thinking activities and the conversion from the empirical to the theoretical levels of knowledge proves that in the course of this process a number of methods of scientific knowledge may be comprehensively applied: inductive, deductive, experimental, statistical, etc. The order followed in

the application of these methods could hardly be established in advance, as it depends on the characteristics of the studied process, the specific conditions governing its study, and the availability of experimental and conceptual tools. It is important to emphasize that, in all cases, the determination of the necessary dependence is given priority in scientific research.

Emphasizing the priority of necessity criterion in the study of laws governing objective reality, nevertheless, we must bear in mind the fact that, to one or another extent, this also requires the observance of the principle of universality. When we discussed the significance of the criterion of necessity we deliberately avoided the question of the general nature of the studied dependence. In one or another specific study, using any one of the accepted scientific methods, the scientist determines, above all, its necessity. In each individual case, however, as follows from our definition, it could be a question only of a relative necessity, of a necessity in terms of a given totality of random conditions and factors, and of a necessity of space and time in a given area. We cannot exclude in advance the possibility that, given another development of circumstances, the studied dependence will turn out less substantial and stable. It is entirely natural, therefore, that in order to establish the stability of a given dependence we must study it under different circumstances, at another point in time, and in another area in space. The more common features it shows under different circumstances, the more solid will be the substantiation of its necessity. Conversely, the more completely we determine the necessary nature of the dependence, the more clearly will the subject area of the studied law be delineated, and the greater will be the confidence with which we could speak of its universal nature. "Necessity," Lenin pointed out, " is inseparable from the universal" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 29, p 72).

Therefore, any criterion governing a scientific law separately does not have an absolute value but, closely interrelated, such criteria insure a sufficiently reliable base for scientific laws. The recognition of objective necessity in dialectical-materialistic philosophy enables us to consider various methods for the substantiation of laws--without absolutizing any one of them--as means for taking our knowledge closer to the objective laws governing processes. "Knowledge," wrote Lenin in his "Philosophical Note-Books," "is the reflection of nature by man. However, this is not a simple, direct, and purposeful reflection but a process of a number of abstractions, formations, development of concepts, laws, etc., as concepts, laws, etc. . . . covering conventionally and approximately the universal law of the eternally moving and developing nature" (ibid, vol 29, pp 163-164). Noting the approximate and relatively nature of scientific knowledge, the Leninist concept of the law also strengthens our faith in it.

Marxist-Leninist theory itself relies on the inviolable laws comprehensively proved by the social, natura', and technical sciences, the entire history of society, and the age-old practical activities of man. Therefore, there is no firmer foundation for understanding the nature of phenomena and for the revolutionary transforming activities of the communist party and the toiling

masses than this theory. "Marxism-Leninism," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the CC CPSU Accountability Report to the 25th party congress, "is the only reliable foundation for the elaboration of a correct strategy and tactic. It gives us an understanding of historical perspectives. It helps us to define the trend of socioeconomic and political developments for many years ahead, and to be properly guided in international events." The further creative development of the very rich Leninist legacy, to which the party directs us, is a necessary prerequisite for strengthening the foundations of dialectical-materialistic philosophy and a guarantee for new Soviet scientific successes.

5003
CSO: 1802

TOPICAL ASPECTS OF THE CORRELATION OF FUNDAMENTAL AND APPLIED RESEARCH

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 79 pp 58-67

[Article by A. Zotov, doctor of philosophical sciences]

[Text] The 25th CPSU Congress paid very close attention to the integration of science with production under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution, and to the link between basic and applied research. The party Central Committee Accountability Report, presented by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, considered insuring the fastest possible practical application of new ideas a highly responsible and topical task.

Its successful implementation calls for the comprehensive study of scientific and technical progress in the socialist society. In this area Marxist-Leninist philosophy has been called upon to play an important role. It is the methodological and conceptual base for the study of all aspects of scientific and technical progress in its close interconnection with social progress. In fact, any specialist, whether economist, sociologist, or science and production organizer, builds models of the processes he studies on the basis of the general philosophical principles related to knowledge, its correlation with practice, etc. Therefore, we would like to emphasize, from the very beginning, that the problem of correlation between fundamental and applied research* cannot be reduced to the formulation of organizational measures facilitating the use of scientific achievements in plant shops. In order for such measures to be successful, it is important to see in a scientific discovery, to one or another extent, the outlines of a technological design, so that basic science and production practice would speak, if not the same, similar or, in any case, translatable languages. Therefore, as we try to resolve the problem of the links between science and production on the organizational level, inevitably we come across methodological problems. As V. I. Lenin pointed out, "He who takes up specific problems without having resolved the general problems in advance, will inevitably, at each step, unwittingly face such general problems" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 15, p 368).

*In this article this comprehensive problem is considered only on the basis of data provided by the natural and technical sciences.

Dealing with a historical project, i.e., a project whose structure developed in the past, makes it easier to understand many contemporary problems as we turn to its origins. Such is precisely the nature of science, for a considerable share of its content has come to us from our predecessors, while many research principles are mastered through training. In order to determine the origins of the obvious (and essential) difference existing today between basic and applied research, we must take into consideration that the foundations of scientific thinking were laid at a time when research was motivated by different ideals, pursued different objectives, and fulfilled functions different from present ones. These ideals, objectives, and functions could not remain merely in a superficial form. They impressed on us a structure of knowledge and, at the same time, were transmitted to subsequent generations of researchers. Contemporary science is not free at all from this legacy.

Science and philosophy historians unanimously share the view that science is the offspring of ancient Greek civilization. This view must be refined: Not science in the strict meaning of the term (by this we mean natural science), but only its essential prerequisites appeared in ancient Greece. Furthermore, in the social conditions of the times, such prerequisites themselves excluded the development of the natural sciences in the contemporary meaning of the term. Only inherited as elements of the culture of a different epoch, with its qualitatively different value orientations, enabled them to develop into the natural sciences.

Let us try to clarify this. The most important prerequisite for science is the ability to make theoretical models of the object and logically to substantiate their content. The most favorable conditions for the use of such methods was offered by the slave-owning democratic system. Indeed, the democratic forum the ancient Greeks demanded, above all, of its citizens the ability to explain and prove their thoughts. Here the highest value was ascribed not to a reference to authority (even though democracy does not reject authority) but "impersonal" proof which could persuade without referring to personal sources. It could be said, in this sense, that logic was born as the technology of oratorial art in a democratic society.

On the other hand, the conditions of the slave-owning society created scorn for physical labor as a means for achieving utilitarian and production purposes, for such activities were the lot of the slave and, therefore, considered second grade compared with political activities or knowledge for its own sake. Yet, it was precisely the "impracticality" of the ancient Greek philosophers that enabled them to lay the foundations of theoretical thinking for future science and raise them to the level of Euclidian "Principles," for example. Naturally, the prime source of their mental structures was the same as that of their Egyptian or Babylonian confreres--practice with empirical objects. The former, however, by virtue of the socio-economic characteristics of slave-owning democracy, were able to abandon such grounds. The possibility to ignore the disparity between theoretical thinking and the empirical characteristics of a specific fact in the first stages of the development of theoretical thinking was vitally necessary, for without it theoretical objects such as a straight line, uni-dimensional, or a dimensionless point could not be developed.

However, these same circumstances excluded the development of true natural sciences, which presumed both the existence of theoretical models of the object as well as a mandatory investigation of the theoretical structures through experimentation, i.e., the obtaining of a visual practical result. It was no accident that the theoretical thinking of the ancients was most brilliantly embodied in geometry (the mechanics of Archimedes is only the exception confirming the rule; let us recal that his contemporaries deemed it necessary to justify his occupation with "common" technical problems an exceptional circumstance caused by the threat facing Syracuse on the part of the Romans).

In the area of theoretical knowledge of nature the Greeks were able to create only a nature philosophy, i.e., a certain means for a likely interpretation of phenomena in which fabricated relations in life were used instead of real ones. However, nature philosophy was able to achieve its specific objectives as it converted in its own way the world of natural phenomena from chaos to cosmos, i.e., into something orderly and explainable.

One of the aspects of the picture depicted here in general features is the sharp pitting of "wisdom," as knowledge of the world against "technology," as the sum total of skills and abilities and the art to manufacture necessary objects. The direction followed by theoretical thinking toward streamlining the interpretation of reality triggered the specific quality of this knowledge: That which, initially, was a superficial value stipulation became its own characteristic feature. It was the contemplativeness of theoretical knowledge.

It was impossible to shift from nature philosophy to natural sciences as such so long as the only criterion of the truthfulness of a theoretical elaboration was deemed to be its ability to explain (interpret) natural phenomena. The theoretical interpretation of nature became natural science only after learning how to experiment. The objective pursued by the nature philosophers, however, and the norms governing the thinking of ancient Greek theoreticians did not make experimentation necessary. It was only the Renaissance (and, to a certain extent, the later Middle Ages), which had inherited from antiquity the skills of theorizing that changed the value atmosphere of mental work, triggering yet another necessary prerequisite for the appearance of the natural sciences. The desire to obtain a practical use stopped being considered as something shameful for the philosopher. F. Bacon's famous thesis that "knowledge is power" became a manifestation of the new status of the results of research thought. It was during that historical age that the experimental science of nature was born.

It might have seemed that experimentation should have immediately undermined the contemplative grounds of the theoretician. Yet, as we saw, contemplativeness in the period of development of theoretical thinking turned into a characteristic of the "content of knowledge." For this reason, initially experimentation was considered merely as a means for extracting from nature its secrets, a means for "tormenting" nature. True, as K. Marx pointed out, "In the 18th century many scientists zealously undertook the thorough study

of crafts, manufacturing, and factories. Some of them made this area the subject of their specialized studies" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 47, p 422). Technical information was accepted as knowledge, as confirmed by the famous "Encyclopedia or Interpretative Dictionary of Sciences, Arts, and Crafts." Nevertheless, all previous concepts of the status of scientific knowledge remained untouched: The natural scientist presented the results of his work as an object or as the contemplation of an object of knowledge, rather than as human sensory activity. Under such circumstances the distinction between the content of science and its practical results was understandable, even though no longer in terms of the absolute pitting of knowledge against skills, but only as essentially different types of scientific work. Such a division within the sciences was expressed in a certain concept concerning the gnosiological status of formulations developed as a result of one or another study. For example, theoretical mechanics described the laws governing the laws of mass dynamics. To the mechanic-theoretician the fall of an apple or the trajectory of a canon ball were merely examples of the manifestation of the laws of nature, of no interest in themselves. The study of the law in its "pure aspect" was the final and innermost objective of the scientist. Ballistics, whose results were used in military affairs, is interested precisely in such examples even though on a general basis. Therefore, in order for a scientific study to yield applied results, it was necessary to reformulate the "objective" picture of essential relations in a given area of reality (in the spirit of contemplative gnosiology) so that it could be made consistent with practical objectives. The discovery had to be transformed into an invention which could embody scientific truth and reflect the laws of nature, or else as a design showing human interest. It was precisely applied science that offered the means for such transformation.

However, as the natural sciences and their methodological and gnosiological studies developed, the limitations of this interpretation of the various aspects of scientific knowledge became slowly obvious.

Above all, it became ever more difficult to ascribe to natural science data the status of products of the "contemplation of nature" (this particularly applied to chemistry and physics). The laws formulated in these sciences directly apply no longer to factual empirical objects; they describe a certain ideal, "pure" case, abstracting themselves from the complexities of the factual situation or specific experiment or observation: perfect gas, absolutely resilient or rigid bodies, or pure chemical elements. The objective world, regardless of all wishes, could hardly be imagined as a "mixture" of such objects. Rather, the idea imposed itself that these objects were "distorted cases" of real situations (such as mechanical motion without friction). Yet, this means that the formulations of basic research were not in the least natural relations stuck together! It was difficult to combine this conclusion with the contemplative concept of objectives and results of scientific research. If the results of basic science were not found in objective reality in its photographic proof, "as it is in fact," in the contemplative form, it would hardly be possible to consider the traditional form of scientific laws as definitive and properly consistent with the purpose of basic science. Could its further evolution and, with it, an

essential change in the nature of relations between basic and applied science be possible? Interestingly, the answer to this question matured together with the realization of the problem.

Under conditions governed by the contemplative concept, its logical consequence was the idea that the most common principles and the most basic (both in terms of the direction of scientific research as well as its position in the scientific picture of the world) theoretical structures crowned the process of the study of the objective world. The turn to the value orientation of science inevitably had to bring about the appearance of an "inverse relation" between the results of the study of the high level of commonness and their empirical base. In the history of science, it was precisely at this stage that the method of study which, subsequently, found its highest embodiment in Marx's "Das Kapital"--the method of ascending from the abstract to the concrete, the method of the theoretical reconstruction of a specific object, was developed.

This method as a consciously applied methodological tool would be both inconceivable and unnecessary in the case of contemplative science. Empiricism in such a science would be, at best, merely a beginning, which, surpassed, should be forgotten. The method of ascension from the abstract to the concrete becomes necessary when the solution of a practical problem is considered as a target worthy of the scientist.

The method of progress from the abstract to the concrete, in its Hegelian variant, was the idealistic reflection of the changed value orientation and practice of scientific research, above all in the natural sciences. Its true content, and real meaning, however, could be brought to light only by a materialistic philosopher holding an anti-contemplative position. Marx's famous thesis that, "Philosophers have merely explained the world in different ways. The matter, however, is to change it" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 3, p 4) was not only a sociopolitical program but expressed the gnosiological structure of the new science.

At the end of the 19th century and, even more clearly, in the 20th century, gradually the theoretical sciences converted from the mental reconstruction of what exists in nature to the study of the "unused" possibilities by nature. Thus, modern chemistry is not limited to the study of the structure of materials found in nature. It designs and creates substances which do not exist in a natural condition (nylon is a universally familiar example). The same could be said of physics which studies effects triggered by itself, as there are neither lasers nor flexible light conduits in nature.

However, science has changed on another level as well. Whereas in the classical period of its development method and theoretical instruments, generally speaking, remained in the shadows (even though the problem of method interested Bacon, Decartes, and Newton), and the golden stock of science was results accepted by its treasury regardless of the means through which they were obtained, in the modern natural sciences it is precisely attention to the ways and means of research that has increased immeasurably. It is

occasionally even stated that the main scientific accomplishment of the 20th century was the discovery of discovery methods. This totality of changes means a change of gnosiological research norms. This found its general theoretical manifestation in the methodology of dialectical materialism. A radical restructuring of abstractions is taking place, crowning the work of the theoretical scientist and representative of basic science. The dissemination of attempts to express basic scientific laws as "prohibition principles" could be considered a specific landmark in this process. Whereas the most important laws discovered by the natural scientists are formulated as prohibition principles or in any other way determining the possible natural area, the end result of the theoretical reconstruction of something specific is no longer presented as the ideal "limit" case but, rather, as a class which could be achieved or could exist. Now the result of the work done by the theoretician is no longer a "pure," and ideal case. It also becomes a substantiated "project" for a class of essentially possible phenomena which could be either detected in nature or created artificially. This leads to the occurrence of an important gnosiological change: Modern basic science shifts from the designing of ideal models of phenomena occurring in nature to the study objective possibilities for the discovery of what the natural laws permit, aimed, in the final account, at their implementation or, conversely, their prevention (such is the case, for example, of a number of ecological possibilities). The task of coordinating "pure" with applied research is today frequently formulated differently from the past. Indeed, to the extent to which the scientist depicts the picture in his field of research, within the range of the possible, he is already giving technological advice, occasionally in a rather general form but, sometimes, quite concretely even though he ignores problems of economic effectiveness or necessary outlays. The solution of the problem of the existence of isotopes by the physicists, for example, marks the beginning of the elaboration of systems for their industrial production. A proof of the possibility to achieve a controlled thermonuclear synthesis is naturally extended through the designing of the Tomahawk-10 Research System, which could be considered as the embryo of a future hydrogen based power industry. Such is the obviously essential yet quite abstract answer to the question raised in the heading of the article: The general line for the development of contemporary science is such that within it the main gnosiological concept is transformed and, to an ever greater extent, the view of the contemplativeness of basic science becomes a relic of the past. This means that the methodological confrontation between "pure" and applied research loses grounds and is "dropped."

Naturally, this does not mean that the other non-gnosiological yet very essential differences between basic and applied sciences are also eliminated. The overwhelming majority of astrophysical studies do not become applied or turned into production technologies, for they resolve their problems within the range of the "possible" (such as, for example, are "black holes" or solar systems consisting of anti-matter possible in the universe?). The determination of the theoretical possibility for the existence of super-light particles, "tachyons," is not the same as the problem of developing new means of communications and does not convert into the building of computer elements. The similarity of gnosiological concepts facilitates the link between basic

and applied research conditions without eliminating major differences in their purpose and results. The study of that which is essentially possible in nature and the discovery of fundamental laws governing the objective world remains (as in the past) the prime task of "academic" science. However, within the limits of the understanding of what is basically possible and what has been discovered by basic science, applied research which leads to factual technical designs becomes easier.

In the course of such an important transformation, scientific knowledge does not stop being a reflection of the objective world even though the angle from which the scientist studies the world changes. Now the world becomes not merely something given but an area of objective possibilities. Naturally, the "material" on which the researcher bases his concepts and designs is found, as before, in the available, the objectively extant reality.

Changes in the gnosiological characteristics of knowledge are reflected also in the interaction between science and production. Naturally, a determining aspect in this complex is the production process, which is the material base of social life. Yet, it would be erroneous to reduce it to the needs of the existing production structure or organized production process. It should be considered as the production need of society. The two are far from identical.

The existing production structure and technology have a characteristic inertia: They dictate the direction to be followed by technical (and, to a certain extent, even scientific) research, leading them, as a rule, toward the rationalization of the existing production cycle.

Within the limits of the evolving production cycle, the work of the inventor and the scientist, directed, so to speak, by "technological" requirements of existing production facilities, usually does not exceed the limits of scientific and technical ideas materialized in the initial prototypes of a given type of technology. The bottlenecks of this system are not enlarged through simple growth. Therefore, the needs of existing technology determine a certain "vector" which could be described as "technological tradition." It is only external factors such as problems of manpower, raw material shortages, higher requirements concerning the quality and cost of goods, etc., which motivate quality changes. Therefore, the ability to surmount the "charm" of traditional technological solutions has become today an important quality in a produ tion manager.

Let us now consider another block of this complex--science. Without being its determining aspect, neverthless, it has its own "vector," usually described as the logic of scientific development. In this case we are interested by one aspect only. Any sufficiently autonomous scientific field, unless considered, ideally, as a closed system unaffected by external influences, may be broken down into sections. The solution of some problems within this system either presumes the solution of other problems or contributes to their solution. With a good organization of the work in an academic institute, ideally, the plan for scientific research reproduces such a system of problems. Even in the case of reaching an absolute solution to

the end problem, the system evolves, triggering in the course of this evolution production tasks of different degrees of complexity. In this case the development "vector" is provided by the logic of the development of the research program and does not in the least mandatorily coincide with the "vector" of production-technological requirements.

The limitation of such an abstract model is detected immediately, the moment we no longer consider production and science as closed systems. Production, even within the limits of existing technology, reaching a sufficiently high level of complexity reveals a "attraction" to science. Problems of maximum admissible speeds of metal cutting go beyond problems of the resistance of materials and into the bed of scientific work, i.e., begin to dictate tasks related to basic scientific research. On the other hand, non-production scientific problems such as, for example, the study of distant galaxies, set tasks related to optical production and the production of measurement instruments, and, as "astronomy emerges into space," tasks facing metallurgy and the production of metal-ceramic goods, as well as tasks facing rocket designers and builders. We could hardly ignore the fact that production facilities directly serving scientific research account today for a substantial share of the volume of industrial output as a whole and that scientific instruments account for a respectable percentage of industrial output.

Therefore, both production, reaching a certain level of complexity, and science, reaching a high level and demanding new research equipment, necessarily "intertwine." The blocks become mutually enriched as they interact. At the 25th CPSU Congress USSR Academy of Sciences President A. P. Aleksandrov said that, "In the field of the natural sciences and, of late, partially in the social sciences, labor productivity and its quality decisively depend on the availability for scientific projects of contemporary highly productive automated laboratory equipment and computers. Today we cannot achieve high results with the help of obsolete research apparatus." At the same time, progress achieved in basic sciences is changing scientific viewpoints, substantially changing technology, triggering the appearance of new materials, and opening opportunities for the study and utilization of essentially new phenomena.

Thus, changes in the value orientation of science and the restructuring of its basic gnosiological concept, the "industrialization" of some trends of scientific research, and the variety of ties linking scientific research with production process lead to the fact that in a number of cases theoretical knowledge is assuming to an ever greater extent the aspect of a basic technological plan.

Naturally, far from all opportunities opened through scientific research, technically attainable in principle and even formulated in the language of the "essential technological design," can be implemented today because of financial, economic, and other practical considerations. In the socialist society any suggested technological "prescription" must be correlated with the system of values whose main element is man himself, the individual with

his variety of interests and needs. Only those meeting the criteria of expediency, economy, and humaneness find a practical embodiment among the many theoretical possibilities. Finally, not all results of scientific research, even those meeting such stipulations, become known (at the proper time) by those engaged in production or production organization. Taking these factors as well into consideration, the problem of the correlation between basic and applied knowledge far exceeds the framework of the "science-production" model, bringing to light other aspects whose study is equally interesting from the methodological viewpoint. Let us consider briefly the information, organization, and social aspects.

The pace of scientific development and the shortening of the "incubation period" of production technology largely depend today on the speed with which the researcher finds the necessary information and the "prescriptions" of technological processes, produced in science, reach production workers interested in them. Without going into the details of the changes occurring here, let us note that the cost of information in our country is growing considerably faster than that of production or science as a whole. Fast information is becoming ever more important. The impersonal information service which requires a search on the part of the consumer only actively limits any purposeful search for information on the part of the units which require it. It is a question not only of the need for a good, economical, and "easy to read" information, but of its rapid motion. At the same time, the organization of information work is merely part of the problem of organizing the ties between scientific research and production. The problem of the extent to which a production consumer is interested in scientific information is also largely dependent on organizational aspects and, above all, incentives which motivate the production worker to want a renovation of the production process. It is no accident that the "Main Directions of the Development of the USSR National Economy in 1976-1980" call for "improving the method of economic management and economic incentive and of the system of criteria in assessing the work of associations, enterprises, and organizations, based on the need to improve end production results."

An important component of the organization of ties between science and production is the conversion of scientific results (even if already formulated as basic technological designs) to the production process. There are frequent debates in our publications on the question of what system would be more effective here--a scientific research institute at a plant or a plant at a scientific research institute? Such discussions could be fruitful only by taking into consideration the relative independence of the "science" and "production" block within their overall system, and the specific "inertia" of each of them created by this autonomy. The limitation of the production worker, affecting the position of the "scientist in production work," as well as the limitation of the researcher, influencing the position of the "engineer in science," cannot be surmounted, apparently, without providing a broad basic training of specialists at all levels of our science and national economy. It takes more the mere wish to find the new. One must also know where and what to look for. If an engineer or plant director lacks a broad scientific training, even in the presence of effective

incentives he would remain, as in the past, guided by common sense, whose limitations are proportional to the technological inertia of the production process he manages. Thus, the problem of organization turns into the problem of the organizers, of scientific cadres, and of production. "The success of the scientific and technical revolution and its beneficial impact on the economy and on all aspects of social life cannot be insured through the efforts of the scientific workers alone," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out in the Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th CPSU Congress. "The involvement in this process of historical significance of all participants in public production and all units of the economic mechanism is assuming an ever growing role."

The information and organization aspects are related to optimizing the functioning of science and production. However, their nature is also largely determined by sociopolitical factors. Let us emphasize here the substantial differences existing in the nature of the interaction between science and production in the capitalist and socialist so eties. The idealized model a "science-production" system, properly organized on the information and organization levels, the model through which some general laws governing the development of science and production under capitalism and socialism could be studied, reveals the limits of its theoretical possibilities whenever an attempt is made to resolve more general problems of scientific and technical progress, along with the limits of the utilization of the experience of capitalist countries in socialist conditions.

The subordination of the production process to the earning of monopoly profits is incompatible with the requirements of the harmonious development of the "science-production" system in the enterest of the entire society. The conflicting trends in the organization of the production process and of scientific research are a manifestation of this incompatibility. In the capitalist countries, for example, along with attempts to create multilateral and even supranational production and research complexes, a system of patents is in operation which hinders the technological process. Barriers of intra-company secrects are erected, hindering the free exchange of information. Private capitalist enterprise does not make it possible to resolve universal problems effectively, such as environmental protection, economical use of non-recoverable natural resources, etc. Therefore, under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution the accuracy of Marx's statement that culture, if developed spontaneously rather deliberately directed, would leave a desert behind it is reasserted with greater emphasis.

Under socialism science and production are under the control of the "united individuals" (Marx); taking into consideration the objective prerequisites governing the harmonious development of science and production, society subordinates them to the great objective of the building of communism.

This objective is determined by the main trends of scientific and production progress. It is precisely from this viewpoint that the problem is resolved of whether or not one or another possibility discovered by science would be dangerous for mankind, could lead to uncontrolled consequences, trigger

irreversible processes in the habitat, etc. Such an approach, which is essentially a choice among a multiplicity of possible socioeconomic solutions (naturally, based on the scientific study of the trends of social progress),should determine the main directions of scientific research.

Unquestionably, scientific research has its own logic for the solution of problems. In the course of the solution of one problem others appear independent of the value system which determined the choice of the direct research target. That is precisely why a necessary prerequisite for the sensible planning of scientific and technical progress is the thorough study of internal objective laws governing the development of science as a system of interrelated problems, few of which promise direct practical application. Attempts to follow a strictly pragmatic orientation in research could present additional difficulties on the way to the set objective.

V. I. Lenin wrote that the "progress of knowledge leading to the object can only be dialectic: We draw in order to hit the target better . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 29, p 252). This applies to scientific-production planning as well. Shortsighted practicalism is no less dangerous than the conversion of scientific research into a kind of "art for art's sake." That is precisely why the "Basic Directions for the Development of the USSR National Economy in 1976-1980" calls for a close link between basic and theoretical research, on the one hand, and material production tasks, on the other. All sections of the 10th Five-Year Plan organically include the achievements of progressive Soviet science. One of the most important tasks of the science of philosophy, stemming from the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress, is the profound study of relations between basic and applied research, and the concretizing of such concepts in terms of the contemporary stage of social and scientific and technical progress. Its implementation by the Soviet scientists will unquestionably contribute to combining the opportunities opened by the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of socialism.

5003
CSO: 1802

SCIENTIFIC INTEGRATION UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVOLUTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 79 pp 68-79

[Article by M. Chepikov, candidate of philosophical sciences; some of the questions raised in this article are for discussion purposes]

[Text] One of the characteristic features of the current stage of social progress is the deep interconnection among revolutionary trends in the development of economic and social relations, science, technology, production, and the entire set of the social, natural, and technical sciences. The influence of the scientific and technical revolution on integration processes in scientific knowledge is attained, above all, through the penetration of contemporary technology in all realms of human activities, including, above all, science, through the penetration of the production process within it. The ever more advanced technical equipment for scientific activities and the rapprochement between science and production strengthen relations among the technical, natural, and social sciences. In turn, integration processes in science, as the processes of differentiation of scientific knowledge, dialectically interrelated with them (their study exceeds the limits of the present article), have an all-round profound influence on the scientific and technical revolution. This influence is accomplished under the conditions of mature socialism both directly (through the utilization of scientific discoveries in production and social life), as well as indirectly (through the energizing of processes molding communist social relations and, with them, the all-round development of the individual and his creative possibilities).

Taking into consideration the dialectical interrelationship between the synthesis of scientific knowledge and the scientific and technical revolution, it could be assumed that in the immediate and more distant future integration processes in science will become ever stronger rather than weaker. This will be manifested, above all, in the further strengthening of ties among sciences (natural, social, and technical), the steady reciprocal enrichment and interaction among them; the organic combination (merger) of science with production; and the ever more intensive conversion of science into a direct productive force.

Naturally, it would be erroneous to reduce the increased interdependence between scientific synthesis and the tempestuously developing scientific and technical revolution to these three forms of manifestation alone. There could be a great number of manifestations. In our view, however, these forms focus the entire essence of this interdependence.

1. "Merger" among Natural, Social, and Technical Sciences

The 25th CPSU Congress defined the main ways of development of science in the 10th Five-Year Plan and the immediate future. They consist, above all, of the expansion and intensification of basic and applied research with a view to upgrading further production-effectiveness and the quality of our entire work, and accelerating scientific and technical progress and, on this basis, increasing the contribution made by the scientists to laying the material and technical foundations for communism, improving social relations, and upgrading the prosperity and standards of the working people. It is entirely obvious that success in the implementation of such congress plans largely depends on the purposeful rapprochement, merger among social, natural, and technical sciences, and the extensive and well-organized cooperation among scientists working in a great variety of fields of knowledge. It could be said most definitely that in our time it is impossible to resolve any more or less important national economic problem without the close interaction among the natural, social, and technical sciences.

At the same time, the interaction among sciences is the most important factor of their own development. The history of scientific knowledge clearly proves that the natural sciences have always been a powerful incentive for the social sciences, equipping them with fruitful methods and ideas. Thus, the social sciences drew from the natural sciences a fundamental idea such as the objective nature of laws, not to mention quantitative analysis and synthesis methods. In turn, the social sciences did not remain indebted to the natural sciences. Scientific philosophy and social studies as a whole, enriching the natural and technical sciences with essentially important concepts and categories, favorably influenced the course of scientific and technical progress and the growth of public production.

In this connection we must not fail to note, taking into consideration the historically developed nature of interrelations among sciences, the importance of the proper methodological approach to the solution of the problem of their interrelationship. The planned and comprehensive development of all realms of our society demands the attentive analysis of trends and laws governing the development of sciences and the determination of the strategic directions of the progress achieved in scientific knowledge. Paying attention to the topical nature of the profound study of trends and laws governing the development of sciences, in our view, we must proceed from the need for a flexible influence on relations among natural, social, and technical sciences (taking into consideration the practical problems of today and tomorrow), purposefully focusing their potential on the solution of current and future problems and, accordingly, providing scope for the development of basic and applied research. It is self-evident that without this the effective management of society would

be inconceivable. That is why in the CPSU Central Committee Acountability Report to the 25th party congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev particularly emphasized the theoretical-practical significance of this task, particularly in the intensified study of problems related to the trends governing the development of our society and its productive forces. This includes, for example, the nature and content of labor under mature socialist conditions, and changes in the social structure. Improving distribution according to labor, combining moral with material incentive, socialist way of life and the development of our comprehensive culture, along with other most important problems require the combined efforts of the representatives of the different sciences.

We see, therefore, that the close association and unity among natural, social, and technical sciences contains tremendous possibilities for the solution of the big problems of the building of communism.

As a system of sciences related to nature, which is both single and varied in its manifestations, the natural sciences perform two most important tasks. Above all, they bring to light the nature of phenomena and processes occurring in the natural environment, penetrate the mechanism of the laws of this environment, with a view to "controlling" such processes and, something particularly important, to predict new phenomena and events; furthermore, it looks for the possibility for a purposeful utilization of the laws of nature in material production and social practice.

At this point, in order to clarify better the interrelationship among natural, social, and technical sciences, a brief discussion of the contemporary structure of the natural sciences is necessary. It is entirely clear that it is determined by no other than the structure of the natural systems themselves. On this basis, it is accepted to consider the structure of the natural sciences in two aspects which reflect, on the one hand, the various types of matter and its forms of motion in their reciprocal subordination, and, on the other, the depth of penetration within the essence of one and the same phenomenon (process) in nature, indicating, essentially, progress from knowledge of phenomena (their description) to their essence, from a lesser to a deeper essence, etc. Naturally, it is impossible not to see here the inner logic of development of the natural sciences, the logic of the progress of scientific knowledge.

Since the natural sciences reflect the material world, presenting it historically through the development of nature from a low, relatively simple level to a higher and more complex one, it consists itself of a multiplicity of various sciences ranging from basic and general to applied and separate. Their ever deeper interpenetration and the strengthening of the integration among natural sciences at the present stage is a universally acknowledged fact. This process is based on the material unity of the world, and the common characteristics and composition of heterogeneous projects, as well as the similarity of structures of qualitatively different areas of phenomena representing systems of different levels of complexity and different levels and types of organization, processes of reciprocal conversions of some

material formations and conditions into others, and common origins and genetic unity (identity). The so-called marginal and synthetic scientific disciplines, whose number is growing with every passing year and step of scientific progress, are contributing to this process most effectively.

The social sciences are playing an ever more noticeable and exceptionally important role in the contemporary advancing synthesis of scientific knowledge. This is dictated, above all, by their ever growing influence on production activities. This does not reduce in the least the most important role of these sciences related to the study and further improvement of social relations, the upbringing of the new man, the scientific management of society, etc. At this point we must emphasize the unquestionable fact which has appeared under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution linked with the penetration of social research into the "dark corners" of the production process, as a result of which we are witnessing the creation of essentially new forms of scientific knowledge and new forms of social production and types of technological developments. This is manifested not only on the scale of individual enterprises and sectors but of the entire public production.

The role of the human factor has grown and continues to grow in the course of the development of the scientific and technical revolution. Broad horizons open to the social sciences in the study of its structure and signficance. The study of the problems of the scientific and technical revolution, the elaboration of the theoretical principles of planning the development of the national economy and management, production organization improvements, and increasing labor productivity through the most effective combination of material with moral incentives are a very partial list of problems facing the social scientists today, whose solution could not fail to contribute to the interaction among the social, natural, and technical sciences. In fact, should we take, for example, the development and utilization of computer and automation facilities in production, a great variety of scientists become involved in such matters: mathematicians, engineers, psychologists, linguists, economists, etc. This is understandable, for the successful functioning of modern production could hardly be imagined without the comprehensive solution of its problems on the basis of the study of economics, psychology, linguistics, and other aspects of human activities.

The "invasion" of social sciences in the production process affects both the areas of management and organization as well as the very foundations of the production process, creating changes in the "man-science-technology" system. This change is crowned by birth of new, essentially synthetic sciences, such as industrial esthetics, economic cybernetics, engineering psychology, etc.

The technical sciences play a tremendous, if not determining, role in the interaction and interpenetration between natural and social sciences. They combine within a single entity seemingly conflicting branches of knowledge. To prove this let us briefly consider some aspects of the creation, operation, and development of technology.

The interaction between man and technology has always been the most important and the mandatory aspect of social progress. In fact, social progress as a whole is determined by the development of the production method, stimulated by production forces. In turn, technical progress is based on productive capital, even though, on this basis, it would be erroneous to totally identify them with technology. A number of examples could be cited of some technical apparatus, produced by man, which are used only as a labor tool while others, additionally, become a means for the solution of non-production problems. A television set, for example, is both a powerful and reliable tool in the management of a production process, in scientific research, etc., as well as a means for education, entertainment, and recreation.

Even though technology and technical systems do not always require the direct participation of man for their functioning (automated laboratories and lines, outer space apparatus, etc. can, as we know, work independently, on the basis of a program). Nevertheless, they are justifiably considered a social phenomenon. An entirely definite view has been developed in our scientific literature on this matter. This is the result of the profound scientific penetration into the dialectically conflicting nature of technology. As an objective factor of social life, technology, at the same time, cannot be identified with natural objects, for the latter are transformed in accordance with know laws into one or another type of technical equipment. Creatively influencing the natural objects and matter, man gives them the type of organization and characteristics not found under natural conditions.

Technology blends and correspondingly combines the laws of nature and of social development based on the study of phenomena and processes in the material world, their forecasting, and their possible utilization in the conscious and purposeful transformation of reality. One way or another, the technical sciences and their creative arsenal synthesize the data of the natural and social sciences. Thus technology obeys its own laws developing under the influence of natural and social factors. Naturally, all this does not occur spontaneously. Present here is a conscious (subjective) element of selection of achievements of the natural and social sciences consistent with the requirements of social progress and man's social interests.

2. Organic Combination (Fusion) of Science with Production

Under the circumstances of the rapidly developing scientific and technical revolution a tempestuous growth of production forces and intensification of economic processes occur and science becomes ever more profoundly fused with production.

The organic combination of science with production is expressed mainly in the fact that production becomes ever more closely linked with scientific activities (including experimentation), aimed not only at the study, application, mastering, and perfecting of new systems for the management and organization of production processes. This is dictated, above all, by the tremendously increased complexity of production and technology, the drastic increase in the pace of scientific development, and the shortened time required for the practical utilization of its achievements.

Under present circumstances, it is above all the development of automated production that is the material and technical base for the fusion of science with production. Let us note that our country has pioneered this development.

The creation of the first automated enterprises in the world was made possible only with the closest possible cooperation among a big group of scientists working in the basic and applied sciences. Today successfully operating in our country are not only automated plants but entire automated production complexes. Naturally, on the one hand their creation stimulates the process of integration of science with scientific knowledge and, on the other, thanks to such processes, it provides new opportunites for the implementation and the expansion of a program for comprehensive production automation.

In this connection we must remember K. Marx's words: "The use of natural agents--including them, to a certain extent, within capital--coincides with the development of science as an autonomous factor in the production process. Whereas the production process becomes the application of science, conversely, science becomes a factor, a function so to speak of the production process. Each discovery becomes the base for a new discovery or for new advanced production methods" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 47, pp 553-554). Clearly, Marx considered the conversion of science into a direct productive force an objective law of social development. The integration of scientific knowledge is equally legitimate and is directly and indirectly related to this conversion. In this case science does not merely enter production or the enterprise, but also triggers an inverse process of the invasion of the production process into the scientific research process, becoming in a way its experimental base. This is clearly seen in the work of scientific-production associations in which the process of fusion of science with production goes so far that it becomes difficult to determine whether this is a scientific center with its own production facility or a production facility with scientific objectives. Many scientists see in such associations, clearly representing a combination of the set of sciences (theoretical and applied) with production, a prototype of the organic unity between science and labor on the scale of the entire society.

Naturally, an embryonic fusion between the natural sciences and production took place also during the conversion from manual production to machine-factory production. Here science played the role of a kind of auxiliary worker, while the production process turned into a realm for the practical utilization of science. ". . . The capitalist production method was the first to place the natural sciences . . . in the service of the direct production process," Marx wrote, "whereas conversely, the development of production provides facilities for the theoretical conquest of nature. . . . The development of the natural sciences themselves (which are the base of all knowledge), as any other elaboration related to the production process, is based, again, on capitalist production which is the first to create on a large scale the material facilities for research, observation, and experimentation in the natural sciences. . . . Therefore, along with the dissemination of capitalist production, the scientific factor is developed consciously

and extensively for the first time. It is used and brought to life on a scale which was inconceivable in previous ages" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 47, pp 554, 556).

In the period of its establishment, the capitalist production method inevitably stimulates the development of the natural sciences, making them a necessary prerequisite for the expansion of material output. "The 18th century," wrote F. Engels in this connection, "brought together the results of past history which, until then, operated only on an isolated, random manner, proving the need for them and their internal cohesion. Innumerable chaotic data were streamlined, classified, and given causal relations. Knowledge became science and the sciences came closer to their completion, i.e., on the one hand they moved toward philosophy and, on the other, toward practice" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 1, p 599).

Noting the embryos of the fusion among sciences and the synthesis of uncoordinated scientific data, created by the development of the capitalist economy and its need for science (true, limited, since scientific sectors were used essentially for the creation of new labor tools and new machines, rather than the mechanization of the production process as a whole), we must emphasize the positive significance of this fact. Its importance is not reduced in the least by the fact that science, serving the production process and practice, received from them more than it gave. The purposes and directions of science were determined by production, which marched ahead, led, and stimulated science. It was precisely this that led Engels to claim that if a technical need develops in society, this moves science ahead more than the work of ten universities.

However, the conversion of science (naturally, not all, but part of it) into the "servant" of the production process, which, initially, stimulated integration processes in a number of fields of knowledge, did not mean in the least the disappearance of the antagonism between science and capitalist production. Even in the 19th century, when machines used in production could neither be developed nor operated without the use of science, science, as Marx noted, acted as "alien, hostile toward labor and as a force dominating it" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 47, p 555).

Initially it seems contradictory that in machine production science acts as a productive force without, at the same time, being one. However, the matter is that, taking its first steps in this direction, it could not do without the "live appendages" of capitalist production--the workers. Thus, it was used in production not directly but only through the representatives of an entirely different realm of division of labor (in the early stage separated from the realm of science by a seemingly unbreachable gap). Naturally, a similar combination of labor with science occurs under socialism as well with the (essential) difference, however, that science, as, in fact, any machine, is not pitted against the worker as an antagonist, as a "hostile . . . force dominating him," but is his loyal and reliable ally in labor, helping him to raise his productivity and production effectiveness as a whole.

The "scientification" of production, i.e., the application of scientific achievements in industrial practice, which is the direct and indirect materialization of scientific knowledge, is occasionally identified with the conversion of science into a direct production force. It seems to us that the essence of the problem cannot be reduced to this, not only because production "scientification" is related to productive forces and production relations, but because the very transformation of science into a direct productive force is a broader process than "scientification" (the name given to this process), since it encompasses both the transfer of scientific achievements out of the scientific sphere into production-technical practice and the use of the applied scientific achievements in both production and scientific research.

It is self-evident that such processes, stimulated by the integration of science with scientific knowledge, despite existing differences, most closely interact and become interdependent. We can see this by considering the problem of the conversion of science into a direct productive force.

3. Important Result of Integration Processes under the Conditions of the Scientific and Technical Revolution

Profound quality changes in production forces are taking place in our country, triggered not only by the new production scales but, above all, by the changed ratios among the basic production elements, science, and man and the ever intensifying processes of integration between science and scientific knowledge. "The scientific and technical revolution," emphasized A. N. Kosygin, "is characterized by the ever more extensive application of new types of energy, new materials, modern communications facilities, and means of control of technological processes, i.e., by a profound restructuring of both the technical base of production as well as the forms of organization of production and their management. Under the influence of the scientific and technical revolution a number of new sectors have been created, such as nuclear power industry, production and processing of plastics and chemical staples, the electronic industry, modern instrument manufacturing, a microbiological industry, etc. . . . Man is being freed from heavy physical labor. The very content of labor changes, becoming a truly creative activity. The profound changes in production forces and the scientific and technical revolution triggered the need to improve the production structure and required new technical solutions and methods for labor organization and the all-round assessment of the future of technical progress." Under mature socialist conditions is a question of the comprehensive, the all-round conversion of science into a direct productive force, both through the mastery of acquired knowledge and the materialization of such knowledge in technological processes and technology, and through the intensified organic ties between scientific labor and material output.

Comprehensive production automation, which in a way frees man from participation in the direct technological cycle, is the material (clear) form of conversion of science into a direct production force under the conditions of the present scientific and technical revolution. At different levels and to

varying degrees, man is replaced by scientific knowledge materialized in machines (apparatus, instruments, etc.). Here science, which operates as a universal spiritual product of social development "separated" from the direct labor process, acts as an autonomous factor in the production process. Science, whose power is steadily rising thanks to integration processes, is becoming ever more intensively a powerful production accelerator. The materialization of scientific discoveries used in one or another (big or small) technological cycle, do not become the simple material bearers of the spiritual element in production but operate as the "scientific" content of production forces, becoming their most important incentive.

Thus, the conversion of science into a direct productive force on a higher level means, we repeat, the comprehensive automation of all basic production areas in which the product will be created without the direct participation of human labor.[1] However, in order for such a "separation" to occur, i.e., as Marx said, for the conversion of science into a material, a physical object, a process of fusion, of organic combination among the sciences themselves (natural and social, "old" and "new," basic and applied), as well as science as a whole with production, must take place.

Implementing the historically important task of organically combining the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of the socialist economic system, the party and the people are trying to develop further the socialist forms of combining science with production. The successes achieved in the solution of this problem are eloquently confirmed, above all, by the operation of automated technological lines and entire enterprises in which science influences the labor object directly through the technology, and the indirect link of science-technology-man-labor object-labor product is being used ever less frequently. Becoming an element in the production forces, here science has a determining influence on production, for it helps to develop efficient forms of its organization and enterprise management (or groups of enterprises, sectors, and the national economy as a whole), itself gaining the most important incentive for its own development, for necessarily it must face new problems and new tasks, which by virtue of its organic ties with production, require an immediate practical solution.

The very process of the conversion of science into a direct productive force under developed socialist conditions is manifested in the considerable reduction of the time needed for the application of scientific discoveries in industrial output; in the development of the latest scientifically based technologies; in replacing the old management methods with modern methods related to the use of computers and new automated systems; and in the considerably increased role of scientific knowledge in the planning of socioeconomic development. In this case science is entirely at the service of the working people and of their interests: Labor socialization and production concentration are intensified, and the people's prosperity is enhanced.

Naturally, a scientific and technical revolution is taking place in the economically developed capitalist countries as well. There too a process of integration between science and scientific knowledge and of the fusion of

science with production takes place. However, how different such processes are in terms of nature and content with those occurring under developed socialist conditions!

Under capitalism the power of science, increased thanks to the fusion of its sectors with production, is used mainly for the purpose of intensifying the exploitation of the working people, and for private profit. In other words, scientific achievements become no more than a demanded commodity. Contemporary bourgeois reality abounds with cases proving that under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution in the captialist countries the scientific product (knowledge) embodied in theoretical ideas, technological developments, and so on, becomes a commodity to be bought and sold. Naturally, the only beneficiary here is the capitalist. The workers, engineers, and technicians who have (or will have to) put to practical use such scientific ideas lose and so do the scientists whose intellect is used, directly or indirectly, for obtaining the added product. It is science as a whole that loses. By virtue of the domination of capitalist social relations, it is not provided with the necessary incentive for all-round comprehensive development. A "green light" is given, above all, to scientific sectors or groups of sectors which contribute to the earning of profits by one or another dominating group of monopolists, members of military-industrial associations, etc. Despite the stimulating effect of the scientific and technical revolution, the development of integration processes is one-sided and, occasionally, distorted. The integration of scientific knowledge, whose nature is objective, takes place under the conditions of an irreconcilable contradiction with the economic laws of capitalism. Because of the rule of private ownership, extended to science (the system of patents, licenses, authorship rights, etc.), one or another company may either use a discovery or prevent its use, if it deems it suitable, for decades.

Despite the zealous efforts of its ideological watchdogs, the antagonistic contradictions of capitalism leave their mark on the nature of interrelationships between science and practice. This may be observed in the exceptionally stressed situation in virtually all realms of human activity and, above all, in the interaction between man and nature, fraught with the danger of an ecological crisis, a dangerous disturbance of the balance in the contemporary habitat, etc.

Under such circumstances, however tempestuous the manifestation of the scientific and technical revolution may be, the process of conversion of science into a direct productive force will not take place in its full extent. This requires a different social climate which would exclude the domination and misshaping influence of private ownership, the conversion of science into an object and means of exploitation, and the distortion of the forms of its development. Such a climate is created only under the conditions of the building of socialism and communism. It is no accident that today in the West a number of sociologists and science experts are expressing the idea that, even though contributing to the development of individual scientific sectors and of some groups of scientific sectors, capitalism as a whole is fatal to science. It does not stimulate but hinders the integration processes developing in it.

Characteristic in this respect is the admission of Rome University Professor Giovanni Berlinguer made at the Soviet-Italian symposium held in 1974 in Ferrara (Italy). "It seems obvious to me," he said, "that without social control and conscious guidance or, in other words, without new forms of democracy, the scientific and technical revolution carries within it the risk of anthropological regress rather than progress" (VOPROSY FILOSOFII, No 10, 1974, p 144).

The militarization of science, with all its negative consequences, the conversion of science into a realm of organized business serving the interests of the big monopolies, various types of "mind control," and the poisoning of science with the spirit of narrow practicalism are some of the reasons which prevent capitalism from creating the social climate required for the full development of scientific knowledge. The words of Norbert Wiener sound like a very stern condemnation of the capitalist system of organization of science: "I am particularly happy that for many years I was not one of the cogs in a contemporary scientific factory, doing what was ordered, working on assignments given by the bosses, and using my brain only in commendam, the way the medieval knights used their fiefs. I believe that had I been born in the present age of mental feudalism I would not have been able to achieve a great deal. I pity with all my heart the contemporary young scientists, many of whom, whether they wish it or not, are doomed by the 'spirit of the time' to serve as intellectual lackeys or time keepers, noting the time of coming and going to and from work" (N. Wiener, "Ya--Matematik" [I Am a Mathematician], Nauka, Moscow, 1967, p 343).

The heartfelt exclamation of the scientist (no other description could be given to Wiener's admission) is no accident. We cannot fail to see in his words a profound concern for the fate of scientists in the capitalist world where, as Marx foresaw, science and technology are entirely at the service of capital and of increasing the norms of added value and increased exploitation of the working people. "The nature of capital," Marx emphasized, "remains the same in its undeveloped and developed forms" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 23, p 297). Naturally, the imperialist stage of capitalism neither changes nor could change the nature and character of the socioeconomic laws of the capitalist system. However zealous the supporters of contemporary capitalism may be, in this case they cannot mislead the world's society. Rivalry, organically inherent in the capitalist society, turns science, as been openly stated by a number of famous Western scientists, into an object of unrestrained exploitation. The researchers themselves become obedient robots obeying, as Wiener stated, orders.

Only a society which creates all the necessary conditions for the development of science could hope for the successful solution of social and economic problems. Such a society can be only a socialist society. In this connection J. Bernal's admission is interesting. He noted that "the victory will come to the system which will be best able to apply and develop science. Here again, in both theory and practice, the advantage must be on the side of the socialist states" (J. Bernal, "Nauka va Istorii Obshchestva" [Science in the History of Society], Inostrannaya Literatura, Moscow, 1956, p 454).

The strengthening of relations among social, natural, and technical sciences, achieved under the conditions of the contemporary scientific and technical revolution on the solid methodological base of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, is a purposeful concentration of the theoretical and applied possibilities of the sciences to resolve problems related not only to the study and development of natural resources but the stimulation of social progress and the development of the potential of the human individual. Also important here is resolving the problem of the rational utilization of nature. The Soviet scientists must not neglect environmental and population problems, which have become aggravated of late. "Improving the socialist use of nature and developing an effective demographic policy," as was emphasized at the 25th CPSU Congress, "is an important task facing an entire set of natural and social sciences." Naturally, the role of the technical sciences as the binding link here would be difficult to overestimate. The main task of the technical experts (ranging from theoreticians to experimental-production workers) is, in close contact with the representatives of the natural and social sciences, the elaboration of optimal decisions for complex problems and the pursuit of the type of strategy of interaction between nature and man which would stimulate social progress, contribute to the sensible reorganization of nature, and meet the ever growing material and spiritual needs of man.

The intensive fusion of science with production, closely linked with the intensifying integration processes under the conditions of the contemporary scientific and technical revolution, is affecting most beneficially the solution of the great tasks of building the material and technical foundations for communism, the improvement of social relations, and the molding of the new man. The work of scientists and specialists in the sectorial research institutes and planning and design organizations, directly insuring the integration of science with production, its "scientification," deserves great attention. This means that they must contribute to the solution of most important problems, such as enriching the empirical production experience with a scientific analysis and substantiation, a profound study of the trend toward increased production complexity and intensified production concentration, study of relations among working people in production collectives at all possible levels, and a study of the interaction between workers and modern production facilities.

The ever fuller conversion of science into a direct productive force (accomplished both through the materialization of scientific discoveries in modern equipment and technology as well as in the very labor of the participants in the production process, whose scientific knowledge becomes an ever more mandatory and essential element of their skills) is the result, above all, of the high level of development of material production. We are witnessing the tremendous growth of its scale, the steady increase in the number of new sectors, and the involvement in the national economy of new and ever more advanced productive forces. At the same time, we cannot fail to note that the conversion of science into a direct productive force became possible also as a result of the discovery and assertion of the new role of science. This is linked the increased "penetrating ability" of scientific achievements in production and their embodiment in contemporary technology.

The progress of science and technology is the main lever in the creation of the material and technical foundations for communism. The effectiveness of this lever is directly dependent on the intensive conversion of science into a direct productive force, for it (the conversion) is becoming an ever more active and effective factor and a necessary prerequisite for building a communist society in the USSR. "We, the communists," delegates to the 25th CPSU Congress emphasized, "proceed from the fact that it is only under socialist conditions that the scientific and technical revolution is acquiring a proper direction consistent with the interests of man and society. In turn, it is only on the basis of the accelerated development of science and technology that the end tasks of the social revolution--the building of a communist society--could be implemented."

All this faces the scientific collectives and their party organizations with a number of very important and urgent tasks. The most topical among them is the elaboration of effective means for controlling scientific development and improving the forms of scientific organization and ways and mean for upgrading the effectiveness of all research.

FOOTNOTE

1. It is assumed that communist output as well will ha. some specific sectors (directions) which, perhaps temporarily, may not be covered by total automation and that, perhaps, man's participation in the technological cycle will not be totally excluded. Furthermore, in all likelihood, some types of physical labor will be retained. However, they will be of a different nature and, in any case, could not be a basis for professional limitations.

5003
CSO: 1802

TOLSTOY AND THE THEATER

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 79 pp 80-90

[Article by V. Komissarzhevskiy]

[Text] Once, stopping in a forest meadow with Turgenev, Tolstoy saw an old, thin, tired horse.

Quickly turning to his guest, Tolstoy said: ". . . Do you want me to tell you what this horse feels and thinks? . . ."

His listener later recalled that that is how Tolstoy began and, truthfully, turned himself into an old jade, clearly, with merciless logic, intelligently, and artistically depicting everything taking place in the horse's mind.

"Lev Nikolayevich, have you ever been a horse?" Turgenev asked jokingly that morning.

At one point, probably, Tolstoy had been Natasha Rostov, Anna Karenina, or Anna Pavlovna Sherer, the mistress of the salon in which political intrigues were being woven. He had also been the sharp-tongued muzhik Akim from "The Power of Darkness," Prince Bolkonskiy, the thoughtless, brave Dolokhov, Karatayev and Napoleon, Kutuzov and the emperor, the mischievous Protasov in the "Living Corpse," the Gypsy Masha, and the legendary mountaineer Khadzhi-Murat, thirsting for freedom. . . .

Had Tolstoy not described them with the palpable quality of truth, as though he himself became his own characters, became one of them? This incarnation was one of the qualities of Tolstoy's powerful prose. However, it is also an accurate characteristic that its creator felt an insurmountable need for the theater. It constantly "caught him by the throat," manifested, initially, in raw sketches, subsequently, when its hour was to come, to turn into masterpieces which enhanced, as everything else he did in art, not only the Russian, but the world stage.

In order to have drama, Tolstoy wrote, we must have, above all, the "suitability of the moment," i.e., circumstances which must be so wound up that the characters would be forced to make an immediate decision on how to act.

". . . An auditor is coming to us," Hamlet's father states darkly. Chatskiy lunges into Famusov's house like a meteorite. . . . Almost always Tolstoy begins with such excited "starts." However, speaking of the "suitability of the moment," in terms Tolstoyan theater, we come across "record points" of a different kind: 1896 and 1905 are two "turning points" between which, in Lenin's words, lies Tolstoy's main work.

The first reaction to 1861 was almost instantaneous and somewhat confused. Immediately following the "liberation" of the peasants, at the turn of the 1860's, Tolstoy wrote his grotesque comedy "Contaminated Family." Its characters were petty, ridiculous, and noxious people, resembling those he sketched on bits of paper when he was in the Caucasus, headed by Mr Venerov, a tax official, a rogue and seducer. Making generous use of the radical vocabulary of Turgenev's Bazarov, such officials (whether Tolstoy wished it or not) were to depict the scarecrow of nihilism which would contaminate with "harmful ideas" the family of landowner Ivan Mikhaylovich Pribyshev. Initially, the latter would do everything possible to become an educated person. Subsequently, discovering the adventurer within himself, he would customarily use the lash and sock his servants on the jaw. In the end he would soften and appear far more likable than the provincial "radicals."

One way or another, at that time such a play could have been considered quite legitimately an attack against the "new people" depicted by Chernyshevskiy. Chernyshevskiy, who relied on the peasant revolution, and Tolstoy, who rejected the revolution as he did any type of violence, seemed to be on the opposite sides of the spectrum. However, as we know, this did not prevent Tolstoy from respecting in the revolutionaries their sincere anger at evil. Once he described them as "saints." Chernyshevskiy's hopes for a peasant community and his speeches against war and Malthusianism, and a number of his ethical formulas (in particular, the idea that everything that is moral is sensible and everything sensible is moral) interested Tolstoy more and more. In the last year of his life, reading N. Rusanov's article "Chernyshevskiy in Siberia," he willingly agreed with some of the ideas of the exiled writer, complaining only of the sharpness of his polemic style. However, an entire lifetime had to pass before reaching this point. Meanwhile, he was most eager to have the play staged as soon as possible and thus to participate in the debates on Turgenev's "Fathers and Sons," which raved in university halls and worldly salons.

"Why wait for next year," Tolstoy argued with Ostrovskiy, who apparently did not consider the comedy ready and was not willing to share its anti-Bazarov spirit. His idea was that Tolstoy, who had made a brilliant beginning with his literary biography, would take the time to think before opposing the "new people."

Yet, Tolstoy insisted that, ". . . This comedy is quite contemporary and will not be as successful next year." "You fear that the people will catch on very soon," Ostrovskiy answered.

Almost one-quarter of a century had to pass before the people would catch on, seeing the troubles afflicting the ruined Russia of the muzhiks, "gladdened"

by the "liberation." The "seismograph" in Tolstoy's soul reacted to the troubles, feeling their daily horror. His tormented conscience shrieked in his diaries. Like nightmares, his notes speak of children dying of hunger in the countryside, muzhiks frozen in snow storms, poor old women, ancient old men forced to plow their tiny plots. . . . Compared with such hell even music and even prayer seemed to him blasphemous.

"I said that I could not buy this estate because its revenue would be founded on the poverty and grief of the people. I said this and, suddenly, I realized the truth of what I had said," he was to write later in an obviously autobiographical unfinished story whose initial title had been "Notes of a Sane Man." "The main thing, the truth," the author said in it, "is that the muzhiks want to live like us, that they are people. . . . Suddenly, it was as if something which had long been oppressing me had gone away or, more accurately, had been born. The wife was angry and abusive. I, however, was happy. This was the beginning of my madness."

Soon this also became the beginning of his theater. "War and Peace" had already been written. Russia was already reading "Anna Karenina" when, seemingly unexpectedly yet, if fact, quite logically (for "Tolstoy's crisis" did not pacify him but only increased the conflict between the genius with the world of social evil, making it, consequently, even more dramatic), the writer "plunged" immediately with three plays (two completed and one started) in the year 1886.

All this may have seemed to begin as a theater joke. In fact, however, behind the joke was Tolstoy's lifelong devotion to the popular theater and his equally inflexible rejection of elitist theater.

Thus, on one occasion, walking along Devich'yy field, Tolstoy saw the talentless rubbish performed that day on the square by a company of fools. He decided to write his own "fool's play," as it was known in Yasnaya Polyana. It was a popular farce entitled "The First Distiller or How the Little Devil Earned a Thick Slice of Bread." He had earned it by having invented the first grain vodka on earth, which could turn a person into a fox, a wolf, or a pig. It was only thus that the little devil could take to the chief devil the "muzhik souls," for otherwise he could not eliminate the goodness deep within them.

However, Tolstoy was aware of other "devils" which were even more dangerous to the muzhik's soul. They were the devil of power and the power of darkness which corrupted the patriarchal Russian countryside, precious to his heart, money, the accursed money, dirty money, the dark force which led a person to his doom and crime.

Davydov, the prosecutor of the Tula district court, a close acquaintance of Tolstoy's, described to him once a crime had shaken him up, committed in a village in Chernskiy Uyzd. It was the murder of a child born to the murderer's stepdaughter and the criminal himself had publically repented during the marriage ceremony. Tolstoy studied the case thoroughly and met with the

murderer Koloskov whom he named Nikita in his play. We would find in his future plays the same type of documentary proof and confrontations with characters.

Passing through the crucible of Tolstoy's artistic genius and of his amazing knowledge of the countryside, the minutes of the case became the "Power of Darkness," which became on the great plays on the world's stage. Reading or seeing "Power of Darkness" one gets the impression that all of it was written using the voice of the people--free and effortless. Yet, true to himself, Tolstoy rewrote each act several times, "plundering," as he said, "his own notes" to get the striking language.

Tolstoy considered that language is "the main if not the only means for the depiction of characters." The sad and jocular folk sayings and expressions, the clumsy yet meaningful peasant speech, the harmony of songs, sharp exclamations, and intimate words, whether coming from the heart or callousness, the characters which reached the Tolstoyan theater stage may have appeared, on the surface, to be folkish but, in fact, illuminated by the light of inspiration which came not from an ancient muzhik tragedy or Shakespeare, whom Tolstoy did not like. This was neither Aeschylus nor Shakespeare. This was Tolstoy. . . .

We mentioned the dirty power of money. Naturally, we meet with it in just about every scene. Why? Frenzied Russian capitalism was running around the peasant land, like a mad bull, and around it flew the owls released from the darkness of serfdom. Opposing all this impurity in "Power of Darkness" is the maiden Anyutka, shaken up by the crime, shining in her purity, making the darkness somehow not so hopeless.

The staging of the "Power of Darkness," directed by B.Ravenskikh in the Malyy Theater, could be described as a show of Russian choirs and Russian nature in which the major character, justifiably, was the one played by Igor' Il'inskiy as Akim. Anyone who loves the theater knows why, recalling this staging (still used), with its many strong performers, we speak, above all, of Il'inskiy-Akim. The main surprise--the paradoxical solution--could be found precisely in him: Akim was always played as the embodiment of Tolstoy's non-violence, as a symbol of Christian obedience to fate. The unprejudiced reading of the famous play showed, however, that this non-violent little muzhik, this sparrow, was merely pretending to be non-violent. . . . He opposed the baseness of Nikita, who had cast away the girl he had seduced. He opposed the tricky mechanism of the bank, which robbed the muzhiks. He opposed the foulness, stench, and crimes committed in his son's home. "The great power of silence" is something I found in Tolstoy's writings. Akim's silent departure from the dishonorable house, having rejected all of his son's gifts, sharply changed the direction of the play. Il'inskiy depicted not humility but the aggressive popular morality.

It is likely that writing the "Power of Darkness," Tolstoy was developing the principles for understanding the characters, principles entered in his diary 12 years later. "One of the greatest errors in judging a person is that we

describe, we define a person as intelligent, stupid, good, bad, strong, or weak, even though man is all of this. . . ."

Several days later he was to write that, "How good it would be to write a work of fiction depicting human fluidity, and that a person could be . . . sometimes strong and sometimes the weakest being."

I believe that this "fluidity" of character already existed in his first muzhik tragedy. It is found in Kulina, the dullish girl who covers, in the course of the development of the play, the distance from a virtual animal to a woman ready to assume the guilt of the man she loves. It may be found in the old, retired soldier Mitrich, who in the terrible night of the child's murder had not interfered but who was destroyed after that night, sinking into drunkenness and debauchery caused by his non-violence. The only one who remains firm is Matrena, the "main director" of the murder, for murder to her was a commonplace, practical matter. She totally lacks an understanding of the crime, which to her is a "norm," a way of life, as the citizen of the power of darkness. The main anti-hero in the tragedy is different. In the context of the peasant drama we see the story of a soul, asleep for ages, having no faith yet, suddenly, awakened. The scene of the murder of the child, particularly "in the second variant" of the play, is striking. It is indicated with the help of Anyutka, who huddles up against Mitrich in her fear, as she listens to the crunching of the baby's bones in the cellar. One had to be a genius to describe this without a shade of the pathological.

". . . What will happen?" the girl whispers. How is one to live?

As always in the best works of Russian literature, the child is a faultless tuning fork of morality. Children are the "magnifying glasses of evil," wrote Tolstoy in his diary. Even a quarter of a century later I am still unable to forget Anyutka--V. Blokhin and Mitrich--M. Zharov. "What have they done to me? What have they done to me?!" moans Nikita. "What did you do?" we hear Tolstoy asking deep inside the play.

This is the anguish an awakened soul, an action of great shame and horror, which keeps growing, "flowing" and, finally, resolving itself in a different person whose name, nevertheless, will remain Nikita, a person who will forever repent for his unpardonable sin.

On the occasion of Tolstoy's anniversary "Power of Darkness" was staged by 27 theaters throughout the country. There were 27 different concepts and a number of new lives and destinies, for, in this play which has covered the world's stage, everyone will find something personal, contemporary, vitally needed by the people. Naturally, providing that Tolstoy is played not only on the occasion of an anniversary but we strive with tremendous sincerity, as Lenin wrote in his articles on the writer, "to reach the roots . . . ."

That same year, and in the same notebook in which the rural tragedy had been written, Tolstoy began his "Fruits of Enlightenment." It was in that same notebook and that same year. . . . This is noteworthy, for even though in

this case the action shifts from the countryside to the rich Moscow apartment of a retired lieutenant of horse guards, "owner of 24,000 desyatiny in different guberniyas," Leonid Fedorovich Zvezdintsev, and even though we see on the stage, comically presented, elegant ladies, professors, messengers "from Bourdier," hypnotists, sharp wits, refined members of the society of bicycle riders, horse and dog races, and "cotton and calico balls" (such balls took place!), all this bachanalia of spiritualists who learnedly summoned the spirit of one dead Spaniard Don Castillos, unwilling to hear the muzhik envoys and their seven-times (counted) repeated request for land or that fact that "they have no more livestock than a chicken and even that chicken has nowhere to go"--naturally, all this represents that same "power of darkness."

This tragic motif like the fate of the old cook who once had cooked for the gentlemen and even for the emperor himself incomparable "saute a la Ramon," while now, no longer needed, was dying like a dog in his kitchen, was piercingly heard in the famous show staged by Mikhail Kedrov in the Artistic Theater.

It seems to me that if requested to express Tolstoy's "challenges" to the world in one or two words, the word "shameful" should be put side by side with the word "truth." "Enduring shame" is the invariable statement entered innumerable times in Tolstoy's diaries like a theme song. Even in his most favorite poem by Pushkin "I Read My Life with Disgust" he, as we know, presented his own version of the last line, "I do not wash out the sad lines," which was "I do not was out the shameful lines." One of his searing exposures was entitled "Shameful."

"I am now talking to you and I am ashamed. To be a leader and sit in the bank is so shameful, so shameful . . . ." This was in "The Living Corpse," the third of Tolstoy's great plays (not counting his early tries, one-act farces, fables, theater studies, and a big unfinished play which, as we shall later see, he considered inordinately important).

"Power of Darkness" was the "idiocy of rural life." "The Fruits of Enlightenment" was the idiocy of urban life.

How to pull out of this global "idiocy" and take the path of the mind and the conscience? How to live without shame?

How to leave a world in which those who must watch over human laws, protect and create sensible and moral relations among people, the moment they put on a uniform begin to bully their compatriots, "receiving a 20 kopeck piece for their filth?"

As V. B. Shklovskiy recalls, next door to Tolstoy's house in Moscow, on Khamovnicheskiy Lane, that same house in which Lev Nikolayevich lived "on two floors," alternating between the owner's rooms on top, with butlers in white gloves, and the modest writer's studio in the basement, there were, at that time, four factories. However, Tolstoy, who knew the Russia of student classrooms, Sevastopol bastions, cossack villages, Russian peasant huts, the nomads

of the Saratov Steppes, and the worldly salons and guest homes around the Khirov circle, salons and houses he visited at the time of the Moscow census, Tolstoy neither knew nor believed in this neighboring world of factory whistles, plant labor, and workers' fraternity.

So, where was this good, conscientious, gifted, enthusiastic yet weak Protasov to run away from loneliness and the falseness of his life with a beautiful wife, who, however, did not share her husband's thoughts, or his official business, which was his enduring shame?

Like Pushkin's Aleko he could go to the Gypsies, the Gypsy caravan. Nevertheless, would he not remain alone? "This is the steppe, it is the 10th century, it is not freedom but giving a free hand . . ." is the replica with which Protasov, listening to the Gypsy chorus, opens his role in the play. However, one cannot run to the 10th century! As to giving a free hand, the times of Aleko are gone, one could booze it up in the restaurant with Gypsies, naturally, but for how long? If you want to give a free hand according to the laws of man to your wife and your friend-enemy Viktor Karenin, another law would become effective here--the law of the official court which is absolutely death to anything pertaining to the human heart. It would doom both it and them. True, there is yet another solution--death. . . .

The greatest actors wanted to play Protasov: I. Moskvin, N. Simonov, M. Romanov, S. Moissi, I. Bersenev, M. Tsarev. . . . A tremendous amount of things have been published on the subject of "The Living Corpse," for this play was indeed new not only to Tolstoy but to the world stage.

I shall not undertake to describe the way it was born after the evening when Tolstoy saw "Uncle Vanya" at the Artistic Theater and, despite all his tender love for Chekhov, felt "indignation" toward the play and decided to write the "Corpse," perhaps subconsciously introducing in his play something of Checkhov's dramatic poetry (pauses, undercurrents, trailing sentences, or suppressions which rejected in theory).

The avalanche of popular suffering in Russia made, in Tolstoy's mind, the emotions of Chekhov's characters insignificant and foolish. "What else does he need (the author)? There is the warm play of the guitar, and the cricket is chirring greatly. First he wanted to take someone's elses wife and now he is dreaming of something . . . ," Tolstoy said after seeing the play.

Naturally, Tolstoy was wrong, for Chekhov was able to describe in his plays those same sufferings and hopes of the "Russian hard times" and the Russian raznochinets intelligentsia (almost totally absent in Tolstoy), which he described, naturally, in his own style.

One way or another, Chekhov helped to write "The Living Corpse." In the play this combined three of Tolstoy's cherished motifs. The first, which in the course of the years had become his destiny and the last explosion of his powerful vitality, was the motif of withdrawal. It seems as though starting with "The Cossacks," and almost from the beginning of his writer's career, Tolstoy considered all sorts of withdrawals. The flight of his Olenin to the Caucasus already represents a withdrawal.

Twenty-two years later, for the first time, he would try himself to leave Yasnaya Polyana. He would fail. Yet another 26 years would pass after that time and he would leave it forever. Until then he would try everything and consider various types of flight. "Father Sergiy"--Prince Stepan Kasatskiy, the brilliant commander of a life-guard troop of the cuirassier regiment, runs to a monastery and then to the monk's cave in search of the truth, instead of becoming the emperor's aide-de-camp. He then undertakes a religious pilgrimage which, according to the legend, will be undertaken by Emperor Aleksandr I himself. Whether or not Tolstoy believed this fable, he opens his notes with it. Korney Vasil'yev will become a pilgrim who has abandoned the world of fierce passions as a character in Tolstoy's "Minor Prose." Finally, Khadzhi-Murat as well would break into a mortal flight, running from both Shamil' and the Russian czar.

The play also contained the idea taken from the life of the migrants and of the aristocrat who would abandon, with them, his unjust and empty life and go to Tashkent.

Fedor Protasov also ran away but did not know where to go--whether to a miserable guest house or to the Gypsies. At that time he did not know what awaited him.

Therefore, the second motif in "The Living Corpse" is the Gypsy motif or, to use the expression of the period, the motif of "Gypsyhood." This has already been discussed. Let us merely add that this motif was important to Tolstoy: His initial literary concept was entitled "The Story of a Gypsy Life." His borther had married a Gypsy. He himself had seriously studied Gypsy folklore.

The third motif was that of death. Tolstoy thought of death throughout his life and feared it. He tried to surmount his fear with the idea that death is merely the extension of life and a great test.

In the play Protasov meets a madman who describes himself as the genius, the missionary of death. The author is not simpathetic to this character.

Once Tolstoy wrote a fable on three deaths--of a lady, a muzhik, and a tree. The lady was not ready to die and stubbornly clung to pitiful gleams of life. The muzhik and the tree died in a Tolstoyan fashion--naturally, peacefully, quietly, and solemnly.

Reading the end of "The Living Corpse," the part where Fedya Protasov, convinced that the huge pile of unfair laws will, one way or another, strangle through its weight the laws of man, shoots himself in the heart and, dying, repeats after Tolstoy's diary: "How nice . . . . How nice . . . ." One feels that in fact this is not nice but horrible. This contentment turns into an exposure of the murderers. The exposure becomes the high "moment of truth" in the play, when Protasov, as though, finally, giving a free hand to everything which had piled up in the course of his unlucky life, "raises his voice" (as called for in the directions), in order to lash at the csar's lackey who earns "every 20th of the month a 20 kopek piece for his filth."

The outbreak disappears but Protasov, the Protasov as describe by Tolstoy, would probably regret it: Remember his conversation with the painter Petushkov in the tavern on the need to remove the filth of life. However, "to achieve this one must be a hero and I am not a hero," Fedor adds bitterly. This means that he was ready to resist should this have helped to "destroy the filth."

With fearless sincerity Tolstoy fought with himself: with faith in God, fear of death, his unabating pagan passions, the slightest signs of vanity, his writing and, finally, his desire to write "art" rather than preach. Nevertheless, "art" won, becoming in the final account his great prose or his theater. He wrote his last play the year he died.

Arguing with himself, he expressed views which, summed up, represent the beginning of his stage esthetics, many of which have a vital contemporary meaning.

Considering the play to be "just about the most influential" form of art, Tolstoy cautioned that "only he who has something to tell the people, to tell something important to the people could write a play." He knew "how important it is for a playwright to know what precisely will make his characters to act and speak, as well as that which will not make them to speak or act, in order not to destroy the illusion of the reader or the audience."

Tolstoy loved the sharp, energetic, and eventful theater. It is no accident that his two famous plays "Power of Darkness," and "The Living Corpse" were born of factual court trials. However, the energy, the events, and the motion in his theater are always combined with a spiritual motion.

Tolstoy insisted on the complete sincerity of the author, on his love for the character, without which the audience could not identify with him. You may recall the decisive role which Tolstoy ascribed in the theater to the word and the "dialectics of the character," to what he called "fluidity" or, elsewhere, also a kaleidoscope in which he would have wished to depict the different and frequently unexpected characteristics of people. He was ready to accept even from Shakespeare, whom he rejected, "clever methods for depicting the dynamics of feelings." However, one of the concepts governing his stage esthetics appears to me to be particularly proper today: "A play must contain a problem as yet unresolved by the people, forcing every character to resolve it according to his inner character. It is a laboratory experiment."

This thought is of the greatest importance to us. How frequently we still come across, in our plays, the fact that it raises long resolved problems. Such a play, whatever the level of talent and skill it contains, naturally, becomes merely an illustration of something already answered. In this case, naturally, the theater could not be "the most influential" form of art. Even though the moment the play is staged the problem remains unresolved, it must be formulated by every character "in accordance with his inner features."

How frequently we come across the fact that such a character would or would not resolve it "inconsistently."

Should we recall the fact that Tolstoy did not tolerate elitist art. The fact that he speaks of a people's theater toward which he aspired throughout his life and for which he worked as a "laboratory experiment," means that he called upon the playwright to write not for the elite but for everyone, tirelessly seeking the truth of what is the focal point of the play, the complexity and surprise of man and, if necessary, use "the microscope which will lead the artist into his soul and would present all those secrets shared by the people." It is precisely in that laboratory, as in his prose, that we see in action Tolstoy's X-rays which can shed light through all covers concealing the behavior of the character, revealing his nature so frequently thoroughly concealed.

There is no limit to study! Justifiably we consider "The Living Corpse" a masterpiece. This is indeed the case. Yet, after meeting with the son of the defendant Gimer, whose trial gave birth to the play and, subsequently, with Gimer himself, he claimed that what he had written still did not include the complexity of relations and circumstances contained within life itself, even though the characters of the factual drama were spiritually immeasurably lower than the characters of "The Living Corpse." A variety of interpretations by experts exist on this subject found in their comments on the creation of the play. What is important to us now is only that Tolstoy's theater was totally uncompromising!

This theater, as we know, cannot be restricted to plays only. Justifiably, it includes Tolstoy's prose. In his time, after directing Dostoevski's "The Borthers Karamazov" at the Moscow Academic Art Theater, Nemirovich-Danchenko, who as we know did not tend to engage in enthusiastic hyperbole, described to Stanislavskiy the possibilities which had opened for converting into plays works of literature: "I myself did not expect that such tremendous possibilities would open . . . . . Something tremendous has happened, some kind of tremendous bloodless revolution . . . . Now nothing has become impossible in the theater . . . . I believe that this revolution will last not 5 or 10 years, but a 100, forever!"

This letter was prophetic, whatever the failures experienced in the course of one or another adaptation of great or simply good texts for the stage or the screen.

Tolstoy's prose and theater should be the topic of a separate study. I shall merely recall the most inspiring accomplishments along this way. I believe that the most powerful Tolstoyan production in its time was "Resurrection," at the Art Theater. Here, for the first time, at the beginning of the 1930's, a discovery was made which, subsequently, was repeated, properly or not, on different stages until, unfortunately, it became a stereotype.

At that time it was a true discovery. Who in my generation does not remember how, side by side with us, in the pit, if I am not mistaken, in a blue jacket

with a white collar, and a pencil in hand as the only prop, rose the great actor Vasiliy Kachalov as the "author's" representative? From his very first words he gained our trust that he truly came "from Tolstoy," from his pain and searching mind, and his simple and meaningful words. Kachalov led us along the pages of the novel which came to life and in which Tolstoy's artistic genius had so crushingly uncrowned his own Tolstoyan character Nekhlyudov who had "enjoyed" once in this life Katyusha Maslova, thrusting in her hand a hundred ruble note for selling her body on the street and wanting, with her help, to save himself spiritually.

Thanks to Kachalov the image of the beauty of the world, unconquerable spring, the icebreaker which plays a major role in the novel, as well as the sarcasm completely exposing the hypocritical judges, invulnerable in their armor-clad uniforms, who condemned Katyusha Maslova to forced labor, became particularly outstanding and vivid.

Kachalov not only described to us what people thought but interfered in the action itself the way a personage empowered by the author to make and to lead the performance can always do.

Kachalov, "representing the author," and Yelanskaya, who played Katyusha, so scorchingly carrying within herself her great offense, as well as the actually occasional role of the friend of prosecutor Breve--Prudkin--the official who having spent the previous night in a house of prostitution would now be trying Maslova, have remained in my mind the lifetime embodiment of Tolstoy on the stage.

We recall that in the same Moscow Academic Art Theater "Anna Karenina" enjoyed an even more sensational and loud success, even though the novel had been adapted for the stage not without losses, which today one cannot even recall. Levin, with his search for a new way of life and his torments, so close to Tolstoy's heart, has disappeared from the performance, and so has his brother Nikolay, who gave the novel a kind of new dimension with the stress of his revolutionary thinking. There are no more discussions about art and the final and eighth part (subsequent to Anna's death) which tells us that not only Karenin but the entire system which threw her under the wheels of the train would perish, has been dropped.

The theater has abandoned the attempt to cover the entire space of the novel. In a virtually concert solution, in the blue, heavy velvet curtains on which would appear opera boxes, race-course stands, or the solemn, cold office of Karenin, the high official, Nemirovich-Danchenko has to blaze, burn and, finally, go out the blinding fire of the love felt by Anna, whose duel with Karenin and Petersburg society captivates the audience to such an extent that the thought of comparing the play with the novel does not even arise.

The triumph of the theater was achieved by the powerful directing, strong ensemble, and outstanding actors' duet consistent with the very essence of the emotions of readers and audiences: the clash between an outstanding woman revealing humaneness and love (Anna-Tarasova) and the anti-human bureaucratic

machine represented by Karenin (Khmelev). Naturally, he too had suffered a great deal or, rather, "pretended to suffer," as Tolstoy wrote, willingly compromising the character of Aleksey Aleksandrovich. Could we emphasize the drama of Karenin himself as some audiences suggested at that time, blaming Khmelev for his cruelty? Probably, providing, however, that we do not forget one thing: that it was precisely "he, Karenin, the world," as Khmelev answered such accusations, "that hurled Anna under the wheels. . . ."

In foreign theaters, let us note the success achieved by the famous German director Erwin Piskator, who with co-directors staged Tolstoy's "War and Peace." The play, in this variant, was stage for a number of years in Europe and the United States.[1]

I recall this production, for in the play (in the opera, as we know, Sergey Prokof'yev has been amazingly successful in this respect) the "Piskator model" was perhaps the only attempt to adapt Tolstoy's huge epic for the stage. The critics, as E. Piskator joked, considered this attempt either "the best staging of prose ever made," or "the worst of any they had ever seen." This would depend, one may think, also on who the performers were and what the audience expected of it in each specific case: "Popular thinking," which brought everyone together in Tolstoy's novel, or an open anti-war appeal.

In one of his interviews E. Piskator, known for his liking of political plays, said that he considered this, above all, an anti-militaristic play on the fact that each new war increases the number of casualties by a number of millions. Piskator wanted to express this more precisely and firmly compared with Tolstoy's pacifistic concept.

As to the structure of the play, it is a "conversational version for the theater." Once again here we have a narrator (the director admitted that he considered it unimportant whether or not this could be explained by the influence of the Greek chorus or of Kachalov. Occasionally we narrate in our own words, omitting a great deal. Occasionally, we introduce something of our own about Tolstoy's great novel).

There are three platforms on the stage. On the top is the "platform of fate." Here the figures of Napoleon and Kutuzov appear. Below it is "action platform," on which the characters live, pursuing their own affairs, loving, unaware of the fact that their fate has already been decided on the "fate platform." There, on the top, the lights shine on the map of the battle of Borodino and on almost half a meter high puppet soldiers. The narrator describes the course of the battle. The map disappears and, below, on the proscenium itself, Tolstoy's living characters--Pierre, Natasha, Andrey, and others--will think, love, suffer, and try to understand themselves and the world. Such was the "anti-Napoleonic," and, essentially, anti-Nazi staging by E. Piskator, based on Tolstoy's novel.

. . . Of late a great deal has been published in the press on what occurred on the stage, "on Tolstoy's territory." For this reason, here I shall be

extremely brief. I believe that what "Resurrection" was in the 1930's, "History of a Horse," staged at the Bol'shoy Dramatic Art Theater imeni M. Gor'kiy, in Leningrad, is to us. The essentially unexpected style of a "muzhik musical," as Tovstonogov defines the genre of the production, no longer amazes anyone, the more so since a tragic eccentricity is combined here with faithfulness to Tolstoy's text.

We know that Tolstoy himself was keen and eager for anything new in the theater. The 12-scene structure of "The Living Corpse" is due to the fact that someone had described to him initial experiments with a rotating stage. We also know how much he wanted to write for the motion pictures. Before he began to write he invited to his home in Yasnaya Polyana the first motion picture crews and he himself was filmed. ". . . Conservatism can never be more harmful than in art," wrote Tolstoy in his diary. He believed that "if you are unable to say anything new either in essence or in form, you have no right to take this to the people."

The outstanding performance of the role of Pegov-Kholstomer by the amazing actor Ye. Lebedev is a decisive feature in the success of "History of a Horse." There are moments when one thinks of an ancient tragedy. That is probably the way the famous tragedy actors played King Lear . . . .

The plasticity of the conventional herd of young horses listening to the old skewbald trotter doomed to die is accompanied in this play by a truly Tolstoyan penetrating view on things. We frequently find in the writer's diaries the idea of Martians and strangers who look, amazed, at the strange beings described as humans, who for some reason from time to time dress in multicolored clothing and, using most tricky methods, kill one another.

Tolstoy needed this "outside," "extraplanetary" view on the evil of life. He found it in the wise view of the old horse, who accurately diagnosed what was causing mankind's calamities. "My, my, my," i the precise formula of ownership which degenerates the world.

A skewbald horse in someone else's herd is, naturally, a metaphor. The hypothesis was formulated that perhaps that was Tolstoy himself. Belatedly, I recently read in Tolstoy's diary that, "Everywhere people are precisely like me, i.e., skewbald . . . ." Actually, even without this "similarity" between Kholstomer's thoughts and fate and Tolstoy's is obvious.

At the age of 82 Tolstoy loved to ride his horse into the thick of the forest, ride through growths, and climb slopes in the search for a new, unfamiliar road. We believe that it is precisely thus that our theater will advance in mastering his legacy.

. . . Blinded by the maximalism of his moral requirements, as we know, in the final years of his life, Tolstoy considered art, including his own, "overindulgence" which could not bring benefits to the people. How wrong he was! It is precisely for this brilliant "overindulgence" that grateful mankind is so highly revering Tolstoy's memory one-half a century after his death.

FOOTNOTE

1. Let us point out that starting with "Power of Darkness," staged two years after the play was written at the Antoine Free Theater in Paris, Tolstoy's plays have been extensively staged throughout the world. There have been a number of stage versions (including ballet and opera) of "Anna Karenina," and "Resurrection." European theaters have frequently staged "Kreucher's Sonata" as well. . . .

5003
CSO: 1802

'WE TAKE PRIDE IN THE MEMORY OF OUR FATHERS'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 79 pp 91-95

[Article by V. Sedykh, Paris-Moscow]

[Text] On 14 July 190 years will have passed from the tempestuous day when the mutinous people of Paris stormd the Bastille, the sinister fortress-jail. This uprising which broke out in the very midst of the alarming year of 1789 marked the beginning of the great French bourgeois revolution. Subsequently, 14 July became the French national holiday.

. . . Maret, one of the oldest districts in Paris, spreads northwest of Place de la Bastille, where the ponderous Seine, the big boulevards, and the smart Temple Street form a kind of triangle. The Soubise and Roan palaces stand here in the strange labyrinth of narrow, twisting little streets and crumbling medieval houses. For a long time they have been the repositories of very rich archives and the French History Museum, which contains unique relics and documents of the revolution of the end of the 18th century.

One may see in the Soubise Palace the private diary of Louis XVI, opened at a page dated 17 July 1789. It was the desire of the vainglorious king that his descendants be informed to the least detail of his "great" accomplishments. Day after day he recorded his impressions of hunting, walks, celebrations, and religious services. On the day the Bastille was taken the monarch wrote: "Tuesday, 14th--nothing."

That same room in the Soubise Palace contains a mock-up of the Bastille. The inventive entrepreneur Pallois, who was subsequently ordered to destroy the castle, presented this model, carefully made of the great prison stone as a gift to the National Assembly. Also exhibited here are bundles of cell keys, blackened by time. A few playing cards are under glass. On them the king had written the names of noblemen admitted to the court. Actually, the king played less with the careers of those around him than with the destinies of the people . . . "winning" the guillotine.

What triggered the French revolution? By the end of the 18th century the contradictions between the feudal system and the new production forces which had ripened within it had become particularly grave. The toiling masses

suffered unbearably from poverty and rightlessness. The young, active, and then progressing bourgeoisie was thirsting to engage in extensive activities. However, social progress was blocked by the king's absolutism, the paracitism of the nobility, and the obscurantism of the clergy. King Louis XVI and his loyal servants were unwilling to yield their positions to the "third estate," which included the bourgeoisie, the peasants, the workers, and the artisans. A revolutionary situation was ripening in the country, resulting, in the final account, in the explosion of the people's indignation and the storming of the Bastille, which the rebels considered the embodiment of royal despotism and of the old hated order. The bourgeoisie was the leader of the 1789 French Revolution. Its main force was the poor--the artisans, workers, and peasants, who paid with their blood for the victory whose benefits went to the rich. The bourgeois revolution swept off the feudal-absolutist system and opened the way to the capitalist production method, more progressive at that time. This was its historical significance. "Consider the great French Revolution," V. I. Lenin wrote. "It is not described as great for nothing. It did so much for its class for which it worked, for the bourgeoisie, that the entire 19th century, the century which gave civilization and culture to all mankind, passed under the sign of the French Revolution" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 38, p 367).

Adopting the "Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen," revolutionary France proclaimed the splendid principles of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity!" These slogans inspired the French people in the struggle against the interventionists and the supporters of the king, who had settled in Koblenz. In five years the badly armed units of the French people developed into the strongest army in Europe, which repelled all the attacks of the counter-revolution and the foreign aggressors who tried to restore the monarchy. The revolutionary army, whose banners carried the famous slogan of "Peace to the Shacks and War to the Palaces," was able to defend the republic.

However, about one century had to pass before 14 July was officially proclaimed the national French holiday and the French people had to cover a very long and difficult path. Step by step, in one conspiracy after another and one coup d'etat after another, through the Directorate, Consulate, and Empire, the big bourgeoisie tried to deprive the people of the revolutionary gains of 1789-1794.

Nevertheless, no forces were able to turn the wheel of history back. Over a number of decades, one after another, storms shook France: the July 1830 revolution, the revolutionary events of February and June 1848, and, finally, the spring tempest of 1871 when the Paris proletariat, proclaiming the Commune, for the first time in history seized the power.

The first proletarian spring did not bloom long. The icy winds of Verailles--the then bulwark of the bourgeoisie and the reaction--destroyed the young shoots of socialism. However, they were unable to destroy the powerful tree of the revolution, whose roots had sunk into the very thick of the popular masses. New and ever stronger shoots of freedom began to appear on the soil abundantly watered with the blood and sweat of many generations of revolutionaries.

Characterizing the class struggle in that country, F. Engels wrote: "It is in France that the changing political forms within which the class struggle developed and in which its results were manifested, were shaped most clearly. As the center of feudalism in the Middle Ages and as a model country of uniform limited monarchy since the Renaissance, France defeated feudalism in the course of the great revolution and founded the pure rule of the bourgeoisie with a classical clarity unencountered in any other European country. It is here again that the struggle of the proletariat rearing its head against the ruling bourgeoisie is assuming a sharpness unfound in other countries" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 21, p 259).

In 1880, under the pressure of democratic forces, the then French government headed by Freycinet was forced to pass two outstanding resolutions: It granted amnesty to the fighters of the Paris Commune and officially proclaimed 14 July as the French national holiday on the eve of the event. Arguing in the senate in favor of the adoption of these bills, Victor Hugo said: ". . . Fourteen July is a great holiday. It is a holiday of the people. Look: All faces are shining with happiness and lively conversation can be heard everywhere. This is a more than people's holiday. It is a national holiday. Look at those banners and listen to the greetings. This is more than a national holiday--it is an international holiday."

One hundred years will have passed in the final week of May, when chestnut trees are in bloom in Paris and the working people march to the Wall of the Communards where the last defenders of the Commune fell. In the very midst of summer--on 14 July--following the official ceremonies, the moment the heat has dropped and the old city sinks into a violet evening, the traditional celebrations in honor of the great 1789 Revolution begin in the capitol.

The Parisians go to dances on the Place de la Bastille, as though literally obeying the great legacy of their predessors who put on the place of the destroyed jail a plaque with a brief inscription: "Here we dance," and on the great paving blocks laid bricks marking all eight towers of the vanished stronghold of absolutism. Rue de L'Ancienne Comedie is unusually lively, particularly the Procope Cafe, which was once the meeting place for famous figures. One could imagine even now the ghosts of the Encyclopedists and of Robespierre, La Fontaine, and Marat. There is music at the Palais Royal, visited in the evenings by thousands of Parisians and tourists from the world over. In 1789 this was the center of a headquarters of the ripening uprising. It was precisely at this place, in the Foi Cafe, that two days before the fall of the Bastille, Camille Desmoulines called the citizens to arms. The fireworks burst over the Place de la Concorde. This square, like the rest of Paris, is like an open history book. Once it was named Louis XV Square and then Louis XVI Square. It was here that he was executed by the supreme will of the people who gave the square the proud name of the revolution. Subsequently, the Directory, which feared the mutinous masses like fire, renamed it Concord Square, meaning accord.

On this day the Marseillaise, born in 1792, can be heard quite frequently:

Entering the world battle,
We are proud of the memory of our fathers.

How often, listening to this proud anthem, I recalled the words of Maurice Thorez that the Marseilles is the genius of the French people, expressing their deep devotion to the cause of freedom and universal peace. "The Marseillaise," M. Thorez said, is the "burning and passionate expression of the revolutionary will of the people and their thrust and heroism. It is revolution itself . . . . Like the International, the Marseilles has always and everywhere embodied, and will embody to the people's masses the great cause of the liberation of all mankind."

The outstanding leader of the French communists ascribed great importance to the holiday of great French Revolution. In 1939, on the eve of World War II, he said: "Nowhere in France will the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the French Revolution take place more solemnly than in cities where communists have an influence. Nowhere in the world will the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the great French Revolution take place with greater solemnity than in the Soviet Union."

Indeed, that summer a big exhibit on the French Revolution was opened in Moscow. A special collection of articles by major Soviet scientists was published and in its editorial PRAVDA noted that "the most frenzied and most reactionary circles of financial capital are openly preaching the uprooting of everything which the French bourgeois revolution brought with it."

In January of that same year, 1939, Romain Rolland wrote in his message to the conference of French communists the following: "On the threshold of a year in which we shall celebrate the sesquicentennial of the French Revolution, I send my fraternal greetings to those whom I consider its direct and true heirs." R. Rolland emphasized that "it is precisely socialism and communism that had the honor to assume the resumption of the interrupted cause and to continue the work started by the great working people of 1789." The writer considered 7 November 1917 "the greatest date in the history of human society since the famous days of the French Revolution." In his words, "The Russian revolution must solidly build its home--the Republic of Labor. On the day when the building of this new structure will be completed we shall see how in Europe and in the rest of the world a number of structures eaten up by worms will crumble and how this will happen without any outside interference."

More than ever before, today the spokesmen for capitalism love to don the toga of "defenders of freedom," hypocritically describing as "enemies of democracy" the true bearers of the freedom-loving traditions and principles. Today the Marseillaise is sung not only by the simple working people whose hands are creating the wealth and greatness of France. It is sung by the monopoly magnates, by those who appropriate the results of the people's toil and genius. However, whereas to the working people the words of the Marseillaise remain full of profound revolutionary meaning, to the bourgeoisie they have long become nearly meaningless sounds, for the priests

of capitalism consider the beautiful triptych of "Liberty-Equality-Fraternity!" precisely freedom for private enterprise, and freedom for exploitation, even though they do not shy from claiming to be "supporters of human rights."

Whereas to the French toiling masses the historical date of 14 July 1789 represents merely the beginning of a long and far from covered road to social liberation, to the bourgeoisie the revolution ended with the elimination of the monarchy. It is not in vain that of late some Western "philosophers" are trying ever more frequently to distort the historical significance not only of the Paris Commune, which from the very beginning they tried to label as a "myth," but the 1789 French Revolution as well. A characteristic example of this is the book by Francois Fure, "Thoughts on the French Revolution," in which he claims that the revolution, i.e., the epoch of revolutionary upheavals, has ended, having obviously exhausted itself, due to the absence of the need, as he believes, for a revolutionary reorganization of the capitalist society.

Should we be amazed by the fact that such "revelations" trigger the enthusiastic response of bourgeois circles and, particularly, of the periodical L'EXPRESS--the fierce defender of the capitalist system and the open enemy of the revolutionary movement and of socialism. Recently Max Gallo--the historian who, incidentally, had written in his time that pamphlet entitle "A Grave for Communism" in which he tried to refute the "Marxist myth" of the permanent significance of the 1871 Paris proletarian uprising--unrestrainedly praised this book in the weekly. Exposing the provocatory nature of Fure's book, the French Marxist journal NOUVELLE CRITIQUE justifiably asked: The revolution "finished for whom? For the old Jacobin fighters? For Francois Fure? For our entire 'revisionist' generation?" In conclusion it stated that Francois Fure reflects today the feelings of those for whom the revolution has ended.

In his time, one of the founders of the French Communist Party, the outstanding master of culture Paul Vaillant-Couturier, described the noble aspirations of the heirs of the revolutionary traditions of the French people as follows:

> "We are the children of those who took the Bastille, those who fought in February, saw the Commune in a black fog, who suffered from the oppression and violence, who perished like smoke from hatred. We shall rally all France through our effort!"

Addressing in May 1979 the 23rd Congress of the French Communist Party, its secretary general Georges Marchais stated that the French Communist Party is "a revolutionary party belonging to the people. It represents a powerful force in the social and national renovation of the country." It was noted at the congress that presently France faces two roads. Either adaptation to the current crisis in the interest of transnational corporations, with all the consequences to the working people and the nation as a whole, or limiting

the domination of capital and engaging in profound progressive changes which will make possible the progress of France democratically toward socialism. "Our working class and the entire French people and French youth," G. Marchais said, "need the hope, perspectives, and ideals which we offer. Relying on all the achievements and experience acquired since the October Revolution, we are struggling for radical changes in French society. This is a complex, difficult, and lengthy struggle. There is the risk of errors and occasionally we err."

In his speech the French Communist Party secretary general particularly emphasized the historical significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution which took socialism out of the area of hopes and into the area of its practical implementation. "Ready to draw all the necessary lessons from the experience of the socialist countries, and giving, as a whole, a positive rating to this experience, as well as concern with the further development of international solidarity in the struggle for common objectives," he stated, "the French communists are systematically pursuing a political line serving the interests of the struggle for socialism in France and of the interests of socialism in the international arena."

In turn, the CPSU Central Committee emphasized in its greetings to the 23rd French Communist Party Congress, that "the Soviet and French communists are united through their common views on many basic problems of our time, and firm friendship tempered in the joint struggle for common objectives. The CPSU favors the further strengthening of the fraternal cooperation between our two parties on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and in the interests of both parties and the peoples of our two countries, as well as in the interest of insuring the peace and security of the peoples and social progress."

The very rich revolutionary and democratic traditions of the French people are of both national and international significance. Jean Jaures wrote in his monumental "Socialist History of the French Revolution" that "the taking of the Bastille made a tremendous impression. It seemed to the peoples the world over that the prison of all mankind had crumbled down. This was something more than the Declaration of Human Rights. It was a declaration of the popular forces serving the rights of man. This was not only the light which shone out of Paris toward all oppressed mankind. It was hope. At that point the dawn of freedom shone in the millions of hearts living in the darkness of slavery."

That is precisely the way the progressive people in Russia accepted the French Revolution. Noting the centennial of the anniversary of the taking of the Bastille, the members of the "People's Will" organization stated: "One hundred years ago the thunder of a great revolution sounded over France. It was as though a lightning had lit the pitch darkness of the age-old night hanging over the world and under the purple mantle of autocracy the people could see caked human blood. . . . The echoes of this first strike lasted for many years. The revolutionary wave spread to Germany, Italy, Austria, and Spain and, finally, broke in 1825 against the stone bastions of Petropavlovsk Castle."

However, no bastions of autocracy could prevent the penetration of freedom-loving ideas into Russia. Lenin paid tremendous attention to the experience of the French Revolution of the end of the 18th century, as he did, actually, to the other uprisings of the French people and, above all, to the Paris Commune. On the eve of the Great October Revolution, the leader of the Bolsheviks wrote in PRAVDA that "the historical greatness of the true Jacobins, the Jacobins of 1793, was that they were 'Jacobins with the people,' with the revolutionary majority of the people, with the revolutionary progressive classes of their time" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 32, p 216).

Many decades have passed since that statement. However, in our country the interest in the history and in contemporary France is not abating. "To millions of Soviet people," emphasized Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, "France is close as a country of heroic democratic and revolutionary traditions, a country which gave the world outstanding philosophers, a country where the Marseillaise and the International were born."

In turn, progressive and democratic France has always given friendly support to the Russian liberation movement and, particularly, to the 1905 revolution about which Anatole France wrote: "In 1789 our brothers gave Europe a lesson in bourgeois revolution. Today, in turn, the Russian proletariat is giving us lessons in socialist revolution."

Toiling France welcomed with enthusiasm the Great October Revolution, which inaugurated the age of socialism and had a tremendous impact on the further course of the development of the world and the international workers' movement. According to Maurice Thorenz, the working class intuitively realized that the October Revolution was essentially different from all previous revolutions: It brought about not the substitution of one form of social exploitation with another, but the elimination of all exploitation of man by man. This was a radical turn in the history of mankind. The working people in France, realizing that the working class had come to power in Russia, welcomed the implementation of the old dreams of their fathers.

It was precisely the French working class, together with the working people of other countries, that boldy took up at that time the defense of the Great October Revolution, hurling the battle slogan of "Hands Off Soviet Russia!" The chronicles of international proletarian solidarity will forever record the heroic Black Sea uprising of the French seamen who called for a withdrawal of the intervention forces from revolutionary Russia.

The similarity of freedom-loving traditions and cultures, and the very rich historical links and the coinciding or close national interests have all long helped to strengthen the friendship between the French people and the peoples of our multinational country. This friendship was tempered in the joint struggle against the enemy in World wars I and II, in the exploits of the fliers of "Normandy-Neman Air Regiment," and the battles in which Soviet members of the resistance to Hitlerite aggression participated shoulder to shoulder with the French. In the difficult days of the autumn of 1941, when

France was moaning under the yoke of the fascist occupation and when the Hitlerite hordes were rushing toward the capital of the homeland of the October Revolution, the French poet communist Jean Richard Bloch proclaimed with unshakable conviction that:

> "I nevertheless believe in the two peoples, in the people of Paris and the people of Moscow, with the entire clarity and accurate knowledge of the truth which arose in the alarm of those days."

Yes, joint concerns and joint triumphs frequently made the hearts of the French and Soviet peoples to beat together and helped in the rapprochement and reciprocal understanding between two great nations. All this contributed to the successful erection, starting with the mid-1960's, of the building of French-Soviet cooperation--one of the pillars of peace and security in Europe and throughout the world. The most important documents initialed in the course of Franco-Soviet summit meetings are the foundations of this building. One of them, concluded as early as 1971, in the course of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's official visit to Paris, states that "the policy of agreement and cooperation between the USSR and France will be continued in the future; it is called upon to become the permanent policy governing their relations and a permanent factor of international life."

A new and convincing confirmation of the permanent nature of this policy were the summit talks held last April between L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, and V. Giscard d'Estaing, president of the French Republic. As a result of that meeting the Program for Further Development of Cooperation Between the Soviet Union and France in Favor of Detente and Peace, and other important documents were initialed. As the program emphasizes, the parties drafted it "proceeding from the conviction that its implementation will open to the Soviet Union and France new horizons for cooperation for the good of the present and future generations of Soviet and French people, and broaden the opportunities to insure a durable and lasting peace."

Congratulating the friendly French people on the occasion of the anniversary of the fall of the Bastille, the Soviet people wish them with all their hearts prosperity and happiness.

5003
CSO: 1802

ON DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM AND POLITICAL PLURALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 79 pp 96-109

[Article by G. Shakhnazarov, doctor of juridical sciences]

[Text] The USSR Constitution codifies as principle governing the organization and activities of the Soviet State of the Whole People democratic centralism which combines "single leadership with local initiative and creative activeness and with the responsibility of each state organ and every official for assignments" (article 3). The vitality and effectiveness of this Leninist principle have been confirmed also by the experience of the other socialist countries. Essentially, the entire socialist political system is based on it.

That is precisely why bourgeois and reformist propaganda has chosen democratic centralism as the target for fierce critical attacks. Of late such criticism has been invariably accompanied by the praise of pluralism as a kind of model political system, as an ideal model of statehood in general, regardless of class nature.

What is the factual content, the specific historical meaning of pluralism and of democratic centralism, and how do these principles correlate?

Let us recall that the term "pluralism" (from the Latin pluralis--multiple) developed as a philosophical concept according to which the world is based on a number of autonomous spiritual beings. The term was introduced in political circulation in 1915 by the British socialist H. Laskey but has become extensively popular only in the past 20-30 years. This is explained, above all, by the aspiration of bourgeois and reformist theoreticians to find a meaningful concept which could be pitted against the principles of socialist democracy and which would make it possible to depict in a most suitable light what, in their view, is the main virtue of the capitalist political system.

Ignoring minor differences in the descriptions of the pluralistic concept, in an effort to explain its essence, it may be reduced to approximately the following:

First, the claim that in the contemporary so-called industrial society the class struggle has been surmounted, since, allegedly, there are no classes

in the literal meaning of the term, but only social strata or groups united on the basis of professional or other interests. These groups are in a state of complex interaction and the nature of one or another social system is determined, above all, by the extent to which it can secure freedom of expression for the group interests and their representation in the higher power organs. Here the state acts as organization which maintains public order and does not allow matters to reach the level of hand-to-hand fighting as a result of which the majority or the minority would impose its will on its rivals.

Second, it is a thesis according to which the making of political decisions in the state should be the result of the "free play" of heterogeneous political forces enjoying democratic rights--the electoral right, the right to join political parties, to operate through different social organizations, create "pressure groups," and express its positions thanks to the freedom of the press. The multiplicity of "power centers," the theoreticians of pluralism claim, is the only guarantee of freedom.

Here is, for example, what West German political experts write: "Pluralism claims that the number of ideological and spiritual trends existing in modern society, and of social strata, groups, institutions, economic interests, associations, professional roles and functions, political organizations, parties, and instances will be acknowledged and approved, thus giving them scope for free activity to the extent to which, in turn, they approve and support the governmental and constitutional order which is a necessary prerequisite for all pluralist forces to benefit from the law, and be protected and given the possibility to act under conditions governed by reciprocal respect, trade, competition, and conflicts . . . (A. Schwan and G. Schwan, "Sozialdemokratie und Marxismus" [Social Democracy and Marxism], Hamburg, 1974, p 331).

Differentiations may be made among the promoters of pluralism. Some demand that the game be played, so to speak, on an equal basis, freely, i.e., without any interference on the part of the state in the "natural" course of events, and without erecting obstacles hindering any group. One can easily see that this "platonic" love for "equality" and "freedom" conceals the aspiration to continue in the future to make extensive use of the economic power concentrated in the hands of big capital in order to strengthen its political domination. Other supporters of social reformism, primarily linked with leftist circles, believe that, while insuring as a whole the "free play" of political forces, at the same time the state should not allow any excessive dominance on the part of individual groups. The state should perform the functions of an umpire in the relations between the ruling circles and the opposition, seeing to it that the latter is not excessively "abused." Correspondingly, they deem it necessary to improve the state and social system of the developed capitalist countries in the "pluralist direction": Restrict the freedom of the strong social groups in such a way "as to prevent them from disturbing the social or ecological symmetry and threaten 'solidarity under the conditions of freedom'" (H.-G. Assel, "Demokratischer Sozialpluralismus" [Democratic Social Pluralism], Munich-Vienna, 1975, p 212). This, precisely, is the limit of "socialization" which turns the left-wing "pluralists" into great revolutionaries in their own eyes.

Regardless of which pluralist version is taken as a basis, one thing is clear: Any one of them presumes, either intentionally or because of the naivete of its authors, that the bourgeois state today is no longer today a tool for class domination and has become the guardian of the interests of the entire people. This assumption, however, is refuted by the very fact that in the contemporary capitalist countries the power of the monopoly elite has not only not disappeared but, on the contrary, is continuing to be in good health and to increase--the power of a narrow stratum of individuals who hold in their hands a huge share of the public wealth and political power. In other words, no new quality has developed within the capitalist political system which would encourage the search for a entirely different characteristic. The theoretical and propaganda hullabaloo on the subject of pluralism is, essentially, of a speculative nature. It is something like an attempt to turn around the structure of bourgeois statehood in such a way that the public could see only its official, embellished face.

This building consists of two basic elements. First, the existence of conflicting political forces inevitable in capitalism with its division into antagonistic classes--conservative and reactionary, on the one hand, and democratic and revolutionary on the other. The bourgeoisie would willingly deal with the hostile class camp once and for all. However, it is unable to do this since, economically, it cannot do without the working class. Even in cases when the revolutionary party has been subjected to nearly total physical elimination, it has invariably been reborn from the ashes and resumed a new cycle in the struggle. Consequently, the confrontation among different political forces under the conditions of the capitalist system (partially at least) is based on objective social prerequisites independent of the will of the ruling class.

Another element of the "pluralistic system" is determined by the inevitable fractioning of the ruling class and its related strata into various social groups, their economic and ideological rivalry, their internecine struggle for their share of the "government pie," and for the various privileges which make it possible, one way or another, to influence the domestic and foreign policy of the country and which, at the same time, stem from this influence.

Naturally, it is far from always simple to draw a clear line of demarcation between the two elements. Thousands of transitional aspects and a great variety of interpenetrations are possible, occasionally not fitting the conventional system in the least. For example, we cannot simply qualify some political organizations (or, more generally, pressure groups) which represent intermediary social strata fluctuating between the working class and the bourgeoisie. Greatly linking the radical changes in their position with the program for revolutionary changes, they would not hesitate, if possible, to extract for themselves benefits from the existing system.

The bourgeois countries abound in such facts of life. It is precisely these complex forms and various "zigzags" in political practice and all sorts of tactical intrigues that conceal the main line dividing the two basic elements of bourgeois statehood. The image of a kind of "total democracy" appears, allegedly securing the free competition among political forces.

However, looking closely, we would see even on the face of the contemporary bourgeois democracy cracks, some of them substantial! The "free play" of political forces obey rigid rules which guarantee, in the first place, the absolute inviolability of the holy of holies of the private ownership system--the rule of capital. This, one may say, is a kind of roulette in which the players are forbidden to break the bank, and with occasional gamblers having the right merely to play with limited stakes or are not allowed to the table at all. In its time such was precisely the case with the socialists. Now it is with the communists. They are considered outside the "pluralistic circle" and, in order to be allowed to participate in the free play must produce a certificate of "trustworthiness."

We know the commotion which the possible participation of the Italian Communist Party in the Italian Government triggered in the bourgeois camp. It was followed by a series of threats coming from Washington, and warnings from Bonn and London. Obviously not hesitating to disturb the harmony in the compositions of the theoreticians of pluralism, the Western political figures are continuing their lively discussion of the matter of the possibility to "admit" the communists in the government or should they be asked to provide specific guarantees including dropping the name communist. Those who consider the communist pariticipation in the bourgeois governments possible stipulate that communists should be denied the positions of minister of internal affairs, defense, foreign affairs, or finance or, in a word, all key positions in which the bourgeoisie does not tolerate differently thinking people. Of late, taking into consideration the drastically increased role of public opinion, departments controlling mass-information media have also been granted key status.

The incompatibility between the demands of the bourgeoisie and the positions of the communists may be seen in the article by M. Seidner, in the French Communist Party journal: "Under present-day conditions we must ask ourselves whether or not our enemies and, occasionally, even our allies, are ready to accept all consequences of political pluralism. In order to prove to them our support of the concept of pluralist democracy, we would have to change our political activities and organization, and reject the notion of a workers' party of a new type. Such an action would mean to proceed on the basis of essentially thoughtless postulates: We would have to stop being ourselves to make possible cooperation with other forces." He adds: "Without an influential communist party there is no pluralism whatever or, rather, there is token pluralism, . . . removing the working class from active interference in the political life of the country or reducing its possibility to participate in it" (CAHIERS DU COMMUNISME, No 5, 1974, p 47).

Commenting on these views, J. Chevenement, leader of the left wing of the French Socialist Party, claims that the communists are trying to justify their "separate existence," and finds a certain contradiction in Seidner's views. Yet, what contradiction is there here? If pluralism presumes the participation of all forces in the political process and the opportunity for all kinds of thought, on what grounds should it be required that one of these forces, which incidentally is followed by nearly one-quarter of all voters in the country, would change its credo for the sake of being "admitted" to activities?

Characteristically, the logic of the ideological struggle against the right-wing opponents of socialism, in the final account, leads Chevenement to healthy conclusions. Studying the statements of the representatives of conservative circles, he notes: "Pluralism! How many crimes and frauds have been committed in thy name! The right wing would like to establish the boundaries of 'reliability' of parties which, in their view, could be allowed to participate in the political game. According to this criterion, only 'decent' people should be allowed to the table of French democracy" (Jean-Pierre Chevenement, "Les Socialistes, les Communistes et les Autres" [The Socialists, the Communists, and the Others], Aubier, 1977).

Let us add to this that the bourgeoisie has yet another "strategic line" of defense of its political domination: the governmental apparatus. In this "tri-layered pie" in which the "bottom" may consist of skilled workers and the labor intelligentsia, by virtue of social affiliation and moral-psychological views, while the top is the leadership of political parties who have won the elections, the center of gravity fall on the middle layer. It is precisely the permanent bureaucratic elite, consisting of members of strata constituting the "flower" of the ruling class, career people with solid professional training and class upbringing, that is the main guardian of the capitalist power.

In the article "Who Rules France?" (EXPRESS, 24 July 1972) M. Cott cites facts confirming that the decisive role in the governmental mechanism is played by the cast of officials who are graduates of the ENA--the Governmental Higher School for Administrative Cadres. About 40% of the personnel staffing offices of ministries are graduates of that school, and 90% of its graduates are state employees. ENA alumni come from the aristocracy, the big bourgeoisie, and the families of high-ranking employees. Here members of working families account for less than 1%.

"The entire history of bourgeois-parliamentary and, to a large extent, bourgeois-constitutional countries," V. I. Lenin wrote, "indicates that the change of ministers means very little, for the real administrative work is done by a huge army of employees. This army is thoroughly imbued with an anti-democratic spirit and linked with thousands and millions of ties with landowners and the bourgeoisie and is dependent on them for all things. . . . This army is linked with relations of hierarchy and perquisites of 'state' service. The upper ranks of this army, through stocks and banks, are totally dominated by financial capital. To a certain extent, they represent its agents and the promoters of its interests and influence" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 34, p 202-203).

Many decades have passed since those words were written. Yet, if anything has changed it has been no more than the extent of the "perquisites of state service." Corruption within the contemporary bourgeois officials has assumed a scope which their forefathers could not even dream of. Suffice it to refer to millions in bribes paid by the American Lockheed company to noted members in just about all governments of the imperialist countries.

The white collar bureaucracy, keenly responding to the interests of its class, chooses a minister among its own circles, and is more or less sympathetic to a bourgeois-liberal or right-wing socialist. However, it could quite effectively block anyone it would deem "eccentric" or "alien," or who would threaten the procedure of political "action" sanctified by tradition.

Why should the bourseoisie not allow itself the trifle of pluralism with such impressive guarantees? The more so since, in an emergency, it could always use a convincing argument such as bayonets and submachine guns.

Therefore, attempts to present contemporary bourgeois democracy as an ideal pluralistic model of a political system are groundless for the following basic reasons.

The multiplicity of "power centers" and their "free play" presume not a coordination of interests but the subordination of some interests to others. Essentially it is those who hold in their hands the political power, state apparatus, and mass-information media, who direct the "free play." That is why it always results in reducing the "pluralistic multiplicity" to a single political course, which in the final account expresses the basic interests of monopoly capital.

Another aspect of the matter must be considered as well. Since the rivalry among corporate interests do not guarantee their equitable consideration, it is becoming steadily aggravated. However, this does not resolve social problems. Added to the objective reasons for the disparity of interests is the dissatisfaction with the results of the regular round of the struggle on the part of the losers. Those who lose steadily develop a feeling of doom, of being thrown out of the given system.

The competitive political model triggers even more negative consequences when it becomes a question of long-term national needs. Firmly holding the main levers of state control, the monopoly leadership subordinates to its own benefits the solution of any general problem. However, the bourgeois-democratic procedure makes it possible to conceal such benefits behind the national flag. For this reason a high percentage of society sincerely believes that, for example, the arms race is necessary for the sake of saving the country from the "communist threat."

The "majority-minority" problem, so extensively discussed by Western political experts, cannot be resolved in the least within the framework of political rivalry. By its very nature bourgeois parliamentary opposition has only the right to criticize the government, whereas the latter does not have to take into consideration its demands, not to speak of consider within its policy the interests of the classes and social groups it represents.

The following question arises: Does the struggle of the various political parties and currents waged on the ground of bourgeois-democratic legality have no positive significance whatever? Has it been impossible for the revolutionary forces as well to achieve certain successes within this framework?

In their time, the founders of Marxism proved the limited and hypocritical nature of bourgeois democracy in its absolute dimensions, together with its political significance in a relative dimension. Unquestionably, this applies to pluralism as well, which in a certain sense could be considered as one of the democratic forms gained, similar to the universal voting right, freedom of the press, or public trials, as a result of the age-old struggle waged by the people's masses for their interests. Under capitalist conditions the very possibility to use it in the interests of the working people depends to a tremendous extent on the correlation of class forces and the ability of the progressive camp to defend democracy and promote its extension to the realms of economics and social life.

However, the entire problem is, precisely, that bourgeois political science tries to ascribe to pluralism an alien significance, depicting it not as one of the forms (or principles) of the governmental system under capitalism, but as an integral model of a political system which allegedly has been given full scope in the developed capitalist countries and is worthy of comprehensive dissemination.

The ideological underlining of this approach is obvious. The theoreticians and propagandists of this "model" are concerned less by how effectively to apply it under capitalist conditions than by the aspiration to prove its "superiority" over democratic centralism. Furthermore, attempts are launched, on the one hand, to defame democratic centralism and to proclaim its form as allegedly inevitably linked with "totalitarianism" and, therefore, unsuitable as a model for the future and, on the other hand, take pluralism beyond the framework of the capitalist system, proclaiming it the ideal form of future "democratic socialism."

Any principle dealing with power (decision making is the quintessence of power, its highest function) could be properly understood and objectively assessed only in relation to its social base. Without this any talk about its content invariably turns into idle talk. There are two basic characteristics of the social structure which represent the prerequisites for decision making, control, and other management elements based on democratic centralism. First, the coincidence of the basic interests of all population classes and strata; second, the variety of specific interests of individual social groups. The first circumstance is related to the elimination of the private ownership of exploiting classes, and consequently of class antagonism. It is a proof of tremendous progress compared with capitalism. The second is essentially related to the substantial differences remaining within the socialist society among workers, peasants, and intellectuals, among the individual parts within the main classes, and between people engaged in mental and physical labor and the working people of town and country, the characteristics of cultural-national traditions and conditions in different parts of the country, etc. In addition to the specific interests based on the fact that socialism does not as yet provide for the full economic equality among people (attainable in a classless society only), the different population strata have different interests not directly related to the class structure of society (such as national or professional).

The bourgeois sociologists claim that under socialism as well the variety of interests requires political pluralism. The entire experience acquired in the development of socialism refutes this conjecture. On the contrary, it is precisely the principle of democratic centralism which is most consistent with the economic and social structure of the socialist society, and with the sociopolitical and ideological unity achieved within it. Insuring the high effectiveness of the functioning of the new political system, this principle calls for controlling the objective processes and resolving contradictions through cooperation rather than rivalry.

This is one of the main advantages of democratic centralism. Socialism and its political system make it possible to combine the common interests of the people with interests of the component classes and social strata harmoniously; not to confront but to compare, to coordinate, and meet the various specific interests within the framework of a single policy; organically to link the need of society for centralized management with the requirement of maximally developing initiative, creative undertakings, independent activities, and the self-administration of its cells. ". . . Centralism, understood in a truly democratic meaning," Lenin pointed out, "presumes the possibility, created for the first time in history, for the full and unhindered development not only of local characteristics but of local initiative, and a variety of ways, means, and methods for progress toward the common goal" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 36, p 152).

From the very beginning, starting with the October Revolution and the first steps leading to the establishment of a socialist state, the socialist political system has embodied the principle of expressing both the common as well as the varied specific interests. A broad system of corresponding organs and organizations appeared and is developing. This applies, above all, to the soviets of people's deputies, the organs of national statehood and autonomy, the trade unions, the Komsomol, the kolkhoz cooperative and its associations, women's organizations, creative unions, numerous voluntary societies and associations of the population, and the labor collectives.

The expression of public interests and their protection are the first prerequisite for a truly democratic decision-making process. The second no less important prerequisite is the existence of an organization capable of coordinating the various requirements of the basic classes and social strata within a single policy based on the coinciding fundamental interests of all the members of a society marching toward communism. This function can be performed only by a party which expresses the aspirations and expectations of the working people, a uniting and rallying political force and a prestigious vanguard of the people.

The role of the party is responsible and important at all stages of the revolutionary struggle for the ideals of the working class. However, the volume of the problems it resolves grows with each new stage. This particularly applies to the period of developed socialism, when the complex problems of the building of communism, in all their inordinately broad range, are formulated not only in a general manner but are concretely placed on the

agenda. All aspects of social life become immeasurably richer as socialism enters its period of maturity. The ways and means of participation of the working people in the management of the state broaden considerably. Their activities in the fields of economics, politics, and culture are intensified. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized in his article "Historical Landmark on the Way to Communism," "Socialist democracy insures a sensitive reaction to the growing variety of social interests. It opens a wide field for the initiative and sociopolitical activity of the masses."

In a number of socialist countries where a multiparty system had been historically developed, the democratic parties as well represent specific social interests. Under the guidance of the communist party they participate in the process of the coordination of such interests with the common requirements of the entire people.

The procedure for political decision making, presuming a close link between the long-range tasks of the building of communism with the present needs of society is a highly complex matter. Naturally, the financial possibilities and material resources of the country do not make it possible to meet all demands immediately. A choice must be made and a preference must be displayed for some interests over others in terms of the sequence of their satisfaction. Under capitalist conditions, such problems are necessarily resolved through political struggle, frequently involving the use of pressure, misleading public opinion, bribery, and corruption. Under socialism they are resolved by comparing the various interests and viewpoints and determining the most urgent requirements.

In its most general aspect democratic centralism is the optimal combination of the interests of the whole and its parts, of society and the individual, of the state and the citizen, and of the center and the local areas. Any complex concept can be made particularly clear through comparisons. Let us cite one of Lenin's statements: "We favor democratic centralism. We must clearly understand how different democratic centralism is, on the one hand, from bureaucratic centralism and, on the other, from anarchism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 36, p 151). The founder of the Soviet state repeatedly emphasized the need to support most strictly the principle of democratic centralism in its completeness, and not to allow any "distortion," or "attraction" for one of its extremes. Thus, in his words, bureaucratic centralization is "one of the greatest obstructions to economic and political development in general and, in particular, one of the obstacles to centralism in serious, major, basic matters" (ibid, vol 24, p 146).

Yet, the critics of democratic centralism present it most frequently precisely as bureaucratic centralism. Such a simple substitution makes it possible to zealously expose "communist totalitarianism" and advertise the "pluralistic model."

The nature of socialism contains the strongest possible opposition to bureaucratic trends: the universality of the principle of wages based on labor, and the inevitable restrictions imposed on personal property and the

possibility to use it as a means for the acquisition of power. Yet, it is precisely this opportunity that is the nutritive ground for bureaucracy under capitalism: There the wealth creates the power while the power multiplies the wealth.

Distribution according to labor and the high level of social equality already reached in the first phase of the communist system, social mobility, universally favorable conditions for the molding, development, and use of talent and, consequently, the possibility to assume leading positions within state organs or in any other realm of social activity, along with many other characteristic features of the socialist socioeconomic and political system hinder the formation of a separate stratum of managerial elite reproducing itself over a number of generations.

The socialist social organism also contains antidotes to the development of, so to speak, a "one-time bureaucracy," the bureaucracy of a single generation: the truly democratic organization of the political system, presuming the participation of millions of working people, manning machine tools, plowing fields, or working in laboratories, in the work of the soviets, and party, trade union, Komsomol, and other public organizations; criticism of shortcomings as one of the most important principles of the Soviet system, codified in the USSR Constitution (article 49); and the all-embracing organization of people's control, also constitutionally codified (article 92). Naturally, bureaucracy can be totally uprooted only under the conditions of a communist social self-management. However, already under socialism possibilities are created to eliminate to a large extent this toxic legacy of the past. The struggle against it manifestations becomes on of the constant concerns of the ruling party and of the entire mechanism of democratic rule.

Here are interesting confirmations. The Australian scientist L. Churchward, who has studied over many years real socialism, notes as a characteristic of the Soviet state "mass participation in the management process," emphasizes that this "something significantly greater than the participation of the majority of the population in elections in many parliamentary states" (L. G. Churchward, "Contemporary Soviet Government," London, 1975, p 12). Another political expert, Cambridge University Professor D. Lane, arguing with his colleagues, suggests to them to understand that the absence of private property in the USSR offers possibilities, greater than in the West, for the population's participation in political life (see D. Lane, "The Socialist Industrial State," London, 1974, p 55).

The extensive scale of participation of the working people in decision making and control does not lead to the negative effect of any "mass" or lowered quality and level of management competence, as some "critics" of socialism claim. Above all, this is due to the fact that "participation" is conceived and implemented not in the primitive manner of interference by untrained people in management which requires specialized knowledge. This is precisely the essence of the fact that democratic centralism excludes both arbitrariness as well as anarchy and mob rule.

Let us recall the classical Leninist formula which explains the basis on which the objective contradiction between need for specialization and democratic management can be resolved: "The democratic principle of organization . . . means that every representative of the masses, every citizen must be placed under conditions enabling him to participate in the discussion of the laws of the state, the choice of his representatives, and the implementation of state laws. However, this doe not mean in the least that even the slightest possible chaos or disorder would be admissible by anyone responsible in each separate case for specific executive functions, for implementing specific orders, and for managing a certain common labor process within a certain time interval. The masses have the right to choose responsible leaders. The masses must have the right to replace them. The masses must have the right to know and check even the smallest step taken in their activities. The masses must have the right to promote all working members within it to executive functions. However, this does not mean in the least that the process of collective labor could be left without a specific leadership, without the precisely determined responsibility of the manager, and without the strictest possible order created through unity with the will of the leader" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 36, pp 156-157). Consequently, the entire matter is to find, in practical work, the optimal measure for combining the two principles in the management process.

The complexity of such tasks may be judged by the single fact that in order to crystalize its economic and political forms and develop the current formulas governing economic and other management (naturally, within the limits of the specific class structure and its possibilities) required a full century and a half. Even though unlike capitalism, under socialism sociopolitical development is based on science, nevertheless, to a large extent the establishment of optimum principles and institutions is the result of experimentation and of the objective progress of social practice. The task becomes far more complex if we are dealing with a phase in the establishment of the new system without practically tried models and guidelines, but merely on the basis of scientific hypotheses.

We must also bear in mind the fact that the very process of "searching" takes place not in a vacuum laboratory environment where one could methodically and coolly test one solution after another, but under the conditions of intensive social life. For example, it may become necessary to improve a management model while increasing the growth of output at the same time. This may turn out to be as difficult as to improve the design of an automobile as we drive faster.

Let us not forget that so far socialism has had at its disposal not such a long historical time favoring the solution of this great problem. The civil war and imperialist intervention in the first post-October years, the constant threat of foreign aggression hanging over the USSR, the hard class battle within the country, the tremendous trial of the Patriotic War, and the cold war after it, could not fail to influence the political system, occasionally leading to a particular emphasis on centralism. The distance covered by the other socialist countries as well has been quite complex and relatively short.

The fact that despite all such complexities socialism has been able to prove its ability to insure the tremendous all-round progress of the national economy and culture offers sufficiently vivid proof of the strength of the new system. It is obvious, however, that its possibilities are far from exhausted. The CPSU and the other communist and workers' parties in the fraternal countries are formulating among the main tasks the further improvement of the political system and the development of socialist democracy. The adoption of the new USSR Constitution--the Fundamental Law of our State of the Whole People--became the biggest landmark along this way.

The clearer the advantages of the socialist model of administration and economic management become and the greater its achievements, the deeper will its influence on the fate of mankind be.

Let us formulate a few general conclusions.

The pluralistic concepts of the Western ideologues essentially represent the idealizing of bourgeois democracy. The "free competition" among social groups and their "equal" participation in the state power organs are a window dressing of bourgeois democracy or simply a fiction. The class nature of the capitalist state does not change from this in the least. It was, and remains the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Yet, pluralism growing on this soil inevitably becomes on of the more or less concealed forms of its exercise. Furthermore, the measure of influence on governmental affairs accessible to the working people under the conditions of a bourgeois democracy is not a gift on the part of capital to the people but a concession gained as a result of the adamant struggle of the working class and all progressive forces against the tyranny of monopoly capital.

On the basis of historical experience, we have all the necessary reasons to affirm that the measure of true democracy and the depth at which the entire variety of social interests may be expressed are not determined in the least by the number of parties running the state but by the nature, direction, and practical content of their policies. We know, for example, that prior to the liberation of Hungary the country had a multiparty political structure. Naturally, however, this did not make Horty's fascist system democratic at all or consistent with the expectations of the people. In socialist Hungary, within a one-party system, the broadest possible popular rule has been assured. Furthermore, a multiparty system, with the leading role of the communist and workers' parties, has been successfully used in the building of a new society in a number of socialist countries.

Democratic centralism, whether under the conditions of a one- or multiple-party system in the socialist countries, presumes the mandatory consideration not only of common and single but different and varied social requirements and interests, historical circumstances, and local conditions. All this is an organic part of the socialist political system. Unlike bourgois democracy, however, the decision-making procedure used in a socialist democracy leads not to the intensification of the confrontation among different social forces but, on the contrary, to the strengthening of social unity. This is possible

only in the absence of class and national antagonisms and the coincidence of the basic interests of all population strata. The principle of democratic centralism, notes Comrade M. A. Suslov, "combines most fully the interests of society with those of the collectives and all citizens."

Of late there have been statements that socialist democracy is also pluralistic in nature. We believe that there is hardly the need to use a foreign concept to characterize the features of the socialist political system which Marxist-Leninist science has long and quite properly defined through concepts such as class needs and interests, social groups, unity and variety of such interests, coincidence or contradictions between them, their protection and expression, coordination, and so on. As to the general definition, the clear concept of "power of the people" should be preferred to the loose and equivocal term "pluralism" which could be given a number of interpretations.

The historical practice of socialist democracy has clearly proved its high effectiveness. Essentially, never before has the state taken into consideration and reflected in its policies such a variety of social and national interests and requirements related to the revolutionary reorganization of all aspects of social life as was accomplished by the country of the October Revolution. The Soviet system would not have lasted even one year had it ignored multiplicity of conditions, interests, and problems.

Finally, if pluralism is identified with bourgeois democracy and proclaimed a universal political system, the inevitability of its disappearance, along with the socioeconomic system which created it, should be acknowledged. This is because already under the conditions of developed socialism, the possibility arises to satisfy the multiplicity of social interests--general and specific--through cooperation rather than rivalry among political forces. In a communist society there would be no classes and class distinctions at all and it would be ridiculous to assume that the people of the future, with their advanced intellect and high moral culture would fail to find a better means for decision making than through group quarrels.

We could have ended the subject at this point had there not been yet another, quite substantial, side to the problem. It is a question of the desire of Western ideologues to use the concept of pluralism not only to substantiate the "advantages" of bourgeois democracy compared with the political system of socialism, but to discredit the philosophical foundations of Marxist-Leninist doctrine. Pluralism is proclaimed the only rational democratic conceptual view and, as such, is pitted against the allegedly dogmatic and totalitarian Marxist monism.

Following is a typical sample of such claims: "While monism encourages authoritarian distortions, the pluralistic model of knowledge and action contains the embryo of humanitarian ethics and philosophy of democracy. Here the contradiction between monism and pluralism develops into a conceptual-philosophical substantiation of the contradictions between totalitarianism and democracy" (H. Spinner, "Pluralismus als Erkenntnismodel" [Pluralism as a Decision-Making Model], Frankfort a/M, 1974, p 104).

We cannot disagree with the fact that multiplicity, variety, is a radical characteristic of natural and social life. However, it could be properly understood only if correlated with another basic characteristic of life--unity. Unity is inconceivable outside of variety and multiplicity and the latter are inconceivable outside of unity. Such is the elementary truth of the dialectical-materialistic, the truly scientific method. That is why attempts to ascribe to pluralism the advantages of variety and wealth of approaches and to monism one-sideness and limitation of views are groundless.

The trouble with many bourgeois ideologues is that they neither can nor want to understand the objective dialectics of nature and society. The fact that they present their distorted view of Marxism as true Marxism is of their own doing. Marxist philosophical monism is a concept of the material unity of the world and to see in it on this basis the aspiration to put everything under a common denominator is the same as, for example, to see in Newton's concept of universal gravity an intention to squeeze all people to the ground with a single huge press.

Such an interpretation of Marxism is based either on a gnosiological misunderstanding or deliberate falsification. The scientific-materialist understanding of the correlation between the single and the varied, between the general and the specific, and between the essence and the phenomenon, which is the meaning of Marxist philosophical monism, is linked with the discovery of the objective dialectical laws governing the development of nature and society. It is precisely against this discovery, confirmed by the entire experience of natural and social history, that our ideological opponents are fighting.[1] They are fighting because its acknowledgment does not suit the political interests of the bourgeoisie. Yet, since their positions are weak, they engage in open fraud, claiming that the theory of scientific communism rejects variety and presumes unification and standardization in all realms of social life, as though socialism is, by its very nature, the kingdom of dullness. To this they add that the communists allegedly intend to promote everywhere by force an identical order, mercilessly crushing traditional natural environments, and ignoring historically developed characteristics of different nations, local development and nature of culture, and human customs and tastes or, in a word, try to make the entire world uniform.

The best answer to this fabrication is social practice which entirely confirms Lenin's prediction that with common basic laws the assumption of power by the working class and working people and the building of socialism takes place in a great variety of aspects. It has been just as irrefutably confirmed that the socialist principles governing the organization of society offer broad scope for the manifestation of the varied capabilities, initiatives, and creative undertakings of the working people. There is no doubt that the further advancement of the new system will be accompanied by the creation of even more favorable conditions for the total development of the richest potential possibilities of all nations and individuals.

FOOTNOTE

1. P. N. Fedoseyev notes that conceptual nihilism is closely linked with the preaching of pluralism in philosophy and politics which directs its wedge against scientific Marxist-Leninist ideology and against the acknowledgment of the general laws governing socio-historical progress (PRAVDA, 18 September 1978). The Bulgarian philosopher A. Kozharov writes that, ". . . The exaggeration, the inflation, and the absolutization of the variety and quality differences within objective reality and the negation or belittling of the material unity of this reality and the negation or underestimating of the legitimate ties and conversions between qualitatively distinct or relatively autonomous areas of reality represent, above all, the gnosiological base of philosophical pluralism" (A. Kozharov, "Monizum i Pluralizum v Ideologiyata i Politikata" [Monism and Pluralism in Ideology and Politics], Sofia, 1972, p 25).

5003
CSO: 5003

G. V. PLEKHANOV'S LIFE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 79 pp 110-114

[Review by I. Mindlin of the book "Plekhanov" by M. Iovchuk and I. Kurbatova. Molodaya Gvardiya, Moscow, 1977, 352 pages]

[Text] The life and activities of Georgiy Valentinovich Plekhanov--the outstanding representative of the social thinking and revolutionary movement in Russia--has invariably interested researchers. It would be useful for every Soviet person to become more closely familiar with this outstanding and gifted personality.

"Marxism," V. I. Lenin wrote, "as the only correct revolutionary theory, was truly experienced by Russia in the course of 50 years of unparalleled suffering and sacrifices, unparalleled revolutionary heroism, unparalleled energy and selfless search, training, practical trials, disappointments, investigations, and comparisons with the European experience" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 41, p 8).

In his speech at the ceremony on the occasion of the 250th anniversary of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said: ". . . A powerful upsurge of the humanities and of progressive social thinking took place in Russia inseparably linked with the general flow of scientific and cultural development. A. N. Radishchev, N. I. Novikov, V. G. Belinskiy, A. I. Hertzen, N. G. Chernyshevskiy, N. A. Dobrolyubov, and G. V. Plekhanov, the pioneer of Marxist thinking in Russia, contributed to the spiritual awakening of Russia and to the shaping of the revolutionary awareness of the peoples of our homeland. In the final account, it was their activities that made it possible to prepare the grounds for the great exploit of the Leninist genius and for the creation of a revolutionary party of workers and peasants and the victory of the Great October Revolution." In this glorious line Plekhanov completes the long and painful odyssey of Russian social thought following the only correct revolutionary theory--Marxism.

Plekhanov's political activities may be separated into three basic stages: From 1876 to 1883 he was a revolutionary narodnik; with the foundation of the "Liberation of Labor" group (1883) to 1903 he was one of the leaders of the Russian revolutionary social democratic movement and its outstanding

theoretician; following the second congress of the RSDWP he switched to the Menshevik camp and, subsequently, with the outbreak of the world imperialist war, took the side of the social defense movement. Following the victory of the February Revolution, returning home after 37 years in exile, Plekhanov opposed Lenin's party, which was leading the Russian working class to the victorious Great October Socialist Revolution. Plekhanov died on 30 May 1918 in Finland, in tragic estrangement and oblivion.

Soon after his death Ye. D. Stasova, the noted leader of our party, wrote to K. T. Novgorodtseva (Sverdlova): "Plekhanov is gone. He was a major figure of the past and I believe that we should note his role in the history of the foundation of the party. . . . It would be proper to publish his biography as a separate book and include a popular outline in BEDNOTA." Since then a number of articles and books have been written on Plekhanov. Works of a biographic nature have been published as well. However, this did not include a biography in strict meaning of the term. This gap is filled by the book by M. Iovchuk and I. Kurbatova "Plekhanov."

The authors have been able to describe in an easy, clear, and consistent style the extremely saturated life of one of the most significant personalities of our homeland and his life, full of difficulties, contradictions, and ups and downs, "woven into the fabric of world history" (p 335).

When in the era of rapidly developing capitalism and establishment of the Russian working class, Plekhanov looked at Marxism, the seeds of that doctrine fell on cultivated soil and, subsequently, yielded outstanding results. N. G. Chernyshevskiy's theory, which had reached the peak of pre-Marxian socialism, was of particularly great importance. The high theoretical level of Russian social thinking and the revolutionary qualities of the Russian proletariat, profoundly described by Plekhanov on the basis of his personal impressions in his work "The Russian Worker in the Revolutionary Movement," were the decisive reasons which accelerated Plekhanov's conversion from populism to Marx's and Engels' scientific socialism. From the first days of his revolutionary activities, he worked in the plants and factories of Petersburg. Subsequently, he himself acknowledged that contacts with progressive workers prepared him to accept and master Marxism.

The evolution of Plekhanov's views is depicted particularly dramatically in the first chapter of the book, entitled "Beginning of the Road. Populism and Conversion to Marxism." Particularly good are the sections tracing the split within the "Land and Freedom" movement,Georgiy Valentinovich's withdrawal from its Voronezh Congress, his firm opposition to terrorism, and his famous aphorism: ". . . A parliament cannot be built on the point of a dagger" (p. 40). He split from such populist leaders as Andrey Zhelyabov and Sof'ya Perovskaya. What were the sources of this ideological firmness and courage, and what was Plekhanov's advantage compared with these heroes who, soon afterwards, reached their golgotha inflexibly and proudly? More than anyone else, Plekhanov and the Black Redistributionists, who supported him, were convinced, more firmly than ever, of the decisive role of the masses, and of the senselessness of any revolutionary struggle that would not awaken the masses. This could not fail but act as a transitional link to a Marxist outlook.

The second chapter entitled "A Pioneer of Marxism in Russia" traces, step by step, the great 20 years in the course of which the philosopher selflessly dedicated his entire talent and energy to the theoretical substantiation and organizational foundation of the social democratic movement in Russia. Meanwhile, starting with the first constitutional congress of the Second International, and with F. Engels' direct and immediate support and help, Plekhanov emerged in the international arena and assumed one of the leading positions among Engels' and Marx's students.

In terms of historical significance to the Russian workers' movement, Lenin compared Plekhanov's first work "Socialism and the Political Struggle" with the "Communist Party Manifesto," which Plekhanov had translated into Russian on the eve of his break with populism. This work and the brilliant work which followed "Our Differences" were sharply rejected by most revolutionary populists. However, the ice of mistrust and rejection of Marxism, largely explained by the fact that it was unfamiliar to the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia, was broken. These works laid the beginning of promoting a revolutionary,a Marxist awareness among the strengthening Russian industrial proletariat. A number of workers, among whom Plekhanov had begun his activities as a populist, followed his appeal and joined the initial social democratic organizations in Petersburg and other industrial centers in the country, and established relations with the "Liberation of Labor" group.

Plekhanov's Marxist works became known to Engels who rated particularly highly the article "On the 60th Anniversary of Hegel's Death," which he described as excellent. Engels paid great attention to Georgiy Valentinovich's articles on Chernyshevskiy, which subsequently became the basis for a book on the great Russian philosopher, published in German. Engels wrote to Plekhanov that, "I thank you in advance for the copy of your 'Chernychevskiy,' which I am awaiting impatiently" (p 119). The author was to organically link the biography with a study of Plekhanov's main works and, particularly, with "On the Development of the Monistic View on History," which was completed in London, near Engels' place, who offered Plekhanov the opportunity to use his library. Engels talked about Marx a great deal to the young Russian revolutionary and showed him the manuscripts of his great friend. Once, unable to find Engels home, Plekhanov left him a note which stated: "I consider my lifetime task to disseminate yours and Marx's ideas" (p 127). He brilliantly carried out this assignment. He was able to publish his book clandestinely in Russia. According to Lenin, an entire generation of Russian Marxists was raised with its help. In a number of other works as well Plekhanov gave models of the propaganda, defense, and development of Marxism, particularly in the then struggle against international revisionism, a characteristic form of which was "economism," which darkened the first steps of the social democratic movement in Russia.

We read with unabated attention and interest the parts describing Plekhanov's first encounter with Lenin and their joint work as editors of ISKRA. Plekhanov rated Lenin very highly. In a letter to his wife he wrote: "It is very lucky that we have such young people in our revolutionary movement" (p 138). Exiled in Shushenskoye, Vladimir Il'ich kept in touch with the

"Liberation of Labor" group, considering its activities as one of the necessary prerequisites for the implementation of his plan for the creation of a Marxist party in Russia.

The extent to which Lenin supported Plekhanov in his struggle against revisionism, both while in exile and following his return to Petersburg, may be judged, for example, by V. I. Zasulich's statement. She was in the capitol clandestinely and met with Lenin on several occasions. She wrote to Plekhanov that, ". . . I can describe Petrov's (Lenin's--the author) feeling toward you with the following part of a statement he made: 'Now they (the Bernsteinians) are quarreling with the orthodox, while I deliberately tell them that I am not only orthodox but a Plekhanovite as well'" (p 163).

The second meeting between Lenin and Plekhanov did not meet Lenin's hopes. The authors provide a thorough study of the stressed situation which developed. One of the reasons for it, the authors state, is "Plekhanov's difficult and ponderous nature and intolerant position not only toward enemies but comrades as well . . ." (pp 172-173). This attempt at describing Plekhanov's personality and mentality deserves close attention. Subsequently, in order to support it the authors use very profound statements by the oldest Bolshevik P. N. Lepeshinskiy. The need for it is obvious, particularly in answering the question of why and how did the subsequent break between Plekhanov and Lenin occur, a break which was fatal to Plekhanov and was very difficult for Lenin? Let us point out that the topic of "Lenin and Plekhanov" has long been awaiting a study. Extensive data on this topic may be found in Lenin's famous note on "How ISKRA [The Spark] Was Almost Extinguished," and in other of Lenin's works.

The story of Lenin's joint work with Plekhanov as ISKRA editors, the description of differences between them in drafting the party program and in the course of the sessions of the second RSDWP Congress, the study of the atmosphere which developed after the congress and of the reasons for the differences between Plekhanov and Lenin are as impressive and dramatic as the description of Plekhanov's withdrawal from the Land and Freedom Congress. Then, however, he committed an exploit whereas now, this was a fall from the tremendous height to which Plekhanov had soared when he opened the first session of the universal-historical second RSDWP Congress. The circumstances which developed within the party after the congress whose decisions were attacked with unparalleled lack of principle-mindedness by the Mensheviks and, among them, all of Plekhanov's fellow workers in the "Liberation of Labor" group, made him confused. Unable to withstand the stress of one of the most difficult and alarming periods in his life, in Lenin's words Plekhanov "became pitifully afraid of division and struggle" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 46, p 315).

Until very recently, all works on Plekhanov have described the period after 1905 as Menshevik. In the work under review, chapter three, discussing this matter, is entitled "A Particular Position." Plekhanov's personality and activities are too complex and conflicting to be assessed and characterized in simple terms. Even though at one point he was the fiercest of Mensheviks,

this did not prevent him from mercilessly criticizing other Mensheviks, particularly when they, by the logic of things, supported liquidationism. Criticizing the slanderous liquidationist anti-Bolshevik writings by Zhordaniya, Plekhanov wrote: "The Bolsheviks were not Blanquists but Marxists. . . . The article by An. is not merely a criticism of the old Bolshevism. It is the criticism of all views of the old ZARYA and ISKRA" ("Filosofsko-Literaturnoye Nasledіye G. V. Plekhanova" [G. V Plekhanov's Pilosophical-Literary Legacy], vol 1, Moscow, 1973, 96).

On the basis of Lenin's descriptions of Plekhanov and, particularly, Lenin's assessment of his philosophical legacy, the authors do not allow the extrapolation of Plekhanov's Menshevism to his philosophical works. Furthermore, they prove that even at that stage Plekhanov enriched Marxism, particularly in areas such as esthetics and the study of religion. His work "On So-Called Religious Search in Russia," as well as other writings directed against religious ideology, were of great importance to the defeat of God-searching and "God-construction." Criticism of religion was inseparably linked with the struggle against the anti-Marxist and profoundly reactionary Machist philosophy. At that time Lenin noted that "the Menshevik G. V. Plekhanov and the Bolshevik V. Il'in (Lenin--the author) were decisively fighting" this new form of philosophical revisionism whose epicenter turned to be in Russia ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 25, p 355). At that stage Plekhanov made a great contribution to the Marxist history of social thinking in the West and, particularly, in Russia.

The authors carefully treat everything contributed by Plekhanov to Marxism. We could say that, for the first time, their work offers a balanced assessment of such a tremendous work as the "History of Russian Social Thought." Entirely consistent with the truth, they state that Plekhanov, burdened by Menshevik errors and confusions, "nevertheless formulated from the positions of Marxist philosophy a number of important and complex problems of the history of domestic and world social philosophy" (p 305). The authors convincingly prove that the tremendous data used by Plekhanov in various realms of knowledge "left in science foundations which could (let us add, should--the author) be extended, developed, and embodied in new Marxist scientific works" (ibid). Particularly important in our view is the need to study more profoundly the tremendous contribution made by the best representatives of Russian social thinking to world culture and to the "continuity of relations between them and the Russian Marxists" (p 304). Relying on this time link, Plekhanov--the first Russian Marxist--assumed a firm position in history.

V. I. Lenin valued this more than anyone else and took all the necessary measures to immortalize Plekhanov's memory. On his suggestion, as early as 1921 the publication of Plekhanov's collected works was undertaken. The initiative was supported and approved with a resolution passed by the 11th party congress, which read: "The congress instructs the Central Committee to take measures insuring that the Marxist classics, above all Plekhanov's Marxist works, be published in the immediate future."

In 1921, on Lenin's suggestion, work was begun on a monument to G. V. Plekhanov, now erected in front of the building of the Technological Institute in Leningrad. On the third anniversary of Plekhanov's death, Vladimir Il'ich sent a note to the Petrograd Soviet requesting that everything necessary be done to help the sculptors. Soon afterwards, using the words of the great poet, Lenin erected a monument of the mind to the first Russian Marxist, stating that, ". . . One cannot be a conscientious, a true communist without studying, yes, precisely, studying, everything Plekhanov has written in the field of philosophy, for it is better than all other international Marxist literature" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 42, p 290).

Summing up their narration, the authors note: "Plekhanov wrote unforgetable pages of the chronicle of the history of Russian and world culture, enriching it with valuable philosophical and social works" (p 335). This is well put. However, on the very next page, they reach a conclusion which, it seems to us, conflicts with a great deal of the statements made in the book. They write that Plekhanov "remained on the level of the Marxism of the Second International, with its inherent limitations and deviations from revolutionary dialectics" (p 336). Yes, unlike Lenin, he was unable to interpret profoundly dialectically the course of social development in the 20th century and the latest scientific data, and raise to a new level the Marxist dialectical-materialistic concept. That is why his opportunism and political tragedy are, naturally, not accidental. However, at the same, Plekhanov was a fierce enemy of the thoroughly debased Marxism reached by the Second International.

The parties of the Second International betrayed Marxism, above all in the field of philosophy. The kernals of this betrayal were ripening already in Engels' lifetime and were severely criticized by him. However, renegades, Kautskiy in particular, were deaf to this criticism. Revisionism openly opposed Marxism soon after Engels' death. It was headed by Bernstein, who described himself as Engels' friend and who was proclaimed by the entire revisionist camarilla as Engels' ideological executor. Who was the first openly to oppose the revisionists? Who raised the gauntlet they threw down and answered with such blows that, to this day, the heirs of the opportunists of various schools recall Plekhanov with a shudder and hatred, proclaiming him a doctrinairian and a dogmatic?

We know that in his time Lenin described Plekhanov as the only Marxist in the international social democratic movement who fought the incredible baseness of revisionism from the positions of consistent dialectical materialism. This was said in 1908, in the period of the struggle against the new form of philosophical revisionism--Machism--supported by the Second International. "This must be even more decisively emphasized," Lenin wrote, "because today profoundly erroneous attempts are being made to promote the old and reactionary philosophical rubbish under the banner of criticizing Plekhanov's tactical opportunism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 17, p 20). No, as a philosopher Plekhanov does not fit in the least in the procrustean bed of the theoreticians of the Second International.

Including Plekhanov's works in the series of mandatory textbooks on communism, we must alway bear in mind that it is only in Lenin's works that Marxism

reached its new heights, for which reason it is justifiably known today as Marxism-Leninism. Naturally, studying Plekhanov, we must be familiar with everything in his works which Lenin considered acceptable and unacceptable. The merit of the authors of this book is their ability systematically and clearly to explain the nature of Lenin's approach to Plekhanov's legacy and clearly point out Plekhanov's errors and delusions.

We know that Plekhanov took a negative attitude toward the Great October Socialist Revolution, considering it premature, and claiming that "history has not as yet kneeded the flour of which the socialist pie could be baked." True, here again we must give his due, for when the people around, belonging to the "Unity" group began to predict the fast end of the soviets, Plekhanov answered then that the Bolsheviks have seized the power for a long time, perhaps forever. He also categorically and indignantly rejected any offer to join in the struggle against the Soviet system. When the infamous B. Savinkov turned to him with the suggestion to agree to become the head of the "leftist" government, in the case of a successful outcome of the conspiracy against the Soviet Government headed by Lenin, Plekhanov angrily answered: "I dedicated 40 years of my life to the proletariat and I am not about to shoot at it even if it follows the wrong way" (p 326). Furthermore, we know from Plekhanov's wife's memoirs that, on his death bed, his final words were, "Yes, in our entire common struggle, Lenin proved to be right and I, Plekhanov, proved to be wrong." The philosopher had sufficient strength and courage to acknowledge his political and ideological failure. Such an admission ascribes his personal tragedy even greater tension and depth. All this is properly described in the book's fourth chapter.

In conclusion, let us make a few necessary remarks.

The authors claim that "in Soviet science a proper attitude toward Plekhanov has been established finally and firmly" (p 642). Unfortunately, this is not exactly so. We still come across recurrences of "erroneous trends of a negativistic interpretation" (ibid) which, in their time, dominated the assessment of Plekhanov.

The claim that Lenin's instruction calling for including Plekhanov's philosophical works "in the series of mandatory textbooks on communism" is being fulfilled should be further refined and asserted. Suffice it to look at the current curricula on philosophy, scientific communism, and scientific atheism to see that his works are poorly represented. Equally inadequate is the publication of G. V. Plekhanov's works. Let us merely recall that in 1959 a subscription was launched for the six-volume work of his historical-sociological works (see VOPROSY FILOSOFII, No 12, 1959). However, the work was not published. Finally, the need is ripe to publish the complete academic collection of Plekhanov's works similar to the publication of the works of his great predecessors V. G. Belinskiy, A. I. Hertzen, and N. G. Chernyshevskiy. This publication was planned as early as the beginning of the 1920's by Lenin, when Plekhanov's heirs presented as a gift to the Soviet state the huge archives of the philosopher and his unique library.

The style of the book is good. Actually, it would be impossible to adopt a different style when writing of a Plekhanov. It is not in vain that the authors emphasize his outstanding literary skills. It would be pertinent here to recall that, completing his article "G. V. Plekhanov as a Literary Critic," A. V. Lunacharskiy wrote: "We must most carefully preserve our piety toward Plekhanov, about whom Lenin loved to say that he was 'a person of exceptional physical power of the brain,' and as a person with a truly tremendous culture. We must also add that in both his philosophical works--sociological, historical, and economic--as well as in his literary critical studies, Plekhanov introduced, along with amazing stylistic refinement, and talent of presentation, which placed him on the level of Belinskiy and Gertsen (a question of talent), the distinctive clarity which makes Plekhanov's works almost universally accessible and which makes it possible for almost anyone without any particular training to operate in the world of Plekhanov's concepts with tremendous usefulness. Today this is a universal obligation. One cannot defend a confused presentation of various matters with the statement that high-level problems cannot be interpreted in a "generally accessible language." This has been opposed by several great voices, first among them that of Plekhanov, as well as that of our leading teacher Lenin.

5003
CSO: 1802

BRIEF REVIEW OF BOOKS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 79 pp 114-116

[Text] V. I. Kulikov, "Istoricheskiy Opyt Osvoyeniya Tselinnykh Zemel'"[Historical Experience in the Development of the Virgin Lands], Mysl', Moscow, 1978, 353 pages. Reviewed by S. Popov, candidate of historical sciences.

The mass development of virgin and fallow lands has entered the history of our country as one of the outstanding accomplishments of the Soviet people. The book by V. I. Kulikov, a researcher in the field of CPSU agrarian policy, is dedicated to summing up the experience of the Leninist party--the inspirer and organizer of the virgin land epic.

The first chapter of the monograph convincingly proves that the very idea of developing the virgin land is based on the solid foundation of the Leninist theoretical legacy. V. I. Lenin considered the question of the land as one of the basic ones in agrarian policy. He paid serious attention to the elaboration of measures aimed at the fuller utilization of the available land. The percentage of unused farmland was particularly high in czarist Russia. The colonizing policy of czarism hindered the development of such land and promoted national discord and intensification of exploiting oppression. In order to utilize the neglected land, the land had to be made national property. The rapid development of production forces in the country, in the center and in its peripheries, had to be insured. Overthrowing the exploiting system, the October Revolution created the decisive prerequisites for a considerable expansion of the planted areas and for the planned development of the virgin land.

V. I. Lenin substantiated profoundly and comprehensively the need for putting in circulation the new lands. He organized and headed the work of the party in that direction.

Implementing the course drafted by Lenin, in the 1920's and 1930's the party developed in the virgin land areas a network of grain sovkhozes. It undertook the comprehensive collectivization of agriculture. Already in the prewar period the arable land of the country had been considerably expanded through the development of the steppe areas of Kazakhstan, the Urals, and Siberia.

The author considers the mass development of the virgin lands in the 1950's-1960's the further embodiment of the Leninist agrarian policy.

The idea of mounting a mass assault on the virgin lands, as the author proves, was expressed after the September 1953 CC CPSU Plenum at party aktivs and conferences, and plenums of oblast and kray party committees. The initiative of the broad masses and suggestions formulated by the party organizations and the scientists were approved by the February-March 1954 Central Committee Plenum. Following the party's call, between 1954 and 1956 20,000 families moved to Kazakhstan and over 60,000 to Siberia and the Far East. The Komsomol organizations throughout the country sent to the virgin lands detachments of volunteers.

In order to guide the implementation of the tasks formulated by the party and insure the practical organization of the development of the virgin lands, the Central Committee assigned to Kazakhstan Comrade L. I. Brezhnev whose great energy and purposeful organizational and political activities made a tremendous contribution to the solution of the complex and major problems which arose in the development of the new lands and of the economy and culture of the republic. The virgin land pioneers justifiably describe Leonid Il'ich as the commander in chief of the virgin land front. The unforgettable events of those years are vividly depicted in his outstanding book "Tselina" [Virgin Land]. "In the virgin lands," the author states, "millions of Soviet people continued the experience of the revolution, multiplying under the new historical conditions its gains, and through their living experience engaged in the victorious building of developed socialism."

Success was largely determined by the availability of the necessary material and technical base for the development of the virgin land. The virgin land areas were given over 200,000 tractors, which in 1954 was one-sixth of the country's tractor fleet (p 129); the saturation of the virgin land sovkhozes with powerful agricultural equipment, the author writes, was considerably higher from the very first days of their organization compared with traditional farming areas.

However, the decisive condition for the victory in this unparalleled battle for grain was the heroic toil of the Soviet people. The outstanding working people who grew up on the virgin lands is one of the main topics of the work. The author describes the labor valor of V. Khimich, M. Dovzhik, A. Pochtarev, and many others. The homeland highly rated the exploit of the virgin land workers. A total of 272 conquerors of the virgin lands were awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labor; 26,965 people were awarded orders and medals (p 153).

The final section of the book deals with present accomplishments and concerns of grain growers in the virgin lands. Many basic problems of the new stage of development of agriculture in the virgin land areas, which began with the March 1965 CC CPSU Plenum, were resolved in accordance with latest scientific and technical achievements. This applies, above all, to the development of chemization and reclamation, and the creation of a soil-protecting farming system.

Over the past 24 years Kazakhstan alone has supplied the homeland with 250 million tons of grain. However, this does not exhaust the significance of conquering the virgin lands. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted, here a "gigantic agro-industrial complex was created, whose influence powerfully affected the development of the entire economy of the country. The virgin land epic of this land proved, once again, to the entire world the most noble moral qualities of the Soviet people."

The tremendous success of the party's agrarian policy is depicted in the book on the basis of extensive factual data, a considerable share of which is introduced into scientific circulation for the first time. This increases the value of the monograph, which has already earned the recognition of the readers.

> "Zdravnitsy Profsoyuzov SSR: Kurorty, Sanatorii, Pansionaty i Doma Otdykha" [USSR Trade Union Health Institutions: Resorts, Sanatoriums, Boarding Houses, and Rest Homes]. Edited by I. I. Kozlov. 5th revised and expanded edition. Profizdat, Moscow, 1979, 688 pages. Reviewed by V. Ivanovskiy

The publication of this book has been timed for the 60th anniversary of the Council of People's Commissars decree, signed by V. I. Lenin, "On Treatment Sites of National Importance" (4 April 1919). In detail and using extensive factual data, the work sums up the development of our sanatorium-resort system. It provides basic information on the very rich possibilities offered by nature in the country to help in the treatment of various ailments: mineral springs, considerable in terms of number and varied in terms of chemical composition and healing action, medicinal mud deposits, and numerous areas with favorable weather conditions used for the restoration and strengthening of human health.

Thanks to the constant concern of the Communist Party and Soviet Government for the health of the working people, in our country resort work has assumed a truly tremendous scale. The figures of this growth are the following: from 60 sanatoriums in pre-revolutionary Russia to 14,000 sanatoriums, rest homes, boarding houses, prophylactic institutions, and other health establishments.

In the Ninth Five-Year Plan alone 230 million people were treated and rested in health institutions. This five-year plan their number will exceed 300 million. This is a clear indicator of the universal accessibility of our health institutions, which offer their services largely free of charge or with substantial cost discounts.

The network of sanatoriums and rest institutions, described in detail in this publication, today covers not only the widely known southern resorts of the Crimea and Caucasus, but health institutions in Siberia, the Urals, the Far East, Kazakhstan, Central Asia, and the central oblasts of Russia and the Baltic. Today each republic uses favorable natural characteristics to promote the health of the people. This has made it possible to bring

specialized sanatorium-resort aid closer to the population and save many working people from unnecessary and, occasionally difficult and harmful trips from one weather zone to another.

In the 10th Five-Year Plan the sanatorium-resort areas on the shores of the Black and Azov seas, the Carpathian Mountains, the Riga coast, Georgia, and Azerbaijan are being improved and considerably expanded. During the five-year plan facilities for another 30,500 people will be completed in the health institutions of the trade unions in Siberia, the Urals, and the Far East, or twice the number completed in the 9th Five-Year Plan, costing 180 million rubles. All in all, over the five-year plan facilities for 80,000 will be commissioned, including 58,000 in sanatoriums and boarding houses offering medical treatment. Between 1976 and 1980 the overall volume of capital investments for the construction of sanatorium-resort projects by the trade unions will reach one billion rubles.

The book describes the scientific foundations of the Soviet system of sanatorium-resort treatment in which the scientific research institutes of resort treatment and physio-therapy, and medical and other institutes and organizations have made a major contribution. Within this system scientists and highly skilled specialists are studying ways for upgrading the effectiveness of resort treatment and recreation and for improving treatment methods. The Soviet trade unions are doing extensive work to develop the system of sanatorium-resort treatment. Implementing the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures to Improve Further Public Health Care," the trade unions, in particular, are doing today a great deal to organize the recovery of patients who have suffered acute infarct of the myocardium, and to broaden the network of sanatoriums accepting parents with children, and specialized sanatorium pioneer camps operating on a year-round basis.

A separate chapter grades the country's resorts, giving data on the main treatment factors at their disposal, types of specialized sanatoriums and their purpose, and the amount of time required for sanatorium-resort treatment.

A big section of the book provides medical indications and counterindications for assigning patients (adults and adolescents) to resorts and sanatoriums. The detailed recommendations contained in this section on the type of resort that a person should be assigned in the case of one or another illness will be not only useful to physicians but will help trade union workers to supervise the proper assignment of patients to health institutions.

The final part of the book contains the rules approved by the USSR Ministry of Health, coordinated with the AUCCTU showing the procedure for medical selections for sanatorium and resort-outpatient treatment, the registration of patients in sanatoriums and resort polyclinics, the determination and evacuation of patients for whom sanatorium treatment is counterindicated, and the procedure governing medical selection for sanatorium treatment of adolescents, children, and parents with children.

Unquestionably, the new expanded edition of this work will be useful to many readers. It will help them to resolve more accurately problems related to the organization of their sanatorium-resort treatment and rest, and determine how to spend their leave better. The book "Zdravnitsy Profsoyuzov SSR" is also an expressive description of one of the facets of the Soviet way of life, concretely and convincingly describing the tremendous attention paid in our country to human health.

5003
CSO: 1802

BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 79 pp 117-118

[Text] "V. I. Lenin, KPSS o Normakh Partiynoy Zhizni i Printsipakh Partiynogo Rukovodstva" [V. I. Lenin and the CPSU on the Norms of Party Life and Principles of Party Leadership]. Collection compiled by V. Ya. Bondar (in charge), S. I. Yelkina, and N. V. Krestnikova. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 575 pp.

"V. I. Lenin, KPSS ob Intelligentsii" [V. I. Lenin and the CPSU on the Intelligentsia]. Collection compiled by S. A. Fedyukin, I. K. El'darova. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 295 pp.

"Vospominaniya o Vladimire Iliche Lenine" [Recollections on Vladimir Il'ich Lenin]. In five volumes. Second edition. Editors, G. N. Golikov et al. Second volume prepared by V. A. Chanova and K. A. Ostroukhova. Vol 2. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 496 pp.

"O Dal'neyshem Uluchshenii Ideologicheskoy, Politiko-Vospitatel'noy Raboty" [On Further Improvements in Ideological and Political-Educational work]. CPSU Central Committee Decree of 26 April 1979. Politizdat, Moscow,1979, 496 pp.

Brezhnev, L. I. "Leninskim Kursom" [The Leninist Course]. Speeches, greetings, articles, and memoirs. Vol 7. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 672 pp.

Brezhnev, L. I. "KPSS v Bor'be za Yedinstvo Vsekh Revolyutsionnykh i Mirolyubivykh Sil" [The CPSU in the Struggle for the Unity of All Revolutionary and Peace-Loving Forces]. Second expanded edition. Mysl', Moscow, 1979, 493 pp. (Workers Movement Series)

"Vizit Prezidenta Frantsii V. Zhiskar d'Estena v Sovetskiy Soyuz, 26-28 Aprelya 1979 Goda" [Visit of French President V. Giscard d'Estaing to the Soviet Union on 26-28 April 1979]. Documents and materials. A. M. Aleksandrov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 64 pp.

"Vizit Druzhby i Bratstva" [A Visit of Friendship and Brotherhood]. Visit to Hungary of the Soviet government-party delegation headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU CC general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, 30 May-1June 1979. Speeches, documents, materials. A. M. Aleksandrov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 47 pp.

"Vizit Prem'yer-Ministra Indii M. Desai v Sovietskiy Soyuz, 10-14 Iyunya 1979 Goda" [Visit to the Soviet Union of Indian Prime Minister M. Desai on 10-14 June 1979]. Documents and materials. Ye. M. Samoteykin in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 31 pp.

"Radi Zhizni na Zemle" [For the Sake of Peace on Earth]. Soviet-American Summit Meeting in Viena, 15-18 June 1979. Documents, speeches and materials. A. M. Aleksandrov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 72 pp.

Romanov, G. V. "Moguchaya Sozidatel'naya Sila Sotsialisticheskogo Sorevnovaniya" [The Powerful Constructive Force of Socialist Competition]. Report to the 12 April 1979 All-Union Practical Science Conference. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 32 pp.

Aliyev, G. A. "Formirovaniye Aktivnoy Zhiznennoy Pozitsii: Opyt i Aktual'nyye Problemy Nravstvennogo Vospitaniya" [Shaping an Active Life Stance: Problems of Moral Upbringing]. Report to the 25 April 1979 All-Union Practical Science Conference. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 61 pp.

Vorozheykin, I. Ye. "Letopis' Trudovogo Geroizma" [Labor Heroism Chronicle]. Short history of socialist competition in the USSR, 1917-1977. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 326 pp.

Gots, G. S. "Na Glavnom Napravlenii" [Along the Main Direction]. Profizdat, Moscow, 1978, 232 pp.

"V'yetnam na Puti Stroitel'stva Sotsializma" [Vietnam on the Path of the Building of Socialism]. Authors' collective. Editor in Chief M. Ye. Trigubenko. Nauka, Moscow, 1979, 256 pp.

"Zapadnoyevropeyskaya Integratsiya i Mirovaya Ekonomika" [Western European Integration and the World's Economy]. A collective monograph by scientists from Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, the USSR and Czechoslovakia. Authors: M. M. Maksimova (USSR) et al. Editors: Kh. Nokov (Bulgaria) et al. Mysl', Moscow, 1979, 350 pp.

"Istoriya Mezhdunarodnykh Otnosheniy i Vneshney Politiki SSSR. 1968-1978" [History of USSR International Relations and Foreign Policy, 1968-1978]. Editor in Chief N. I. Lebedev. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1979, 374 pp.

Kaydalov, D. P. and Suimenko, Ye. I. "Psikhlogiya Yedinonachaliya i Kollegial'nosti" [Psychology of One-Man Command and Collective Management]. Problems of the theory and practice of interaction between the leader and the collective. Mysl', Moscow, 1979, 254 pp.

Kalin, I. P. "Partiynoye Rukovodstvo Vospitatel'nym Protsessom" [Party Management of the Education Process]. (Experience of the Modavian Communist Party). Kartya Moldovenyaske, Kishinev, 1979, 224 pp.

Kamshalov, A. I. "Otkryvaya Mir" [Discovering the World]. Molodaya Gvardiya, Moscow, 1979, 256 pp.

"Kitay. Poiski Putey Sotsial'nogo Razvitiya" [China. The Search for Social Development Ways]. From the history of 20th Century sociopolitical thought. Editor in Chief L. P. Delyusin. Nauka, Moscow, 1979, 245 pp.

"Kompleksnyy Podkhod v Ideologicheskoy Rabote" [Comprehensive Approach to Ideological Work]. Collection compiled by V. A. Smirnov and P. P. Khil'kevich. Moskovskiy Rabochiy, Moscow, 1979, 272 pp.

"Ocherk Istorii Kommunisticheskoy Partii Chekhoslovakii" [Outline of the History of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia]. Translated from the Czech. Translation Editor in Chief S. I. Kolesnikov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 430 pp.

"Protokoly Prezidiuma Gosplana za 1921-1922 Gody" [Minutes of the Gosplan Presidium for 1921-1922]. Editor in Chief N. I. Rogovskiy. Vol 2. "Protokoly Orezidiuma Gosplana za 1922 God" [Minutes of the Gosplan Presidium for 1922]. Book 2. Compiled by Z. K. Zvezdin, S. R. Levina, and N. I. Levchenko. Ekonomika, Moscow, 1979, 239 pp.

"Razvitoye Sotsialisticheskoye Obshchestvo: Sushchnost', Kriterii Zrelosti, Kritika Revizioniststskikh Kontseptsiy" [Developed Socialist Society: Nature, Maturity Criteria, Criticism of Revisionist Concepts]. Third expanded and revised edition. Authors' collective headed by G. Ye. Glezerman (USSR) and O. Rheingold (GDR). Mysl', Moscow, 1979, 599 pp.

Rakhmaninov, Yu. N. "Problema Yevropeyskoy Bezopasnosti: Istoricheskiy Opyt Eye Resheniya. 1917-1977 g." [The Problem of European Security: Historical Experience Regarding its Resolution, 1917-1977]. Mysl', Moscow, 1979, 350 pp.

"Regional'nyye Sotsial'no-Ekonomicheskiye Issledovaniya v Stranakh SEV" [Regional Socioeconomic Studies in CEMA-Member Countries]. International monograph. General Editors N. N. Nekrasov and Yu. S. Shiryayev. Mysl', Moscow, 1979, 272 pp.

"Rukovodyashchaya Rol' KPSS v Usloviyakh Razvitogo Sotsializma" [Leading Role of the CPSU Under Developed Socialist Conditions]. Editor in Chief A. F. Yudenkov. Mysl', Moscow, 1979, 327 pp. (Socialism: Experience. Problems. Prospects.)

"Slovo o Magnitke" [Magnitka Story]. Compiled by N. Kartashov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 223 pp.

"Sovershenstvovaniye Khozyaystvennogo Rascheta Ob'yedineniy na Sovremennom Etape" [Improving Association Cost Accounting at the Present Stage]. Leading experience and problems. Edited by P. G. Bunich. Ekonomika, Moscow, 1979, 271 pp.

"Sozidatel'naya Sila Sotsialisticheskogo Sorevnovaniya" [The Constructive Power of Socialist Competition]. Based on the materials of the All-Union Practical Science Conference held in Leningrad on 12-14 April 1979. General Editor Ye. M. Tyazhel'nikov. Pravda, Moscow, 1979, 351 pp. (Experience and topical problems of ideological work).

"Sotsialisticheskiy Internatsionalizm" [Socialist Internationalism]. Theory and practice in international relations of a new type. Collective monograph by scientists from Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Mongolia, Poland, the USSR and Czechoslovakia. Editor in Chief S. Angelov (Bulgaria). Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 422 pp. (Socialism: Experience. Problems. Prospects. International series).

"SSSR" [USSR]. Encyclopedic reference. Editor in Chief A. M. Prokhorov. Sovetskaya Entsiklopedia, Moscow, 1979, 575 pp.

"SSSR v Tsifrakh v 1978 Godu" [The USSR in Figures in 1978]. Short statistical collection. L. A. Umanskiy in charge of publication. Statistika, Moscow, 1979, 239 pp.

"SSSR i Soyuznyye Respubliki v 1978 g." [The USSR and the Union Republics in 1978]. Announcement of the USSR Central Statistical Administration and the central statistical administrations of union republics on the results of the fulfillment of the 1978 State Plan for Economic and Social Development. Statistika, Moscow, 1979, 285 pp.

"S Chego Nachinayetsya Lichnost' [Beginnings of the Personality]. R. I. Kosolapov general editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 238 pp.

"SEV: Mezhdunarodnoye Znacheniye Sotsialisticheskoy Integratsii" [CEMA: International Significance of Socialist Integration]. Collective monograph edited by K. I. Mikul'skiy. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1979, 320 pp.

Farkas, E. "Moral' i Revolyutsionnost" [Morality and Revolutionism]. Thoughts on K. Marx's and F. Engels' ethical legacy. Translated from the Hungarian by M. A. Hevesi. Russian edition edited by A. I. Titarenko. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 168 pp.

Cherneyko, G. A. "Narodnaya Respublika Bolgariya" [The Bulgarian People's Republic]. Reference. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 120 pp.

Shishkina, A. F. "Chelovecheskaya Priroda i Nravstvennost' [Human Nature and Morality]. Historical-critical essay. Mysl', Moscow, 1979, 268 pp.

Shishkov, Yu. V. "Formirovaniye Integratsionnogo Kompleksa v Zapadnoy Yevrope: Tendentsii i Protivorechiya" [Establishment of the Integration Complex in Western Europe: Trends and Contradictions]. Nauka, Moscow, 1979, 343 pp.

5003
CSO: 1802

JOURNAL'S MAIL IN 1979

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, July 79 pp 119-123

[Text] In the first half of the year KOMMUNIST received over 1,000 pieces of mail. They included 115 articles, notes, essays, over 110 answers to items published in the journal, over 180 questions and wishes addressed to the editors, and about 600 statements and petitions by citizens.

The working people in our country inseparably link their interests and labor with the interests of the socialist society and the Soviet state. They participate most directly in production management, and the development of the economy and of social processes. Among the forms of participation of the citizens in the administration of governmental and social affairs, as stipulated in the USSR Constitution, letters and statements addressed to the central and local party, state, and public organs, newspapers, periodicals, the television, and the radio play an important role. Today there is no event in the life of our homeland, in the international arena, and in the field of political, economic, cultural, scientific, and theoretical problems not reflected in the letters sent by the Soviet people. They respond like a sensitive barometer to the most vital problems of the day, profoundly and comprehensively expressing public opinion.

In June, when the attention of the entire world was focused on the Soviet-American summit meeting in Vienna, a great percentage of the letters to the editors expressed warm approval of the consistent peaceful Leninist foreign policy of the Communist Party and the activities of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, in his talks with U.S. President J. Carter, and the signing of SALT II. The letters were sent by workers, kolkhoz members, men of science and culture, and party and soviet workers who expressed their profound gratitude to Comrade L. I. Brezhnev for his personal contribution to the successful completion of the Vienna summit meeting, emphasizing that an event long awaited by the Soviet people and by all persons wanting a lasting peace on earth had taken place.

A number of letters received by the editors in recent months have expressed their approval of the CC CPSU decree "On Improving Further Ideological and

Political-Educational Work." Party workers, propagandists, and lecturers note the particular importance of this document as an important landmark in the ideologocial and political activities of the party in the education of the new man under developed socialist conditions, describing the specific measures taken by the party organizations for the implementation of the Central Committee's decree.

The study of the letters, statements, and materials received by the editors over the past six months confirm, as in the past, the close unity existing between the party and the people, and the high rating which the Soviet people give to all measures of the CC CPSU and Soviet Government in domestic and foreign policy, their loyalty to the ideals of communism, and their aspiration to implement the stipulations of the 25th party congress.

In a number of articles, notes, and essays received by the editors the authors raise questions of party and nationwide significance. A number of materials contain theoretical elaborations on a great variety of problems of Marxist-Leninist science, contemporary international communist and workers' movements, and the anti-imperialist and the national-liberation struggle, as well as specific suggestions aimed at upgrading the effectiveness of our economy, improving production management, upgrading the quality of the work, resolving problems of social and cultural construction, raising the level of political, organizational, and ideological activities of party committees, etc.

For example, N. I. Alekseyev, candidate of philosophical sciences and head of sector at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Research (Moscow), considers problems related to the planning of housing construction in our country in the immediate and more distant future, and submits suggestions on the procedure for the distribution of capital investments for such construction among ministries, departments, and local soviet organs. N. S. Nazarova, docent at the scientific communism chair, Odessa Polytechnical Institute, analyzes the role of mass-information media in the ideological and political education of the youth. V. P. Dombrovskiy, an engineer from Vil'nyus, sent an article on the struggle against philistinism and philistine mentality. A. N. Burov, candidate of economic sciences from Karaganda, discusses in his letter problems of the social development of the socialist society at the present stage. P. Ye. Kuznetsov, candidate of historical sciences and deputy chief of chair at the Military Academy of Rear and Transportation (Leningrad) writes on the methodology of the comprehensive approach to the ideological process in our society. This very short enumeration proves the scope of the spectrum of topics received by KOMMUNIST editors. The most topical materials presenting a profound interpretation of the topic and written in a proper literary style were published by the journal. This includes the articles by Z. Kalacheva "For the Sake of Living and Working Better . . ." (No 4, 1979); V. Kelle "Theory of Ideology and Ideological Activity" (No 5, 1979); A. Laurinchyukas "Influence of the Printed Word"; Dzh. Tursunov "A Single Fate and Common Concerns"; D. Yepiskoposov "On the Formulation of Single Curriculum for the Teaching of the Social Sciences" (No 8, 1979), and others. Other materials have been prepared for future publication.

Naturally, it is impossible to print in the journal all materials received. The most valuable suggestions and critical remarks expressed by the readers have been used in the formulation of long-term topic plans by the editors, and the writing of editorials. Some authors were given recommendations and advice on further work on their topics.

The editors of KOMMUNIST always await impatiently the response to articles they publish. The read such letters with great interest and thank the authors for their good words, support, advice, and critical remarks, wishes, and suggestions. Their authors are the readers of our journal, people practicing different professions, of different ages, and social status. V. V. Gridnev has been CPSU member since 1918 and is retired (Moscow); V. M. Rozhko is a worker at the Sergeyevskiy Sovkhoz, Okoneshnikovskiy Rayon, Omskaya Oblast; N. V. Ivanchuk is a candidate of philosophical sciences and docent at the Ural State University imeni A. M. Gor'kiy (Sverdlovsk); M. Ya. Gamburg is an engineer in Izhevsk; G. N. Sharlay is a party propagandist in Dnepropetrovsk, etc. Their views on the content of the materials published in KOMMUNIST are one of the sources of objective information on the interests and demands of the readers and their attitude toward the journal. This information is needed by the editors in pursuing their regular work.

A number of articles, essays, and letters published in the journal this year and last have triggered the lively and active reaction of the readers. They include the letters to the editors sent by I. Gvozdarev, A. Popov, N. Proskuryakov "Greater Attention to the Quality of the Cement" (No 3, 1978); a selection of letters to the editors entitled "On the Responsibility of the Printed Word" (No 4, 1978); the essay by F. Rodionov on a topic suggested by the readers, "Backwoods" (No 18, 1978); articles by V. Dobrik "Problems of Ideological Work in the Center of Attention," and M. S. Umakhanov "Unity of International and Atheistic Education: Experience and Problems" (No 5, 1979); G. Sonin "Let Us Work Without Laggards with Stressed Plans!" G. Volkov "Uncounted in Russia"; the letter by Vl. Gakov and N. Mikhaylovska "Cautiously with History" (No 8, 1979), etc.

The editors express their thanks to the authors of the materials and to those who have responded to KOMMUNIST publications, sharing their thoughts and expressing their own views on the problems discussed. We hope that our creative relations will continue to strengthen in the future.

Every day the mail brings letters from the readers containing problems of a political and theoretical nature and requests to explain more extensively and, frequently, in a more popular style, one or another concept of an article or document published by the journal. With every passing year the number of questions submitted to the editors is rising. This confirms the growing social activeness of the Soviet people and the intensification and expansion of their theoretical interests in the fields of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, political economy, history, scientific communism, and domestic and foreign party policy at the present stage.

Answering the readers' questions and offering consultations is a structural aspect of the work of the editors. That is why every day answers to the

working people are mailed to various parts of the country. We shall continue to see to it that not a single question remains without an answer, using for purposes of the study and comment on editorial mail scientists, and party, soviet, and economic workers, as recommended by the CC CPSU.

V. I. Lenin considered the letters of the working people not only one of the most important forms of extensive ties between the party and the masses but a factual method of control of the course of the building of socialism and the activities of economic and social organizations, as well as a source of reliable information on the moods of the masses and their attitude toward the measures adopted by the Soviet system. The Leninist principles, style, content, and methods of work with the letters and statements by the working people remain the basis of the activities of party and state organs.

Over one-half of the letters, statements, and petitions received by the editors pertain to various aspects of the activities of the local party, soviet, economic, and social organs and organizations, and industrial, construction, transportation, trade, and consumer services enterprises. Noting the successes achieved in many fields of the national economy, the authors also expose existing shortcomings and raise questions of upgrading social production effectiveness and work quality and submit constructive suggestions. About 600 such communications have been directed by the editors to central departments and to local party, soviet, and economic organs for action. The received answers confirm the attentive and responsive attitude taken by the party committees and state organs to question raised in the letters to KOMMUNIST.

Thus, Ye. V. Yegorova, a worker at the sugar packing shop of the Chechen-Ingush Republic Rosbakaleya Office, turned to the editors with the complaint that the proper sanitation conditions had not been created for the shop's collective; leading workers and specialists rarely visit the workers; they do not deliver lectures; the shop does not have its own trade union organization or labor disputes commission; office manager Yu. S. Samkhadov violates labor legislation. M. A. Dorokhov, secretary of the Chechen-Ingushskaya Oblast party committee, reported to the editors that the obkom had investigated on the site the facts and taken proper measures: political-educational work has been intensified in the shop's collective; a shop trade union organization has been set up and all improper administrative orders have been annulled. Samkhadov was given a party and administrative punishment for violations of labor laws. With a view to improving production and sanitation conditions, the construction of a new shop was undertaken, to be commissioned by the end of the year.

The editors are continuing to receive reports by the working people on violations committed by individual officials. The editors institute particular control over such officials and, as a rule, their answers to us are thorough. The local party and state organs take effective measures toward individuals who violate the norms of party life, try to circumvene Soviet laws, and ignore the principles of socialist morality. For example, the Ivanovskaya Oblast CPSU Committee reported to us that the letter of a

group of kolkhoz members on the improper behavior of N. D. Korchagin, chairman of the Iskra Kolkhoz, Kineshemskiy Rayon, who abused his official position, was checked and the facts cited were fully confirmed. The bureau of the Kineshemskiy Rayon party committee issued Korchagin a strict reprimand, entered in his party card, and removed him from his position.

Following the report of Sh. Shugaibov, the Khasavyurtovskiy Rayon party committee strictly reprimanded R. Kadiyev, director of the Experimental Farm imeni Kirov, recorded in his party card, and relieved him from his position; P. Umashev, chairman of the rayon consumer union, and A. Shakhbulatov, chairman of the Batayurt Village Soviet, were fired for abusing their official positions. A criminal case has been instigated against them and an investigation is underway.

Occasionally, the editors receive letters of different nature. Thus, last April a commission set up by the Main Administration of Secondary Specialized Schools of the RSFSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and the Baumanskiy Rayon party committee, in Moscow, investigated a report on violations of the laws and of instructions issued by superior organs, and abuses allegedly occurring at the Moscow Correspondence Instrument Manufacturing Technical School. In the course of the investigation the commission members talked to 30 workers, read hundreds of pages of different documents and . . . failed to find proof of the facts reported by the plaintiff. The results of the investigation were discussed at a general meeting of the technical school's collective, which resolved that all the claims contained in the statement were inaccurate.

Unfortunately, such letters are not isolated cases. This leads to the view that some authors of letters to the editors or to other central organs do not seriously consider the substantiation and accuracy of judgments and assessments to which they intend to draw the attention. As a result, many such statements interrupt the work of dozens of people who must investigate the report. Furthermore, how unpleasant are the experiences befalling those groundlessly accused of unseemly actions!

The authors of a number of letters complained that they have repeatedly turned to the local organs on one or another matter, all without results. Following the intervention of the editors a positive solution was reached by those same local organs on most petitions. Such was the case of the statements submitted by M. A. Khadartseva from Ordzhonikidze, R. G. Shamoyan from Yerevan, I. P. Saprykin from the Pyatigorskiy Settlement in Stavropol'skiy Kray, and some other comrades. These facts prove that some local organizations adopt a formalistic attitude toward the statements and petitions of the citizens, which leads to further complaints addressed to the central organizations.

A large number of complaints continue to be received for the unjustified delays on the part of officials in considering letters and statements, red tape, and formal bureaucratic replies. Obviously, it would be proper to remind such individuals of the requirements of the CC CPSU decree "On

Improving Further Work with the Letters of the Working People in the Light of the Decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress." Under the conditions of the systematic development of socialist democracy and of strengthening the ties between the party and the masses, the decree states, improving further the work with the letters of the working people and comprehensively perfecting the ways and means of such work become ever more important. The entire personnel of the administrative apparatus must approach the study of each letter responsibly, attentively, principle-mindedly, and efficiently, and consider respectfully the views and requirements of the citizens. The heads of enterprises, organizations, establishments,kolkhozes, and sovkhozes must consider the letters of the working people, as a rule, within no more than one month and notify on time the authors of the letters of the results of the consideration of their suggestions and petitions. The decree makes it incumbent upon party, soviet, and economic organs to take strict punitive measures against officials who violate the established procedure of handling letters by the working people and allow a formulistic-bureaucratic approach to their consideration.

Similar requirements are found in the CC CPSU decree on ideological and political-educational work. The fournal's editors will continue to act in accordance with the instructions of our party's Central Committee and encourage the mandatory adoption and publication of practical measures based on critical reports submitted by KOMMUNIST readers.

Occasionally, an anonymous letter will find its way in the flow of such correspondence. However, we are pleased to note that such "messages" are becoming ever less frequent. This is directly related to the fact that the Soviet people are becoming ever more conscious of being masters of the country, and of the truly great democratic rights of Soviet citizens, codified in the USSR Constitution.

At every step life proves that the Communist Party and the Soviet state place the interests of the working people higher than anything. For this reason any case of injustice, or persecution for criticism allowed by individuals does not remain unpunished. The sensitive and attentive attitude toward the needs and requests of the citizens and an efficient procedure for the consideration of letters and statements is a mandatory norm governing the activities of all units of the party and state apparatus. This guarantees the fullest possible implementation of the principles of socialist democracy and the exercise of the rights of the Soviet person.

5003
CSO: 1802

FOLLOWING THE PUBLICATIONS IN KOMMUNIST

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 79 pp 124-128

[Text] At the All-Russian Council of Kolkhozes

Recently SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and SEL'SKAYA ZHIZN' carried a report on the work of the All-Russian Council of Kolkhozes which stated: "The All-Russian Council of Kolkhozes supported and decided to disseminate extensively the patriotic initiative of the Rossiya Kolkhoz in Kaluzhskaya Oblast of working without laggards and on the basis of intensive plans."

The essence of this matter is as follows:

KOMMUNIST number 8 carried a letter by Hero of Socialist Labor G. I. Sonin, chairman of the Rossiya Kolkhoz in Kozel'skiy Rayon, Kaluzhskaya Oblast, and a survey of the conference of the aktiv of the rayon party organization where topical problems of the further development of the socialist competition among rural workers were discussed.

As was reported to us from Kozel'sk, meetings were held in all 15 kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the rayon, at which the materials published in KOMMUNIST were discussed. Cooperation and mutual aid contracts were initialed between collectives of leading and lagging farms and higher socialist pledges were adopted. They call for increasing the production of agricultural commodities per 100 hectares of farmland, raising labor productivity, reducing production costs, and insuring production profitability. New labor competitiveness conditions were drafted according to which the winners will be determined on a monthly basis in accordance with the overall results of the work of each of the six competing farm groups. The working people of Kozel'skiy Rayon unanimously supported the patriotic initiative of the Rossiya Collective and actively joined the struggle for upgrading economic effectiveness in each kolkhoz sector.

In order to surmount the lagging of individual farms and to enable each collective to fulfill its stressed production plan, the rayon party organization formulated and is implementing a set of political-educational, organizational, and economic measures. Two political days were held in the rayon on the topic of the patriotic initiative of the Rossiya Kolkhoz. In this

connection, 85 lecturers and speakers were sent out by the rayon party committee to kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and industrial enterprises. The temporary party groups and agitation collectives set up in the decisive sectors of sovkhozes and kolkhozes launched active efforts to intensify the effectiveness of the socialist competition. Starting with the new school year particular attention will be paid within the party education system to the economic training of cadres, maintaining close ties between the study of theory and the summation and dissemination of progressive experience, and the specific assignments of production collectives. Practical measures were taken to improve the activities of all councils in charge of the dissemination of progressive experience, economic analysis bureaus, progressive experience courses in kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and the people's university of agricultural knowledge.

Cooperation is developing among the competing collectives: During the sowing campaign and other agricultural operations the leading collectives allocated for the enterprises they sponsored high-quality grain and potato seeds and helped with equipment. Managers and specialists from such farms visited their neighbors' fields and organized steady business contacts with them. Presently the rayon is preparing the conversion of all farms to the shop management structure and the shop cost-accounting system. All these measures, over whose implementation the rayon party members have organized a permanent control system, are aimed at upgrading the economic effectiveness of agricultural production and achieving highest possible end results.

The initiative of the rural working people in Kozel'skiy Rayon who decided to follow the example of the progressive collectives of industrial enterprises and surmount in two to three years the lagging and losses of individual farms is worthy of serious attention.

On 21 June a meeting of the All-Russian Council of Kolkhozes was held at which the question of the implementation by Ryazanskaya Oblast kolkhozes of the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures for the Further Development of Agriculture in the Nonchernozem Zone of the RSFSR" and the report on the measures implemented in Chelyabinskaya Oblast to increase feed production were discussed.

Following the article in KOMMUNIST the All-Russian Council of Kolkhozes passed the decree "On the Initiative of the Collective of the Rossiya Kolkhoz in Kozel'skiy Rayon, Kaluzhskaya Oblast, to Work Without Laggards and on the Basis of Intensive Plans."

The decree approved the patriotic initiative of the Rossiya Kolkhoz which pledged to help two lagging farms to improve production organization, extensively apply progressive technology, upgrade crop yields, and make effective use of all reserves.

Taking into consideration the important national economic significance of the initiative of the Rossiya Kolkhoz and of the working people of Kozel'skiy Rayon, the the All-Russian Council of Kolkhozes suggested to the councils of

kolkhozes and agricultural organs of oblasts, krays, autonomous republics, and rayons extensively to support this valuable patriotic initiative, and to recommend to the progressive collectives to organize their active cooperation with economically weak farms in order to eliminate their lagging within a short time and raise production-economic indicators to the level of average and, subsequently, leading farms.

The participation of the rural workers in the competition under the slogan of "Working Without Laggards on the Basis of Intensive Plans!" must become an important factor in accelerating the intensification of agricultural production and comprehensively contribute to the successful implementation of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress.

"The Woman in Production: New Equipment and Labor Conditions"

In her article (KOMMUNIST, No 2, 1978) T. Borisova, brigade leader-operator of a semi-automated line at the Kormovishchenskiy Forest Industry Farm, Permskaya Oblast, laureate of the USSR State Prize, raised questions on the creation of conditions for the retraining of workers released as a result of scientific and technical progress from labor-intensive auxiliary operations, on designing and improving machines and mechanism taking into consideration the possibility of their operation by women, as well as on the organization of effective preventive servicing, equipment repairs, and improvements in housing and living conditions.

The editors received official answers to these questions from the USSR Ministry of Timber and Wood Processing Industry (from Deputy Minister K. Prodayvoda, and V. Karpov, deputy chief of the capital construction administration), A. Zotimova, secretary of the central committee of the Trade Union of Workers in the Timber, Paper, and Timber Processing Industry, and V. Nemtsov, director of the Central Scientific Research and Planning-Design Institute of Mechanization and Power Industry in the Timber Industry (TsNIIME). They point out that T. Borisova raised important problems whose solution is particularly topical to the sector, being a structural part of its technical, economic, and social development, contributing to improving the working and living conditions of women, and insuring the sector of manpower resources and promoting their more efficient utilization. Presently, in connection with the USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU 25 April 1978 decree "On Additional Measures to Improve the Working Conditions of Women Employed in the National Economy" the USSR Ministry of Timber and Wood Processing Industry has approved a new list of production facilities, skills, and operations banning the labor of women. A system of measures for their retraining and placement has been formulated.

The all-round reduction of manual, unskilled, and heavy physical labor through comprehensive production mechanization and automation is one of the main tasks formulated at the 25th party congress. The implementation of radical measures in this field is particularly important in resolving the social problems of female labor, expanding the limits of its application, promoting the creative and spiritual growth of women workers, and insuring the factual equality of men and women.

As the answers show, a certain amount of work has been done in this respect in the sector. "In 1977-1978," A. Zotimova points out, "the enterprises actively jointed the all-union public review of labor, living, and recreation conditions of women, as proclaimed by the AUCCTU Presidium. Within that time over 25,000 suggestions were received, over 80% of which were acted upon. The labor conditions of 15,000 women were made consistent with the established requirements. A total of 23,400 women were freed from heavy work harmful to the health and from night-shift work."

By the end of the five-year plan approximately 185,000 working women will be freed. The sector will provide them other types of work consistent with their wishes and possibilities; 45,000 of them will master the skills of operators of semi-automated lines, automated conveyors, operators of overhanging gantry cranes, drivers of small lift-trucks, etc. Possibilities for the use of women in other types of work requiring a drastically reduced physical stress and higher skills, are increasing. Currently, the forest industry farms are expanding certain types of output related to the rational processing of raw material: manufacturing of industrial chips, containers, and other goods made of deciduous and low-grade timber and timber waste. As a result, a larger number of machine tools and equipment are beginning to be installed in the receiving warehouses of the shop, thus making possible the more extensive utilization of female labor. Women mastering new skills retain their previous average monthly wage and the right to departmental housing for the entire training or retraining period (not to exceed six months, however).

On the intiative of T. Borisova and her female colleagues a competition was launched in the sector for mastering modern equipment, actively joined by thousands of women workers. Competition conditions and indicators were defined. Every year, on the basis of its results, the title of "Best Woman Machine Operator of the USSR Ministry of Timber and Wood Processing Industry" is awarded.

"In order for women to be able not only to perform skilled work but work in proper healthy conditions," V. Nemtsov writes, "the TsNIIME developed and will soon be equipped with a set of semi-automated lines and lifts with highly comfortable cabins for the operators, manufactured in series. They will automatically keep the temperature constant regardless of the season, within the 17-20° centigrade range. The modern interiors, good visibility, and ventilation will reduce the operator's fatigue and will beneficially affect his work. A new control panel for machine units is being tested. Machines for the comprehensive mechanization of timber procurement are being developed and created as well."

Nevertheless, the technical retooling of the sector and the mechanization of heavy and manual labor are still slow. Only one out of 25 trees is machine processed. The others are felled with power saws. Over 90% tree branches are still cut off with axes and nearly four-fifths of the trees are dressed manually.

Increases in labor productivity and the level of mechanization in the timber procurement industry and the forestry industry is held back by the relatively small amount of new equipment and its low technical standard and inadequate reliability. No single machine met the superior quality requirements at the time its use; less than one-half of the manufactured equipment fails to meet even first quality requirements.

Essentially, the institutes of the USSR Ministry of Timber and Wood Processing Industry must develop a timber procurement technology and formulate and substantiate problems of technical policy. The machine builders must implement the ideas of the designs, starting with the manufacturing of prototypes and ending with the creation of machinery. However, such a clear demarcation of functions has not been established yet.

Most of the machines are manufactured directly at the enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Timber and Wood Processing Industry. Not being under the jurisdiction of the machine-building ministry, they do not enjoy any priority whatever in the allocation of the necessary materials, or complementing goods. They are not being supplied with metal of the required quality. That is why the experimental models of new machinery frequently fail in the tests. Since the functions of the customer and the manufacturer of new equipment are combined, frequently technical assignments are substandard. The result is the manufacturing of machines requiring extensive changes (for example, over 500 changes were made in the design of the LP-30 branch trimming machines, produced over the past three years at the Syktyvkar Machine Plant. A subsequent decision called for the complete modernizing of the machine).

Some of the new timber processing machines are manufactured by the USSR Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building. Taking into consideration the shortcomings, one might have thought that the machine builders would develop their own design organization specializing in timber processing equipment. However, they are not in a hurry to do this, preferring to avoid unnecessary trouble and to produce machines without bearing the responsibility for their technical quality.

Briefly stated, the two ministries have not organized a proper creative association. Consequently, deadlines for the mass delivery of modern forestry equipment are being postponed indefinately. The growth of labor productivity is hindered and the cost of the lumber produced with the help of imperfect machines which frequently break down rises.

Obviously, it is necessary, above all, to formulate a clearer comprehensive scientific and technical program for the development of a most expedient system of machines for the USSR Ministry of Timber and Wood Processing Industry (coordinating productivity with work parameters). On this basis a thorough study should be made of the technical possibilities of the manufacturing sectors and of the level of development of the machine-building base with scientific, technological, and design facilities. The obligations should carefully divided between the consumers and manufacturers of the new equipment. Such problems must be resolved as soon as possible in order to

equip the workers with new advanced machines, mechanize heavy and manual labor, improve working conditions, and upgrade the economic effectiveness of output.

Housing construction is expanding in the sector and the settlements are becoming more comfortable. This makes it possible to improve the housing and living conditions of the working people.

"Currently," notes V. Karpov, "the timber procurement association enterprises have facilities for 220 students in general educational schools per 1,000 working people (compared with the sectorial norm of 200); there are 167 seats in the clubs (with a 150 norm), and 10.4 hospital beds (with a norm of 10). The share of comfortable housing is rising as well (both through new construction and capital repairs). Whereas in 1970 only 32% of the overall number of commissioned housing offered partial and full amenities, the 1977 figure was 60%."

Unfortunately, so far slightly over 23% of the available housing of enterprises of timber procurement associations have running water and central heating and about 35% have gas. This level is considerably lower than the one reached by some other extracting sectors (coal, petroleum, natural gas). There is also a shortage of children's preschool institutions: There are only 77 places per 1,000 residents (with a 110 norm). Furthermore, far from always the average figures reflect the factual situation in a specific enterprise. Whereas in the city the parents can take the child to a kindergarten or school in the neighboring micro-rayon, in the timber settlements,50-150 kilometers apart from each other, this is impossible. Yet, sometimes it is economically inexpedient to build such facilities everywhere. The realistic way for improving housing and living conditions for the workers and employees of timber procurement enterprises is to eliminate the small forestry settlements. In 1976-1977 219 of them were already relocated to bigger settlements (along with suitable housing and sociocultural amenities). About 300 more will be closed down by the end of the five-year plan. Clearly, this effort must be continued in the 11th Five-Year Plan as well.

At the 16th Trade Unions Conference Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said that far from everything has been done as yet to ease the double burden of the Soviet working women at home and at work. The problem of steadily improving all aspects of the life of working women applies not only to the timber and timber processing industries. It must invariably remain in the center of attention of all ministries and departments, and economic and trade union organizations. Its solution everywhere, ranging from big cities to forestry settlements--is of major economic and social significance.

"Cautiously with History"

As we were told by A. Ivanov, editor in chief of the journal MOLODAYA GVARDIYA, the editors of the journal discussed the material "Cautiously with History" (KOMMUNIST, No 8, 1979), which discussed the article by V. Meshcheryakov "More Cautiously with Science Fiction" (MOLODAYA GVARIYA,

No 3, 1979), and accepted the validity of the critical remarks. Criticizing D. Bilenkin's story "Personality Test," the author of the note "More Cautiously with Science Fiction" allowed inaccurate subjective assessments in describing the personality of Bulgarin, a reactionary figure of the first half of the 19th century, assessments which could trigger a controversial understanding of the nature of this hated figure of the history of Russian literary and artistic life of the 19th century, while the editors failed to eliminate such inaccuracies in preparing the material for publication.

The editors passed a decree expressing the need for a more thorough preparation of critical articles, reviews, and other materials for publication. The journal's personnel directly responsible for the substandard preparation of V. Meshcheryakov's manuscript for publication were given administrative punishments.

5003
CSO: 1802 - END -

END OF FICHE DATE FILMED

19 SEP 79

WB