

JPRS 74317

4 October 1979

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 11, July 1979



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.

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

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	1. REPORT NO. JPRS 74317	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle USSR REPORT: TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No. 11, July 1979			5. Report Date 4 October 1979
7. Author(s)			6.
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201			8. Performing Organization Rept. No.
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.
			11. Contract(C) or Grant(G) No. (C) (G)
15. Supplementary Notes Translations from KOMMUNIST, theoretical journal of the CPSU Central Committee, Moscow, published 18 times a year.			13. Type of Report & Period Covered
			14.
16. Abstract (Limit: 200 words) The report contains articles on political, economic, military and social developments and problems within the USSR and as they relate to communist and other countries.			
17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors USSR Political Science Sociology Propaganda Economics			
b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms			
c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 5C			
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22161		19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 151
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price

4 October 1979

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 11, 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
At the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Council of Ministers..	1
At the CPSU Central Committee.....	3
CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers Decree on the Further Development of the Higher School and Upgrading the Quality of Specialists' Training.....	4
Socialist Ideal and Real Socialism.....	11
In Defense of Life and Freedom, Democracy, and Social Progress.....	26
Lessons of the Shchekino Method (K. Cherednichenko, L. Gol'din).....	40
Keeping Abreast of Consumer Demand (V. Solov'yeva).....	53
Example of Specific Concern for Press Effectiveness.....	67
Logic of Revolutionary Thinking and Class Approach in Logic (G. Sadovskiy).....	71
Civic Principle--Artistic Principle (G. Tovstonogov).....	85

CONTENTS (Continued)	Page
At the Sources of the Contemporary Communist Movement (A. Sobolev).....	95
Vienna: An Important Step Forward (Ye. Grigor'yev).....	110
Steel and Friendship (Zdzislaw Romanowski).....	120
Countries With a Socialist Orientation (R. Ul'yanovskiy).....	130
Reorganization of International Economic Relations and Ideological Struggle (G. Skorov).....	141

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, NO 11,
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 : 23 July 1979

Copies : 947,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda," "Kommunist,"
1979

AT THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE POLITBURO AND USSR COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 79 p 3

[Text] The CC CPSU Politburo and USSR Council of Ministers studied the report of the delegation of the Soviet Union, headed by A. N. Kosygin, CC CPSU Politburo member and USSR Council of Ministers chairman, on the results of the 33rd CEMA session which was held in Moscow on 26-28 June 1979.

The CC CPSU Politburo and USSR Council of Ministers rate highly the declaration on the 30th anniversary of CEMA and the communique adopted by the session, reflecting the resolve of the fraternal socialist countries to continue to expand their all-round cooperation based on the principles of socialist internationalism. The essential significance of the assessments and conclusions contained in the greetings addressed to the session by L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, and the greetings presented by the heads of the other fraternal parties and states to the further efforts to intensify cooperation with CEMA-member countries, and to strengthening the unity and solidarity of the socialist comity.

It was noted that the 33rd CEMA session and the participation in its work of a number of non-CEMA members confirm the strengthening of the international prestige of CEMA and the systematic implementation of the course charted by the fraternal parties toward developing extensive and equal cooperation with all countries for the sake of the consolidation of the peace and friendship among nations.

The CC CPSU Politburo and USSR Council of Ministers express their profound satisfaction with the practical results of the session--the completion of the elaboration of all long-term target programs for cooperation in key production sectors, the conclusion of a number of major accords for their implementation, and the adoption of decisions aimed at strengthening further the democratic foundations and improving the activities of the Council.

The CC CPSU Politburo and USSR Council of Ministers note that the session created conditions for further work on the implementation of a broad set of measures stipulated in the long-term target programs, completing the coordination of national economic plans for 1981-1985, and intensifying socialist

economic integration, which has become a stable factor in the all-round progress of each of the fraternal countries separately and the socialist comity as a whole. The implementation of the measures earmarked at the 33rd session will contribute to the expansion and intensification of the fraternal cooperation among countries in their solution of the important problems related to the building of socialism and communism.

The CC CPSU Politburo and USSR Council of Ministers approved the activities of the USSR delegation to the 33rd CEMA session and instructed the competent Soviet organs to formulate and implement the necessary measures insuring the full and timely implementation of the obligations of the Soviet Union stemming from session's decisions.

5003

CSO: 1802

AT THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 79 p 4

[Text] The CC CPSU considered the results of the conference of secretaries of central committees of communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries held in Berlin on 3-5 July 1979, approved the work of the Soviet delegation, and supported the assessments and conclusions contained in the announcements on the results of the conference and the appeal "For Internationalist Solidarity."

The conference unanimously emphasized the great importance of the results of the Vienna meeting between Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, and U.S. President J. Carter and the conclusion of SALT II. The view was expressed that in the forthcoming period the main task will be the practical implementation of the Vienna agreements.

Other topical problems of the struggle for the cessation of the arms race, international security, and the consolidation of the peace the world over were discussed.

The CC CPSU believes that the coordination of actions in a realm such as ideological work, exchange of information and experience in ideological-educational work, and the development of science and culture in the socialist countries play an ever greater role in the building and improvement of the developed socialist society.

The corresponding departments and organizations were instructed to take measures to implement the measures agreed upon at the conference aimed at the further development of the interaction among fraternal parties in said areas.

5003
CSO: 1802

CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE AND USSR COUNCIL OF MINISTERS DECREE ON THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE HIGHER SCHOOL AND UPGRADING THE QUALITY OF SPECIALISTS' TRAINING

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 79 pp 5-10

[Text] The CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers passed the decree "On the Further Development of the Higher School and Upgrading the Quality of Specialists' Training." Implementing the decisions of the 25th party congress, the decree notes, the higher school reached certain successes in providing the national economy with skilled cadres of specialists and, in terms of the scale of their training, basically meets the requirements of the country. The training of university students and the retraining of specialists in accordance with the latest trends of science and technology, and the upgrading of the skills of VUZ teachers and production workers were organized. This contributed to the completion of the formation of a system for continuing education in accordance with the requirements of developed socialism. The higher school is exerting an ever growing influence on the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the further growth of the people's culture and the spiritual wealth of the socialist society.

In many schools the collectives of professors and instructors insure the training of the students on a high professional and ideological-theoretical level, fruitfully combining the training of specialists with work on major scientific problems. Positive results have been achieved in improving the study of the social sciences. The introduction in all VUZ's of the systematic teaching of Marxist-Leninist theory throughout the entire training period contributes to its more profound mastery and to the ideological-theoretical training of the future specialists. The political and labor activeness of the student youth has increased.

The CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers drew the attention to the fact that substantial shortcomings exist in the activities of the higher school.

The training process does not always reflect the latest achievements of science, technology, culture, and progressive experience in the organization of production and management. Some VUZ graduates have no profound knowledge of general scientific subjects and their professional training is weak. The organization of independent creative work by the students and the development within them of the skills of sociopolitical and organizational work have not been paid the necessary attention.

The USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education does not provide adequate guidance in training-method work. It does not make full use of the possibilities of base VUZ's for developing ways to improve the activities of the entire higher school. Shortcomings continue to exist in the organization of VUZ scientific activities. Measures aimed at equipping the higher school with contemporary training-laboratory and scientific equipment continue to be implemented slowly.

Despite the steady increase in the graduation of specialists, the management organs of higher educational institutions, planning organs, and sectorial ministries and departments have not achieved the full supply of cadres in all required fields of leading national economic sectors such as metallurgy, ore-mining and petroleum extraction industries, construction, transportation, and agriculture. Major shortcomings exist as well in training higher education specialists for Siberia, the North, the Far East, and the Nonchernozem Zone of the RSFSR.

The CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers have deemed necessary the adoption of measures aimed at improving further the activities of the higher school, upgrading its role in socioeconomic and scientific and technical progress, and supplying more fully the leading national economic sectors in the country with highly skilled cadres. The USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, the USSR ministries and departments operating VUZ's, the central committees of communist parties and councils of ministers of union republics, and the party kraykoms, obkoms, and gorkoms have been asked to eliminate such shortcomings. They must insure further improvements in the activities of higher educational institutions and upgrade their role as centers of education, communist upbringing, and development of science and culture.

The higher school must focus its main attention on the all-round improvement of the quality of professional training and ideological-political education of specialists, and on strengthening relations with production and the practice of the building communism. It must steadily perfect its curricula and programs on the basis of upgrading the significance of basic sciences in the theoretical and professional training of broad specialists. It must reflect more fully the latest achievements of science and progressive experience. Control over the activities of training institutions must be intensified by means of state inspections and increased exactingness toward the rectorates concerning the quality of the training.

The rectorates and the party organizations have been assigned the task to focus the efforts of professors and instructors in higher educational institutions on improving the training-educational and scientific-methodological work. They must insure the further enhancement of the level of lectures and their importance in developing in the students scientific thinking and a Marxist-Leninist outlook. Lectures must include problems and reflect topical questions of theory and practice and contemporary achievements in social and scientific and technical progress. They must contribute to the intensification of independent work. Seminars and laboratory training must be galvanized as effective methods for consolidating the knowledge and revealing the creative abilities of the students.

The decree emphasizes the need to intensify the role of the chairs as the principal units of the higher educational institution, determining the content and unity of the training, scientific, and educational process. Young lecturers must be given comprehensive assistance in mastering pedagogical skills. In the interest of upgrading the labor effectiveness of professors and instructors, measures will be formulated and implemented to improve the system of moral and material incentive of pedagogical work.

Taking into consideration the growing requirements concerning the quality of specialists' training and the rational combination of their theoretical knowledge with the skill to resolve practical problems, it has been deemed necessary to expand and strengthen further the ties between higher educational institutions and corresponding national economic sectors. The planning of specialists' training will be improved. They shall be issued their assignments sooner--between one and three years before graduation--with subsequent elaboration of five-year plans for their assignment, informing enterprises and VUZ's of such plans. On this basis the joint activities of the higher school and the national economic sectors aimed at improving the training, retraining, and upgrading the skills of cadres and the development of scientific research will be energized. The problems of the broader participation of sectorial ministries and departments in strengthening the material base of VUZ's, the use by educational institutions of the sites and equipment of respective enterprises and organizations, and the creation on their basis if necessary, of branches of specialized chairs must be resolved. The organization of the practical training of students and the apprenticeship of VUZ graduates must be improved.

The CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers noted that the specific participation of sectorial ministries and departments in the development of higher education and in strengthening the material base of educational institutions must be considered an important factor in insuring the scientific and technical and social progress of the sector.

The task was set of upgrading the level of training of future specialists in the natural and technical sciences. To this effect it has been suggested to draw more extensively to scientific-pedagogical activities in VUZ's academicians, corresponding members, and other leading scientists; to insure the systematic delivery of lectures to students and faculties by managers and leading specialist of enterprises and organizations, and leading production workers and innovators; substantially to improve scientific and technical information and dissemination of progressive domestic and foreign practical experience among the students.

The decree emphasizes the need to adopt effective measures for the training of specialists for Siberia, the North, the Far East, and the Nonchernozem Zone of the RSFSR in accordance with the requirements governing the intensive and comprehensive development of these areas. The USSR Gosplan, USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, and RSFSR Council of Ministers, together with interested ministries and departments have been asked to draft and submit to the USSR Council of Ministers suggestions on supplying cadres

to all national economic sectors in said economic areas and their consolidation and efficient utilization. If necessary the contingent of students accepted in the corresponding educational institutions should be increased through the redistribution of the enrollment plan for the country at large.

Measures will be implemented to strengthen with highly stilled scientific-pedagogical cadres and for improving material facilities in VUZ's located in Siberia, the North, the Far East, and the Nonchernozem Zone of the RSFSR. Student dormitories and housing for the teaching staff will be built and the necessary facilities for the instructors will be created. It was recommended to intensify efforts to enroll in the VUZ's of the main areas progressive working and student youth. On an exceptional basis enterprises in industry, construction, and transportation, and sovkhoses and kolhoses in these economic rayons have been granted the right to direct graduates of secondary general educational schools and secondary specialized and vocational-technical schools with no practical experience to enroll in VUZ's in fields for which there is sharp demand with enterprise scholarships in accordance with the stipulations of the USSR Council of Ministers decree number 1099 of 18 September 1959.

It has been deemed necessary to improve enrollment in schools teaching subjects in the metallurgical, ore-mining, petroleum-extracting, and gas industries, construction, transportation, agriculture, and other most important national economic sectors. A list shall be drawn up of skills in great demand in these sectors. In accordance with established procedure, suggestions shall be drafted and submitted regarding moral and material incentives and benefits to students engaged in such studies.

Permission to enroll in VUZ's to study such subjects in said sectors without entrance examinations has been granted to gold medalist graduates of secondary general educational schools and secondary specialized and vocational-technical schools with excellent grades or on the basis of the results of two examinations in the specialized subjects for these individuals who graduated with a 4.5 average.

The decree calls for the implementation of measures for the further development of the universities as the leading training-methodological and scientific centers of the higher school. Their material and technical base and scientific-pedagogical cadres must be strengthened. The list of specialties and number of university students must be refined with a view to the training of cadres for the entire public education system, science, culture, industry, and agriculture. Particular attention is to be paid improving the activities of new universities.

The task has been set of improving the training and assignment and upgrading the skills of lecturers in the social sciences in universities and the selection of young people to study the subjects of philosophy, political economy, scientific communism, and CPSU history. As a rule, individuals with labor and practical experience and with a positive record in sociopolitical work should be trained as teachers in these areas. The work of the institutes

for upgrading the skills of social science lecturers at universities should be improved. The role of such institutes in summing up and disseminating the progressive experience of VUZ social scientists should be intensified.

It is recommended to the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology to plan for the priority development of full-time graduate studies in universities and other higher educational institutions.

The decree indicates the need to take measures to improve the organization of scientific research in VUZ's, closely linked with the tasks of upgrading the quality of specialists' training, the more effective use of the scientific potential of higher educational institutions in resolving most important scientific and technical and socioeconomic problems, and the accelerated practical utilization of results.

The CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers have made it incumbent upon the USSR and union republic ministries of higher and secondary specialized education and the rectorates and party organizations of VUZ's to raise the level of the study of Marxist-Leninist theory, CPSU historical experience, and works by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and other party leaders by students. The responsibility of all chairs for the conceptual direction of the training-education process must be intensified, guided by the CC CPSU decree "On Improving Further Ideological and Political-Educational Work."

Students must be effectively informed on problems of the domestic and foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet Government. They must acquire a correct understanding of topical problems of social development. Leading personnel and party organ lecturers must be systematically involved in delivering lectures in VUZ's. Particular attention should be paid to giving priority to informing professors and lecturers.

It is necessary to develop in the students the habits of individual writing of reports and making public speeches and the ability to participate in creative debates. The necessary qualities of the future educators and organizers and propagandists of communist ideas must be shaped. The young people must be helped to master the methods of struggle against ideological enemies and to expose hostile imperialist propaganda, and revisionism and opportunism of all hues.

The decree calls for making further improvements in the upbringing of the students in a spirit of selfless loyalty to the communist party and the socialist homeland, Soviet patriotism, and proletarian internationalism, developing in them a feeling of personal responsibility for the protection of the great achievements of socialism.

We must promote in the students high political and moral standards and a principled attitude toward deviations from the norms of communist morality, manifestations of consumer petit bourgeois moods and other vestiges of the past. The power of the collective's public opinion must be purposefully used in such efforts.

The decree calls for improving the structure and quality of training of economic cadres, firmly strengthening the ties between the training and upbringing of the students and improvements in plant management, the organization of the modern production process and the entire mechanism of economic management, and to upgrade the level of theoretical training of students enrolled in economic institutes and faculties.

Together with the other organs of VUZ management, the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education has been instructed to insure considerable improvement in on-the-job training of cadres. To this effect more energetic use must be made of training methods taking fully into consideration the specific nature of night and correspondence student training and practical work. The role of the all-union correspondence institutes must be enhanced as the scientific-methodological centers for the training of cadres with this system.

The decree recommends to the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, together with the higher and secondary specialized educational institutions, to take measures to insure a greater availability of high-quality textbooks and training aids for VUZ students.

The management organs of higher educational institutions and the respective ministries and departments have been issued the assignment to improve the organization of medical services and public catering of students and physical therapy and mass cultural work.

The attention of the AUCCTU and the central committee of the trade union of workers in education, higher schools, and scientific institutions has been drawn to the need for upgrading further the role of trade union organizations in improving training and education work and the ways and means of socialist competition in VUZ's, and the development of creative cooperation with production enterprises and scientific and cultural institutions. It has been recommended to take additional measures to improve the housing and living conditions of students, post-graduate students, and lecturers. Together with the VUZ's a network of treatment-prophylactic and health sports institutions must be developed.

The decree stipulates that the Komsomol Central Committee and Komsomol committees must direct the activities of VUZ Komsomol organizations toward upgrading the responsibility of the collectives of school groups and individual students-Komsomol members for the profound and creative mastery of their chosen fields. The work of Komsomol organizations on ideological-moral upbringing and accustoming the young people to high standards of behavior and intolerance toward violations of school discipline and norms of socialist morality must be energized. More effective use must be made of student units in the labor, political, and professional training of future specialists.

The decree makes it incumbent upon the central committees of communist parties of union republics and party kraykoms, obkoms, okruzhkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms to strengthen the management of VUZ party organizations. The party

organizations must provide daily assistance in resolving the main problem of the higher educational institutions, that of comprehensively upgrading the quality of training and improving the ideological-political education of the students, and perfecting the selection, placement, and training of leading cadres in VUZ's, faculties, and chairs. Every instructor must daily broaden his political and cultural outlook. He must be a model of high communist idea-mindedness and party-mindedness, creative attitude toward labor, moral purity, and nobility. The participation of professors and lecturers in lecture and political-educational work among the working people must be broadened. More energetic use must be made of the rectors' councils in promoting ties between VUZ's and production and scientific organizations.

The CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree expresses confidence that the party organizations and collectives of higher educational institutions will apply all their forces and knowledge to the implementation of the party's plans and increase the contribution made by the higher school to the building of communism.

5003

CSO: 1802

SOCIALIST IDEAL AND REAL SOCIALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 79 pp 11-24

[Text] The problem of the extent to which real socialism and its specific historical practice are consistent with the theoretical concepts of a socialist society, described in the works of the founders of Marxism, is one of the main problems of the ideological-theoretical struggle of the last third of the 20th century, related to defining the ways and means for the transition of mankind to a new way of life. It is not in the least a question of academic characteristics. We are faced with a topic affecting the profound interests of multi-million strong masses, for the communists are the first and only political party in history to openly proclaim its aspiration to build a society on a scientific basis, on the firm theoretical basis of the ever deeper knowledge of the objective laws governing social development. In this case the Marxist-Leninist principle of unity between theory and practice is one of the basic sources for our spiritual firmness and confidence in the future victory of the communist system.

It is entirely natural that this basic problem has become one of the main targets of the attacks launched by the enemies of scientific communism even though, as a rule, they are formulated as superficially abstract views on the "contradiction" between the concepts of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and the practical experience in building a socialist society. It is characteristic that W. Brandt, one of our intelligent and experienced opponents, presenting the wish for reality in his programmatic book "Der Wille zum Frieden. Perspektiven der Politik" [The Will for Peace. Political Perspectives] relies on the fact that "the communist world will sink deeper and deeper into domestic difficulties, for it will be able to an ever lesser extent to implement the principle of consistency between theory and reality" (W. Brandt, "Der Wille zum Frieden. Perspektiven der Politik," Hamburg, 1971, p 64).

The history of real socialism is familiar with a number of attempts which have invariably failed to "prove" the essential "inconsistency" between the theory and practice of the building of socialism and communism. One of the latest "inventions" in this area, a kind of quintessence of anti-communist polemics waged against us, is the criticism of already existing socialist societies not from the outside but somehow from the inside, from the positions

. . . of the socialist ideal. In other words, added to the open, frontal criticism of socialism is an inside-out criticism, i.e., attempts to defame the new social system, comparing it with some kind of "ideal model"--naturally, most thoroughly misinterpreted.

The idea of socialism is quite popular in the contemporary world. We should not be amazed by the extent to which attraction for the socialist slogan is growing, along with hiding "behind socialism." For the sake of justice let us note that, in itself, this phenomenon is not new. "At the present time," F. Engels himself wrote, describing the successes of "red republicanism" at the beginning of the 1850's, "all public figures and newspapers which are not openly reactionary are vying with one another for the once scorned title of 'socialist.' The oldest enemies of socialism proclaim themselves socialists" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 44, p 9). The same was noted by V. I. Lenin as well. "'Socialism' in general as an objective, pitted against capitalism (or imperialism)," he wrote in 1916, "is acknowledged today not only by the Kautskians and the social chauvinists but by many bourgeois social politicians as well. However, now it is a question not of an overall confrontation between the two social systems but of a specific objective of a specific 'mass revolutionary struggle' against a specific evil . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 30, p 214).

Nevertheless, the "socialist" mask has assumed a different direction and changed its specific-historical content. A brief description of the essence of this matter as applicable to the present would be that at the present stage the forces of socialism and progress consider capitalism and its imperialist policy the main evil, while the forces of reaction are fighting no longer merely against the theory of scientific socialism but also against its real incarnation in the institutions and practices of the socialist system, hypocritically proclaiming as evils the difficulties of its growth and the temporary shortcomings of its social organization. In other words, our class enemies pit the revolutionary approach to contemporary reality against their Talmudist-demagogic and, essentially, restorational approach. That is why they like to talk about various subjectivistic "models" of socialism which violate the integral scientific concept of the new system, and formulate pretentious judgments on "ideal" social systems which have never ever existed and which are unattainable.

We know that in their concept of an ideal the Marxists have never invested a subjectivistic, fictional, or normative-dogmatic content. They have always considered their most important long-term objectives and principles as their ideals, derived, in the final account, from the objective trends of normal social progress, rather than attractive appeals adapted, as is the bourgeois practice, to current petty political considerations. The only scientific, Marxist-Leninist view of the problem of social ideals stems from the fact that a considerable historical distance separates the proclamation of an ideal from its implementation, a distance filled with adamant organizational and constructive activities and hard struggle.

It is this natural effect that is used by some of our opponents, automatically comparing the ideals of socialism and communism, which are components of the

scientific design for the future social system, with its present obviously substantially incomplete status. It is here that they turn loose their demagogy, publicly telling off the communists for their allegedly "poor" or, in any case, "improper" building of the new society.

It is easy to note that by its very nature this attempt to block the path of scientific communism is aimed at bourgeois social strata which, one way or another, are sympathetic to socialist ideals. In a certain sense this method is aimed also at the population in the socialist countries. In this case the young people are frequently singled out, since as we know they have a particular psychological predisposition for the perception and mental structuring of the world in the guise of concepts of most perfect and just forms of social structure and relations among people. However, we must take into consideration the fact that the inner tendency to compare ideals with reality is inherent not only in the mentality of a developing individual. Frequently it is acutely felt by mature people who sum up the results of past experience and compare the results of their labor and the activities of their generation with the objectives and tasks formulated at the onset of their careers.

In our view, it is precisely on such sociopsychological aspects that the ideologues of so-called "humane" socialism or "socialism with a human face" parasitically rely. Underestimating the subversive potential of this concept in its variants would be an unpardonable error for the reason alone that it is one of the few versions of reformist utopia with whose help practical attempts have been made to endanger the revolutionary gains of the working people in areas where socialist social relations have essentially won. The experience of the 1968 Czechoslovak events convinced, yet once again, millions of people of the importance of the scientific concept of socialism as an element of the political consciousness of the truly free person, and the extent to which it predetermines the socially thought-out, sensible, and responsible channeling of his activities. Conversely, the underestimating of this factor, and the careless attitude toward the formulation and dissemination of Marxist-Leninist theory could mislead even people whose own interests coincide objectively entirely and fully with the interests of the revolutionary working class and of the building of socialism.

The pivot of the "humane" socialism concept is the desire to present real socialism built by the older generations of revolutionaries as "inconsistent" with the theoretical concepts and ideals of the founders of Marxism and, on this basis, promote the clash among the different groups, including the different generations of the socialist society, between its "fathers" and "sons." For this purpose a right-wing revisionist criticism is used of the so-called "monopoly of Leninism in the interpretation of Marxism," which means, above all, the theoretical and practical experience of the Soviet communists. Demagogic claims are formulated on the need for the "democratization and humanizing" of the socialist system, the search for a "new variant of Marxism through the resurrection of its initial liberation objectives," and so on, and so forth.

As we may see, here again the main target of the attacks launched by the opponents of Leninism turn out to be not the ideas of socialism in general but of the socialist society as built under the guidance of the Marxist-Leninist parties. What is offered as a substitution is not a frankly anti-socialist model but a certain subjectivistic structure, thoroughly imbued with political sham, claiming to be a "truly humane" social system, and of surmounting the "gap" allegedly taking place in the socialist countries between the existing forms of political organization and socioeconomic changes whose progressive significance the right-wing opportunists no longer dare to deny openly.

It is easy to see in such elaborations the strong influence of right-wing reformist claims concerning the "removal" of freedom and democracy from socialism, allegedly having taken place in the socialist comity. At the same time, they are totally void of scientific socialism. It is no accident that the "models" of "humane" or "democratic" socialism are pitted less against the capitalist system as the really existing socialist society. Offering a principled class assessment of such "critical" sallies against the ruling Marxist-Leninist parties, A. Cunhal, secretary general of the Portuguese Communist Party, wrote: "One must never pit the historical experience of socialism as it exists, true socialism, against illusions and mirages not based on historical experience. To pit one's own socialist plan not against the capitalist reality of one's own country but against real socialism as it exists in the socialist countries means to abandon the struggle for socialism."

It is noteworthy that today, paradoxical though it might seem, both right-wing and left-wing revisionists are joining in the unsuccessful attempts to separate humanism from real socialism and to pit the practice of the building of socialism against humanist ideals. In turn, distorting the revolutionary humanism of Marxism-Leninism, the Maoists consider humanistic ideals as a kind of concession to the bourgeoisie.

However much the revisionists who preach the credo of "humane" socialism may claim to bring something new in social science and to "renovate" socialist theory and practice, the doubtful "laurels" in the field of speculations on the dialectically conflicting correlation between social ideals and historical reality nevertheless must be awarded to the right-wing social democrats. Both historically and gnosologically they proceed from the old yet still formulated "accusation" against Lenin and the Bolsheviks raised by the revisionists, charging them with irreconcilable "contradiction" between their practice and the end socialist objectives of the working class, recognizing revolutionary coercion as one of the legitimate means for the implementation of such objectives. The communists are even charged with the stupid (a different description would be hard to find!) claim that "all means are good if they justify the end." It is precisely on the basis of such arguments that the oldest leader of the French Socialist Party Jules Moc stated in his book "Socialism in the Nuclear Age" that the differences between socialist and communists he considers "fundamental" are "ethical differences" and are due to the fact that, allegedly, the communists have abandoned the principal ideals of the liberation movement of the working people.

The anti-communists speculate to the utmost with the question of the objectives and means used in the building of socialism and communism. Aiming at the philistine or the simply politically naive people, they draw up a very simple list of problems: Allegedly, ideally, the communists are against violence without rejecting themselves the need for its use; the communists claim to be the supporters of peace and universal disarmament while maintaining strong armies; the communists favor social equality while themselves practicing uneven distribution based on the quantity and quality of labor, and so on. All this is presented outside its historical context and, understandably, with tendentious comments.

Marx, Engels, and Lenin scientifically proved, and practical experience confirmed that the basic socioeconomic interests and objectives of the struggle waged by the proletariat--elimination of the exploitation of man by man, establishment of a people's rule, and building of a classless communist society--can be achieved only through the destruction of the political domination of the bourgeoisie, the conversion of private ownership of productive capital into the property of the entire society and, on this basis, replacing the capitalist production method with the socialist production method based on a general plan in the interests of all members of society. In other words, the transition from capitalism to socialism is impossible without basic and qualitative changes in the nature of socioeconomic and political relations, without the revolutionary negation and without a socialist revolution developing on capitalist grounds as a result of the drastic aggravation of its inherent internal contradictions.

It is obvious that these changes in the nature and structure of social relations cannot take place other than against the will of the bourgeoisie at large. The bourgeoisie has never surrendered voluntarily nor will it surrender its political power or economic privileges even though the objective laws of historical development themselves "operate" against it. The accuracy of this truth is confirmed by the experience of all proletarian revolutions of the 19th and 20th centuries, whether victorious or not. That is why the Marxists stand firmly on the grounds of accepting the need and historical legitimacy of revolutionary coercion in the course of the struggle against the inevitably opposing bourgeoisie and for the socialist reorganization of society. That is why they are firmly convinced that its abandonment is equivalent to the rejection of the final objectives of the struggle of the working class and socialism.

The viewpoint of the historical necessity for revolutionary coercion, organically linked with the acknowledgment of the historical necessity and legitimacy of the transition from capitalism to socialism, does not exclude the fact that, nevertheless, the working class retains a certain freedom in choosing the means for its implementation. Practical experience has indicated that such methods may differ depending on the extent and nature of the bourgeois counteraction and the strength and maturity of the proletarian movement in one or another country and its objective position within the system of intergovernmental links and relations.

The identification of revolutionary coercion with one of its forms--armed violence--has been the source of many political errors, ideological speculations, and, occasionally, unknowing misunderstandings. Incidentally, this is the main theoretical-gnosiological reason for the appearance within some circles of the workers' movement of the concept of a "democratic way to socialism," interpreted as a contemporary revolutionary "alternative" to the October Revolution. However, one could pit the first victorious socialist revolution against democracy only by distorting the nature and meaning of the very concept of "democracy," restricting it, essentially, within the narrow frames of bourgeois-democratic legality.

In reality, any true and, even more so, any socialist revolution is a period of direct democratic development, and the fullest expression of popular will in terms of form and content. It is precisely democratic, since its results are radical changes in the life of the people and since they take place with the direct, conscious, and immediate participation of the people's masses, who display a type of activity simply inconceivable in the "most democratic" periods of the evolutionary development of society.

The Great October Socialist Revolution was precisely such an act of truly popular manifestation of will and sociopolitical creativity. The fact that its immediate beginning was laid by the armed uprising of the workers and soldiers of Petrograd, and that in the course of the struggle for the preservation and consolidation of the revolutionary system, the Russian proletariat withstood all the trials of the civil war and foreign intervention unleashed against it, applies to the characteristic of the way to socialism in our country. However, it does not cast any aspersion on the truly democratic nature of this way, which is inseparable from its socialist content.

The truly revolutionary "alternative" to the October Revolution as a specific form of the assumption of power by the proletariat (precisely as a form coinciding with it in terms of basic content) could not be, consequently, democratic--which, precisely, was the essence of the October Revolution--but a peaceful means, the unarmed form of the socialist revolution, the possibility and preference for which, from the viewpoint of the interests of the working class, were not only never denied by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, but, on the contrary, were comprehensively substantiated in their works.

Characteristically, the contemporary social reformist ideologues try to present Marx's very idea of a peaceful way to socialism as the abandonment of the acknowledgment of the historical necessity of revolutionary coercion for the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie and, even more so, as a conversion from revolutionary to evolutionary positions. In this case, for example, they refer to Marx's 1872 Amsterdam speech.

Indeed, the creator of the theory of scientific socialism and of the dictatorship of the proletariat did not question the possibility for a democratic implementation of the socialist objectives in England and the United States or, in fact, in any other country. However, this was not

because he had betrayed the revolutionary principles of his doctrine ever but because he had seen in the socialist revolution the only way for the establishment of "the broadest possible democracy, a democracy in the pure meaning of the term--rule by the people.

To use Lenin's terms, without tying their own hands or those of the future revolutionaries with the ways, means, and methods for the seizure of the power by the proletariat and the revolutionary rejection of capitalism, the founders of Marxism never nurtured illusions on the possibility for a "non-violent" revolution, i.e., the voluntary abandonment by the bourgeoisie of its political and economic domination. ". . . We," Marx said, turning to the bourgeois governments, "will act peacefully against you wherever we find it possible and use weapons whenever necessary" ("K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 17, p 649).

This does not contradict in the least the pertinent passage of Marx's Amsterdam speech. "We know," he stated, "that we must take into consideration the institutions, mores, and traditions of the individual countries. We do not deny the existence of countries such as America and England and, had I been better familiar with your institutions, perhaps I would have added the Netherlands as well, where the workers could attain their objective through peaceful means. However, even if such were to be the case," Marx went on to say, "we must also recognize that in most countries on the continent force must be the lever of our revolution. For a time we shall have to resort precisely to force to establish once and for all the rule of labor" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 18, p 154).

"The working class," Lenin stated, "naturally, would prefer to assume the power peacefully . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 4, p 264). He tried to implement such a principled position even when the chances for a peaceful victory of the revolution were small. Is this not confirmed by the alliance he offered to the Mensheviks and the S.R. on behalf of the Bolshevik party at the beginning of September 1917 (in a period of headlong increase of the influence of the Bolsheviks in the soviets and throughout the country), a compromise for the sake of the "historically extremely rare" opportunity for the peaceful development of the revolution? Assuming that such a development was "no longer possible" at that time in Russia, nevertheless, Lenin voiced the very characteristic statement of, "perhaps. However, even if there is one chance out of a hundred, the attempt to use this opportunity would be worth it" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 34, p 135). Those were the humanistic ideas from which the communists proceeded subsequently as well, formulating at the 20th CPSU Congress the view of expanding the possibilities for a peaceful transition to socialism--a concept which became the base for the present strategy and tactic of the world's communist movement.

The familiar Marxian thesis to the effect that "an objective which would require unjust means is not the right objective" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 1, p 65) was, and remains to the communists one of the most important principles of the political and class struggle, stemming from the revolutionary-humanistic nature of the ideology of the working class. The

attempts of the anti-communists to squeeze within the concept of "unjust means" the revolutionary coercion used by the working people against the exploiting minority cannot withstand any criticism from the scientific-theoretical viewpoint. From practical-political viewpoint the definition of revolutionary coercion as an "unjust means" is, objectively, nothing but the ideological-political disarming of the working class and the attempt to perpetuate the rule of capital. Here we are dealing with a self-serving sermon that virtually any somewhat radical step worrying the bourgeoisie would be a "sin," and that the step taken by any revolutionary would oppose the "sinfulness" of revolutionary action to the "innocence" of opportunistic inaction.

Naturally, this does not mean that the Marxists-Leninists consider the meaning of a socialist revolution to be coercion, looking at it as some kind of "universal key" for the new society or as a means for resolving problems, applicable in all cases. Such views, slanderously ascribed to the communists, have nothing in common with their world outlook and the practice of real socialism. This is, above all, because the main objectives and tasks of the socialist revolution--economic, sociopolitical, and cultural--are entirely positive and constructive, achieved and resolved through the development of the broadest possible creative initiative of all working people, of the entire toiling nation. With the intensification of the socialist revolution and the successes achieved in building the new classless society, the coercive methods of struggle become more and more secondary and, in the final account, class coercion within a country where socialism has won disappears.

The problems and tasks of the struggle waged by the proletariat in the capitalist countries, systematically suppressed and exploited by the bourgeoisie, is a different matter. It is clear that it cannot radically change its current situation without the readiness to apply on the scale of the entire society one or another form of class coercion toward the exploiters. The adoption of any other solution to this problem could only cause the workers' movement harm difficult to repair. This is what the experience of the October Revolution and the example of all truly revolutionary movements teach us.

The basic ideological sources for the various concepts and views attempting to discredit real socialism by pitting it against the socialist ideal is the influence of right-wing reformism and the social democratic movement in their anti-communist variant. However, we must equally not forget the fact that gnosiological factors related to the lack of understanding of the entire complexity of the building of socialism also exert a certain influence on the shaping and dissemination of such theoretically false and politically harmful views.

As we know, there is no absolute metaphysical identity between the logical and general theoretical image of socialism and its concrete historical development, between ideal and reality, and between the subjective wish to build a complete socialist society rapidly and the objectively limited possibilities for the implementation of this wish by any given generation.

The underestimating of the vital dialectics of the ideal and the real, and the logical and the historical in the development of the new system, and the exaggeration (and, occasionally, dramatizing!) of aspects of partial discrepancy between them could become one of the reasons for the appearance of similar concepts among individual members of the intelligentsia in the socialist countries, even though the objective conditions for the molding of anti-Marxist views here have been essentially outlived.

It is important to take something else into consideration as well. The history of many, including the victorious, revolutions in the 20th century proves that the bright light of the ideal inspiring the revolutionary to accomplish great deeds could (particularly in the early stages in building the new society) not only illuminate their path to their objective but, occasionally, "blind them," dulling political realism, "concealing" the factual historical distance between ideal and reality, and creating the desire to artificially and arbitrarily bring them closer to each other and "introduce" the higher communist principles in life. This was discussed, for example, at the First Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba by F. Castro, its Central Committee's first secretary. Standing on Marxist-Leninist positions, he analyzed some errors allowed in the beginning of the building of socialism. "Customary to a revolution are periods of utopia," he stated, "in the course of which their participants who have dedicated their lives to the noble task of implementing their dreams and ideals assume that historical objectives are far closer than they are in reality, and that the will and intentions of the people are omnipotent and above the requirements of objective reality. . . . Interpreting Marxism from idealistic positions and neglecting the practical experience tested through the efforts of other countries," F. Castro noted, "we tried to find our own methods. . . . It seemed to us that we are approaching the communist forms of production and distribution whereas, in fact, we were removing ourselves from the proper methods for building socialism."

Without ignoring these and other theoretical-cognitive reasons for possible erroneous interpretations of the problem of "socialist ideal and reality," we must, at the same time, most firmly emphasize that, considered on an international scale, under contemporary conditions this problem is less gnosiological than class in nature. In the capitalist countries it has become a structural part of the ideological-political struggle. As witnessed by the West German communists, the young people in the FRG, university students in particular, are showing a tremendous attraction for socialist literature. Some of them use as a basic yardstick the characteristics of the completed communist society, elaborated by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, or else their own idealized concepts of such a society. It is from such positions that they criticize real socialism and develop "socialist theories" of a utopian nature. A similar phenomenon may be observed in other countries as well.

Exposing the blabberings of our ideological enemies on the correlation between the ideal and the real in the development of a socialist society, it is important not to forget in the practice of ideological-theoretical and

educational work, that they do not use the factually existing dialectical contradiction between the two, but resort to their metaphysical confrontation, which objectively serves the single purpose of weakening the attractiveness of real socialism. That is why the proper Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the correlation between social ideals and historical reality is of prime importance in substantiating the refutation of all types of anti-communist content.

We know that in terms of capitalist reality, in its main and decisive aspects the socialist ideal acts as the direct contrast to capitalism and as the radical, the revolutionary-critical rejection of the bourgeois production method and way of life. Consequently, in this case the contradiction between socialist ideal and reality is of a directly antagonistic nature.

The contradiction between socialist ideal and reality is not "abolished" as the working people seize the power in one or another country, but is subjected to an essential change. To use the metaphor of R. Arismendi, Communist Party of Uruguay Central Committee first secretary, "The Soviet Union is not a 'paradise.' It is a victory over the hell of capitalism and imperialism." As a result of the socialist revolution, accomplishments in social practice include, first of all, the elimination of the vestiges of the old system in social life and the social consciousness; secondly, the gradual resolution of a qualitatively new contradiction between the socialist (communist) ideal and the consciously transformed reality, a contradiction created by the initiation of the very process of its implementation, and the dialectical development of the new system. Its main aspects of its now no longer antagonistic contradiction are, on the one hand, the ideal, as the end, the theoretically predictable purpose of the proletarian movement and, on the other, the empirically given social reality which necessarily represents merely one of the initial or intermediate stages or gradations leading to this objective.

This contradiction logically stems from the scientific concept of the origin of the new society. In practice, however, it is very important to take into consideration not only the logical contradictions in the establishment of a communist system but also those triggered by the concrete-historical characteristics of its development. In particular, we must bear in mind that the first socialist revolutions were victorious essentially in countries whose technical and economic development was lesser than that of the leading imperialist countries.

According to the scientific theory of society, compared with capitalism socialism represents a higher stage in the historical progress of mankind not only in the political-ideological but in the socioeconomic meanings of the term, i.e., a more developed and harmonious totality of production forces, the base, and the superstructure. In terms of the factual level of production forces and labor productivity, however, real socialism has not as yet fully reached this stage.

Lenin himself noted a certain contradiction between the universal-historical mission which the developing socialist social system has been called upon to

implement, together with its objective historical role, and the initially limited available material resources, compared with the more developed imperialist states. Arguing with the "left-wing" communists, in 1918 he wrote: ". . . Bukharin was mistaken, for he did not consider the specific characteristics of the specific time in Russia, an exceptional time, in which we, the Russian proletariat, were ahead of England or Germany in terms of political system, by virtue of the political power of the workers, yet, were behind the most backward of the Western European countries in terms of the organization of adequate state capitalism, in terms of the level of culture and the level of preparedness for the material-production 'introduction' of socialism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 36, p 306).

Returning to this thought, in his preparatory materials for the political report submitted by the RKP(b) Central Committee to the 11th party congress in 1922, Lenin wrote: "The crux of the matter is the gap between the universal-historical greatness of the tasks as they have been formulated and initiated, and the material and cultural poverty" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 45, p 414). Lenin and the party considered that the key to the victory of socialism on a universal scale could be found in the total elimination of this gap.

Thus, in the course of the establishment of the socialist society (in the USSR as well as in the majority of the other fraternal countries) complex problems had to be resolved, historically pertaining, in terms of their origin, to the capitalist age. It is very important to take this into consideration in order to refute substantively anti-communist fabrications of a "conflict" between the theory and practice of scientific socialism.

The theoretical picture of developed socialism, presented by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, in works such as "Critique of the Gotha Program," "Anti-Duhring," and "The State and Revolution," presumes the essential completion of a number of socioeconomic processes and, above all, the dissemination of machine production and the related upgrading of the cultural and technical standards of the workers, the restriction of manual unskilled labor, and the technological and organizational socialization of the economy and its centralization.

In the presence of such premises the period of proletarian dictatorship appeared necessarily short, for its main and, essentially, only action was to convert productive capital from private to national property (naturally, along with belated measures of organizing a nationwide accounting and control over labor and consumption, and introducing the individual distribution of products based on the quantity and quality of labor invested).

This logical approach to the problem of the establishment of the new system is a manifestation of its legitimacy. During the lifetime of the founders of scientific communism and in the initial period of Lenin's activities, prior to the October Revolution, it neither could nor should have been different. Its accuracy was confirmed by the history of the victorious dictatorship of the proletariat in our country and the initial experience in the building of socialism. However, it did not always coincide in terms of the sequence and time of such changes.

This non-coincidence was extensively written about in both our country and abroad and its tendentious interpretation has become a favorite method of anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist, and anti-communist propaganda. Indeed, the difference between the logical (scientifically foreseen) and historical (the implementation of predictions) factors in the conversion from capitalism to socialism is obvious. The theoretical prediction which, properly expressing the basic content of future events, also anticipates them by decades and some tasks appear somewhat different than they subsequently develop to be in life. However, only thoughtless publicists could draw from this the conclusion of an allegedly existing gap between the theory and practice of scientific socialism. The most general refutation of such a hasty conclusion is found in the fact that the Marx-Engels-Lenin theory has been formulated to cover a longer (and more meaningful) stage of the movement of the masses compared with the one already covered by the new system.

"Marx's creation, which in itself as a scientific accomplishment is a gigantic entity," noted Rosa Luxemburg at the turn of the century, "outstrips the immediate requirements of the class struggle of the proletariat for whose sake, strictly speaking, it was created. Both through his thorough and complete study of the capitalist economy and the historical method of research used, with an immeasurably broader realm of application, Marx was able to give far more than was required for the practical needs of the class struggle."

Furthermore, it would be useful to recall what Marx wrote on the inter-relationship between the logical and the historical. ". . . It would be inadmissible and erroneous," he pointed out, "to take the economic categories in the sequence in which they historically played a decisive role. On the contrary, their sequence is determined by their correlation within the contemporary bourgeois society, which is directly opposite to what may seem natural or consistent with the sequence of historical progress. It is a question not of the historical condition of economic relations in different consecutive social systems. . . . It is a question of their dismemberment within contemporary bourgeois society" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 12, p 734).

This applies not only to capitalism. Socialism, for example, as it historically appeared and developed in a number of countries, is occasionally forced to resolve the social problems whose implementation, essentially, is a preliminary condition for its appearance, i.e., to finish that which capitalism failed to finish. This greatly complicates and broadens the mission of the dictatorship of the working class, far exceeding the limits of the economic socialization of productive capital predicted by Marx and Engels. This does not mean in the least that they were wrong. Their prediction retains its entire validity for the industrial countries of Western Europe and North America, for, as the result of the development of state-monopoly capitalism in those countries, the working class and the people's regime would be given, as a result of the revolution, an already almost complete production apparatus, almost totally adapted for the management of the socialized economy. The working people of these countries will not have to expend gigantic efforts for the solution of many of the problems

which faced the Russian working class immediately following the October Revolution. The history of the proletarian states here could coincide in its essential aspects with the logic of the scientific prediction, even though the subsequent building of a developed socialist society, naturally, will nowhere or ever be an easy problem to resolve and will always take a great deal of time.

In over 60 years of practical experience of real socialism, a number of people have appeared, and will continue to appear, who hasten (occasionally displaying subjectively good intentions) to proclaim one or another view expressed by Marx, Engels, and Lenin on the socialist society not justified, replacing them with new ones, allegedly more consistent with "existing reality." Occasionally attempts are made to ascribe to Lenin as well this "substitution" operation, claiming that, allegedly, in his latest works on problems of the building of socialism in our country, he had abandoned his own earlier views on socialism. The reflection of one or another specific landmark in its establishment is presented as the essence of the Leninist concept of a socialist society.

Occasionally attempts are being made to separate the Leninist understanding of socialism from that of Marx and Engels on grounds that Lenin paid immeasurably greater attention, compared with his great predecessors, to problems of economic policy in the age of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is quite obvious that particular emphasis is placed on the fact that socialism is far more dependent than it appeared in theory on the retention and improvement of categories servicing the planned public economy such as commodity, value, price, money, etc. In this case Lenin the "realist" is pitted against Marx the "romantic." However, the problem here is to understand Marx, for which reason we must take into consideration the fact that, from his viewpoint, following the elimination of capitalist private ownership and the commodity nature of manpower, which are the culminating point in the historical development of commodity output, commodity-value categories lose their essential significance to society and do not reflect the qualitative aspect of economic and other social relations. Methodologically, Marx considered unimportant the time they would exist after that and the time when they will be replaced by more advanced instruments of commercial responsibility and economic production incentive, since no other way was possible. Marx was interested in the historically meaningful aspect of the matter rather than the economic-organizational one. As to Lenin, he intensified our understanding of the first and expanded the Marxist theory on the second.

It can be said that Marx and Engels were the true masters of scientific prediction and the theoreticians of the already existing socialist society (in philosophical terms, i.e., a society which, in the course of its establishment, had acquired all the essential features possible within the framework of quality alone). Lenin had to develop and refine, on the basis of the comprehensive practical experience of Marx and Engels, a "model" of the future, and elaborate the theory of developing Marxism, above all, the political economy of the transitional period, the economic policy of the

dictatorship of the proletariat, and the theory of the laws governing the functioning and development of the socialist social system and its management foundations. Naturally, the scale of the age in which scientific communism is applied are broadening steadily and, correspondingly, the theoretical arsenal of Marxism-Leninism becomes richer. However, this does not lower the heuristic value of Marx's study of capitalism and his views on socialism, or Lenin's ideological heritage as they affect us and future generations. They continue to act as a reliable antidote to the methodologically helpless attempts to avoid the complexities of contemporary social developments by falling into the doubtful arms of fashionable social utopia, condemned by reality.

This does not eliminate in the least the possibility itself and, given certain circumstances, the necessity for making certain corrections to the practical application of the theoretical views on socialism. A different approach would conflict with the very nature of Marxism-Leninism and with the real history of its development. Such a correction is not a fabricated but a vital problem, creatively resolved by the communist and workers' parties. However, before hastening to proclaim one or another unjustified statement or elaboration of the founders of scientific socialism, would it not be better to begin by giving a closer thought to what is true in the realm of knowledge of society?

Let us recall in this connection that it has frequently happened in the course of history that one or another social judgment considered false from the specific historical viewpoint has turned out to be true in a universal-historical sense. This allows us to ask the following question: Is it not more sensible to assume that the few things in the assertions made by the classics of Marxism-Leninism on the aspect of socialism not confirmed as yet, considering them only through the hindsight of a few past decades, would assume a different meaning if assessed on the basis of longer range positions?

We believe that it is only by taking such dialectics of social truth into consideration could we achieve a proper understanding of the interrelationship between the logical and the historical in the development of socialism, an understanding which would enable us not to circumvent their non-coincidences or artificially coordinate them but to subject the achieved stages of maturity of the socialist society to an objective scientific study from the Leninist positions of the "revolutionary dialectics of Marxist realism."

On the basis of such positions it would be easy to determine also the groundlessness of the anti-communist method used in an attempt to defame the developed socialist society created in our country, since it has not met a number of requirements of the higher communist phase (even though they could not as yet be met). Rebuffing such "criticism," the communists, at the same time, reject all attempts to deprive real socialism of its communist future and weaken the influence of the "end" revolutionary-socialist ideals on the shaping of the ideology and the mentality of the working people.

The importance of the problem of the dialectically conflicting correlation between the socialist (communist) ideal and the factual socialist reality

exceeds the limits of the strictly ideological struggle. It is most directly related to the positive ideological-educational party work with the masses, the youth in particular. We have in mind, above all, the clear Leninist instruction of the need to promote its revolutionary upbringing, based on the scientific outlook concerning the socialist ideal. As we know, a critical attitude toward existing shortcomings and the level of the already achieved socialist development, and its comparison with the more distant party objectives and tasks is a natural consequence (and not in the least a "cost") of raising the youth in the spirit of our ideals. In itself, this is a healthy phenomenon. However, we must adamantly see to it that this criticism, which arises as a reaction to a certain disparity between ideal and reality, is never separated from positive activities aimed at eliminating incomplete projects, improving the new society further, and resolving new and more complex problems, would not create in some people, young people in particular, the desire to assume the position of a critical outsider, who, remaining totally inactive, never makes an error and is "always right." . . .

The materials of the 25th CPSU Congress and the recent Central Committee decree "On Improving Further Ideological and Political-Educational Work," and other party documents indicate the need for active and purposeful propaganda of both communist ideals as well as specific practical problems affecting our current construction, and the determination of the close connection between them. In the course of such propaganda it is important to avoid both the idealizing of the accomplished as well as the adaptation of ideals to existing reality, which in turn leads to their "grounding," depriving them of the ability to be a powerful uplift which shapes and stimulates bold creative thinking and practical activities.

In ideological work with all generations of working people under socialism it is necessary to skillfully explain the specifics of the practical implementation in social life of the principles, objectives, and laws governing the establishment of a communist system formulated as general theoretical concepts and social forecasts in the works of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. The insufficient knowledge of the mechanism for the implementation of scientific predictions in social life could create in some people ideological hesitations, which as we have seen are frequently skillfully used by our enemies. That is why the party displays particular concern for making the process of mental correlation and comparison between theoretical concepts of socialism, acquired in the course of the education and political upbringing of the masses, and the practice of the building of socialism and communism become an effective incentive for the energetic and constructive efforts of the working people aimed at the implementation of our programs.

5003
CSO: 1802

IN DEFENSE OF LIFE AND FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY, AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 79 pp 25-36

[Review of the book "Na Strazhe Mira i Sotsializma" [Guarding Peace and Socialism] by L. I. Brezhnev. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 663 pages]

[Text] Guided by the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the communist party is properly fulfilling its historical mission as the wise and tested leader of the Soviet people, who are building communism. An inseparable aspect of its comprehensive activities is the creation of favorable international conditions for the solution of national economic problems, consolidating peace and security, and strengthening the defense capability of the Soviet state. Inseparably blended in the foreign policy of the CPSU are love of peace and readiness to repel any aggressor. This Leninist course is characterized by its strictly scientific nature, creative approach to the study of dynamically developing world events, bold predictions of the future, and systematic implementation of planned practical measures.

Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, USSR Defense Council chairman, and Marshal of the Soviet Union, is making an invaluable contribution to the elaboration of the problems of the struggle for peace, to securing the safety of our homeland, and to the cause of socialism. This is vividly confirmed by his book "Na Stazhe Mira i Sotsializma." The reports, speeches, articles, and other works it contains sum up the tremendous experience of our party and state in the struggle for detente and against aggressive imperialist policy, reflecting the tireless fruitful activities of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev aimed at upgrading the international prestige of the USSR, and strengthening the defense power of the Soviet state and the combat comity of the socialist countries.

The book will help the party and soviet workers, and military cadres in their study and execution of the foreign policy of the CPSU and Soviet state, and in the communist upbringing of the working people and the Soviet Armed Forces.

I

Radical changes in the correlation of forces occurred in the postwar world in favor of socialism. The main revolutionary forces of our time--the world

socialist system, the international workers' movement, and the national-liberation movement--together with other forces of democracy and social progress have today a sufficient material and spiritual potential to restrain the aggressive aspirations of imperialism, to safeguard and strengthen the peace, and to prevent a new world war.

The conclusion drawn by our Leninist party and the international communist movement that under present conditions a new world war is not inevitable is of tremendous political significance. Real possibilities have been brought to light for excluding a world war from the life of society even while capitalism remains on a certain part of the globe. The Marxist-Leninist parties have clearly indicated, nevertheless, the inadmissibility of a passive contemplation of world events and of expectations that peace will be preserved by itself. On the contrary, they direct the people's masses to the realization that the wrecking of aggressive imperialist plans and strengthening the peace could be achieved only through the continuing and adamant struggle waged by all peace-loving forces on earth. "We are profoundly convinced," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said, "that the conclusion drawn by the international communist movement on the possibility to restrain the aggressor and to prevent a new world war remains valid. However, in order to turn this possibility into reality the broad popular masses must become involved in this struggle which requires the intensive and constantly rising activities of all forces of peace. . . . The socialist countries play a particular role in preserving the peace" (p 89).

Loyally continuing the cause of the great Lenin, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev deserves outstanding credit for the elaboration and implementation of the strategy of peace, most vividly and completely embodied in the peace program formulated at the 24th and developed at the 25th CPSU congresses and in developing the Leninist theory of the defense of the socialist fatherland.

Together with the other members of the socialist comity, the Soviet Union is strictly guided in its relations with the capitalist countries by the party's program for the struggle for peace and international cooperation and for the freedom and independence of the peoples. It systematically supports the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems.

The fraternal socialist countries work for the decisive improvement of the international climate and for the establishment and development of mutually profitable cooperation with the capitalist countries in the economic, political, scientific and technical, cultural, and other areas. They call for the resolution of all international disputes through talks and without the use of force or the threat it use. They believe that military detente must be added to international detente in order to insure its successful development. Peace cannot be stable and durable without an end to the arms race and the gradual reduction of the levels of military potentials of the confronting sides, leading in the final account to universal and total disarmament.

The CPSU and the Soviet state are systematically and adamantly pursuing the peaceful foreign political course bequeathed by the great Lenin. The Vienna talks between L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, and U.S. President J. Carter, concluded with the signing of the USSR-U.S. SALT II treaty, and other Soviet-American documents are another impressive confirmation of this fact.

Providing that it is ratified and enacted, this treaty, aimed at insuring the quantitative limitation of strategic armaments and restraining their qualitative improvement, would encourage the soonest possible successful conclusion of other currently held multilateral and Soviet-American talks related to armament limitations and disarmament.

The Soviet people and millions and millions of people in all continents are deeply satisfied and approve the positive results of the Vienna summit as a major step toward improving Soviet-American relations and the entire international climate, reducing the threat of a nuclear war, consolidating universal peace, restraining the arms race, and developing mutually profitable cooperation among countries with different social systems. "Initialing this treaty," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev stated, "we are helping to defend the most sacred right of every person--the right to life."

Assessing the results of the struggle for peace and international security, we could note that the foreign political activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state have achieved major successes in virtually all foreign political directions. The enemies of detente were unable to void the positive changes in international relations which occurred in the 1970's, and the trend toward political detente remains a leading factor in international life.

Yet, a number of aspects in the condition of the present rather complex and conflicting international circumstances trigger the serious concern of the socialist and other peace-loving countries.

Experience shows that imperialism has not reconciled itself with its defeats on the fronts of social conflicts. Nor has it abandoned its criminal plans to resolve through military power in its favor the historical argument between the capitalist and socialist social systems, to suppress the national-liberation struggle of the peoples and the revolutionary movement in the capitalist countries, and thus to restore its unchallenged domination of the world.

The reactionary forces of imperialism, which was and remains aggressive in its nature, are not in favor of the positive changes occurring in the world. They are doing everything possible to wreck detente, restore the cold war atmosphere, and pursue a policy of balancing on the brink of a world war, fraught with serious consequences for the destinies of peace and all mankind. Hiding behind the myth of the so-called "Soviet military menace," they are trying to heat up the international atmosphere, increase military spending, urge on the arms race, and preserve and expand hotbeds of tension and military conflicts in various parts of the world. All this proves that today as well the imperialists have not abandoned their hopes to use war as a means for attaining their political, economic, and military-strategic objectives.

The book offers a profound and comprehensive study of the events occurring in the world, disclosing the aggressive and reactionary nature of the political strategy and military doctrines of the imperialist countries and the principal directions followed in their military preparations and aggressive actions.

The position of the Chinese leadership is coming ever closer to the aggressive and reactionary policy of imperialism. Its political course, after experiencing an anti-socialist degeneration, is now determined by great-power and hegemonistic aspirations, a scornful attitude toward other countries and peoples, and hostility toward anything which strengthens the peace and international security and conflicts with its plans for world domination. The extent to which the policy of the ruling Beijing circles has become adventuristic and the low level to which they have sunk, having betrayed the interests of socialism, were displayed by their shameful aggression against the Vietnamese people. In his speech to the voters of Baumanskiy Electoral District in Moscow, on 2 March 1979, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that through their predatory attack on socialist Vietnam, "the present Beijing leadership has definitively shown to the entire people the predatory and aggressive nature of its great-power hegemonistic policy. Today everyone can see that it is precisely this policy that represents at this time the greatest danger to universal peace."

In his works and addresses, turning to the lessons of World War II, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev points out the criminal nature of the play of the Western governments with the fascist aggressor for anti-Soviet purposes. Tens of millions of people paid with their lives for their "pacification" policy. The nations neither can nor should allow similar recurrences under present-day circumstances.

As to the all kinds of insinuations on the part of the imperialist ideologues and their Beijing accomplices on the so-called "Soviet military menace," this is the greatest of all lies and a malicious fabrication. The peoples of the world are well aware of the fact that by the very nature of its socioeconomic and political system unfair and aggressive wars are alien to the Soviet Union. Unlike the imperialist countries the USSR, as the other members of the socialist comity, neither aspires nor could aspire to the seizure of foreign territories and to the enslavement and plunder of other countries and peoples or to impose upon them its own will and way of life. On this occasion Comrade L. I. Brezhnev stated that, ". . . We have no territorial claims toward anyone. We threaten no one and do not intend to attack anyone. We favor the free and independent development of all nations" (p 258).

The Soviet Union, which formulated a comprehensive and constructive program for putting an end to the arms race, of nuclear armaments in particular, is guided by the principles of equality and safety of the parties. It is not striving to gain military superiority over the United States or the Western countries. However, the USSR cannot engage in unilateral disarmament or violate the existing military balance in the world, for the imperialist states, as historical experience shows, have frequently used their military

superiority to unleash wars and military conflicts on different scales. That is precisely why Comrade L. I. Brezhnev stated with particular emphasis that, "We shall not undertake to weaken our defense in the face of the growing military power of imperialism, regardless of the type of demagogic reasons behind which appeals to do so are concealed. This would have irreparable consequences to the cause of socialism and of the freedom and independence of the nations."

The imperialists and other aggression enthusiasts must realize properly that the Soviet Union is a powerful state capable of repelling any aggression, that the members of the socialist comity have a powerful economic and military potential, and that any attack mounted against them is doomed to failure, while the aggressor would not remain unpunished. The powerful defensive sword of the socialist countries will inevitably punish him.

For nearly three and a half decades the Soviet people have lived in peace. This is the greatest accomplishment of the Leninist foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state. The fact that within that time the forces of aggression and reaction have not dared to cross over the fatal line and that mankind has been able to protect our planet from a worldwide conflagration was made possible, above all, because they were opposed by the powerful forces of peace and social progress based on the economic and military power of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries, and because the preservation and consolidation of the peace is the concern of the broadest possible popular masses.

Considering the continuing military preparations of the contemporary enemies of peace and socialism, the Communist Party and Soviet state must display the greatest possible vigilance and maintain and strengthen the country's defense potential. It is the duty of our armed forces to maintain a state of constant combat readiness which would guarantee the immediate resistance to any aggressor. Systematically implementing a peaceful foreign political course, and firmly fighting for peace and international security, the party and the government display tireless concern for insuring the reliable protection of the gains of the Great October Revolution and for strengthening the defense capability of the country and the combat power of our great armed forces.

Our power, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized at the international conference of communist and workers' parties in 1969, in Moscow, is a bulwark of peace for anyone fighting the threat of a new world war. Defending socialism and the peace, we are defending the future of all mankind. "Our armed forces are reliably defending the frontiers of their homeland and, together with the allied armies, guarding the gains of the fraternal socialist countries, and the peace and security of the peoples" (p 199).

The works of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev offer a profound substantiation to problems related to strengthening the military-political cooperation among socialist countries and the collective defense of the gains of socialism.

Cooperation among the socialist countries in the military area is an objective law governing the building of the new society. The peoples which have taken

the socialist way, V. I. Lenin said, "mandatorily need a close military and economic alliance, for otherwise the capitalists . . . would suppress and strangle us separately" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch. [Complete Collected Works], vol 40, p 46). These Leninist concepts have become even more topical and significant today. Now, when socialism is convincingly conquering ever new positions in the world arena, the ruling circles of the imperialist countries are doing everything possible to set up a "united front," and to strengthen the aggressive military blocs they have created in their struggle against the members of the socialist comity, involving the use of all means including armed violence. "Under the conditions in which the threat of war remains," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev says, "fraternity in arms is naturally added to the fraternity among our peoples in labor and in the building of the new society. . . . We shall continue to steadily strengthen our collective defense and to improve the mechanism of interaction among fraternal armies. Such is the will of our parties and peoples!" (pp 174-175).

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has made a substantial contribution to substantiating the need for the collective defense of the gains of socialism. This is the class, the international duty of all Marxist-Leninist parties and peoples and governments of the socialist countries. The collective defense of socialism embodies the unity of national and international tasks of the working people. Each nation, acting in the interests of its country, is making its own contribution to the defense of the socialist comity, of the common socialist cause.

The Soviet Union is steadfastly implementing its international duty. A vivid confirmation of this is our active and effective aid to socialist Vietnam in repelling American and, subsequently, Chinese aggression. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's statement in connection with the attack of socialist Vietnam by the Chinese aggressors is imbued with loyalty to class and international duty: "Today as well, in this difficult hour for the Vietnamese people, we express our full and entire solidarity with them. . . . The Soviet Union is loyal to the Friendship and Cooperation Treaty which binds our countries."

The works of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev profoundly reveal the historical purpose of the defense coalition of the socialist states and the need for its preservation and strengthening under contemporary conditions. Combat comity, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev notes, "is one of the most important factors in cooling off the ardor of the aggressors and one of the factors contributing to the preservation of the peace" (p 280). At the 25th CPSU Congress he pointed out that the Soviet Union firmly opposes the division of the world into confronting military blocs and the arms race. However, as long as the NATO bloc remains and as long as militaristic circles are engaged in an arms race, together with the other members of the Warsaw Pact our country will strengthen its military-political alliance (see pp 416-417).

II

Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev deserves outstanding credit for the theoretical elaboration and practical solution of the most important problems related to

military affairs. His works provide a fundamental substantiation of the increased leading role of the CPSU in military construction and in the development and strengthening of the armed forces.

The Soviet Armed Forces are the type of social organism whose existence and development is inconceivable without enhancing the party's leading role. This is an inviolable law governing their lives and activities.

CPSU leadership is the very foundation of Soviet military construction and a decisive factor in the steady improvement of our military organization and in strengthening the combat power of the army and navy. The party documents and, above all, the decisions of its congresses and Central Committee Plenums, are the theoretical and methodological base for the further development of the scientifically substantiated Soviet military doctrine consistent with the nature of contemporary international circumstances and the level of the material and moral and political possibilities of the country. They elaborate and determine the ways for the solution of the most important problems of military construction, training of military cadres, improving the organizational structure and the system of troop guidance and combat and political training, equipping the armed forces and branches with modern weapons and combat materiel, and insuring the high combat readiness of the army and navy.

The materials contained in the book convincingly prove that in the course of his comprehensive activities in guiding the party and the state, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev profoundly and daily studies all aspects of the life and activities of the armed forces, making a tremendous contribution to the elaboration of the military policy of the party and the basic directions of Soviet military construction, and the strengthening of the country's defense capability and the combat power of the army and navy. He plays a great role in the elaboration of the economic strategy of the CPSU on the basis of the organic combination of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of the mature socialist society and the theoretical elaboration and practical development of the military economy and defense industry of the USSR.

Our party and its Central Committee are working so that all components of the defense power of the state--economic, scientific and technical, moral-political, and military--may develop harmoniously, in a state of dialectical unity.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has made a comprehensive contribution to the theoretical elaboration and development of the philosophical-sociological, sociopolitical, and political-economic aspects of the Marxist-Leninist theory of war and armed forces. Masterfully using the Marxist dialectical method and his tremendous practical experience and knowledge, Leonid Il'ich provides a profound analysis of the new aspects of the dialectics of war and peace under present-day conditions in his works. He brings to light the main directions of the aggressive actions of imperialism and other reactionary forces, the reasons and sources of war and threat of war in the contemporary

world, and the basic factors contributing to the prevention of war. He points out the need for and universal-historical significance of defending the fatherland and the gains of socialism.

The question of the fulfillment by the Soviet Armed Forces of their historical mission in defending the socialist fatherland holds one of the central positions in the works of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev. There are a number of outstanding passages in the book discussing Lenin, the party as the creator of the Red Army, a truly national army of a new, socialist type, the heroic struggle and unparalleled exploits of its soldiers in the civil war and foreign military intervention, and the tremendous efforts of the Soviet people and their armed forces in the Great Patriotic War, unequaled in history in terms of scale and fierceness of the struggle. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev profoundly describes the sociopolitical and military-strategic nature of the Great Patriotic War and World War II. He rates highly the struggle against facism waged by the peoples of other countries. However, he describes with particular emphasis and persuasiveness the decisive of the USSR and its armed forces in the defeat of fascist Germany, militaristic Japan, and their allies.

The Soviet people and their heroic soldiers fought for a just cause: for Soviet power and socialism, and for the freedom and independence of the peoples. Everything which Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said and written on the Patriotic War has a tremendous impact. Throughout the war he himself was in the active army, fighting at the most important sectors of the Soviet-German front, and making a worthy contribution to our great victory.

The author pays great attention to the sources of this victory. Its legitimacy, as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev proves, was based on the tremendous socioeconomic achievements of the people under the Soviet system, the superiority of the socialist social and governmental system, and the material and moral and political possibilities of our country and of its armed forces.

The moral-political unity of the society, Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism, friendship among the peoples of the USSR, and their solidarity rallied around the communist party and the unparalleled heroism and courage of the Soviet Army were of tremendous importance in winning this victory. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev describes vividly and convincingly the mass heroism of soldiers, commanders, political workers, partisans, and clandestine workers infinitely loyal to the party and the fatherland and to the cause of socialism, the heroic cities which "are our pride and glory, embodying the noble exploit of the Soviet people" (p 343), the heroic exploit of the working class, kolkhoz peasantry, and people's intelligentsia in the rear, the striking courage of Soviet women and youth, and of the tremendous contribution to victory made by all nations and nationalities in the Soviet Union and, above all, by the great Russian people.

The book provides a profound assessment of the basic strategic offensive operations in the Great Patriotic War, whose brilliant execution confirms the high military skill of Soviet military leaders and commanders and the successful operations of our forces, as well as their outstanding moral-political and combat qualities and the superiority of Soviet military science.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pays particular attention to the study of the role played by the communist party in winning the victory. On the basis of irrefutable historical facts he proves that the party was the organizer and inspirer of the struggle waged by the entire Soviet people and their armed forces against the fascist aggressors, and in the reorganization of the entire life of the country on a military basis. It inspired and led the people to great military and labor exploits, insured the leadership of the armed forces and the guerrilla movement, and secured unity of action between the front and the rear. Everywhere the members of the Leninist party were in the most difficult sectors, marching in the front ranks and leading the masses for the sake of the great objective—the defeat of the aggressor. The CPSU guided party-political work in the army and navy. Such work was, and remains, its powerful weapon in winning victories.

The book shows the universal-historical significance of the victory of the Soviet people and its armed forces in the Great Patriotic War. They defended the gains of the October Revolution, saved mankind from the threat of fascist slavery, rescued world civilization, and carried out their great liberation mission of the peoples of Europe and Asia enslaved by foreign aggressors. This victory had a tremendous impact on the postwar development of all nations on earth. It triggered a powerful upsurge of the revolutionary movement, created favorable conditions for the victory of the people's democratic and socialist revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries, and contributed to the emergence of the world socialist system. The imperialist colonial system began to break down. The communist and workers' movements rose to a new level. The general crisis of capitalism intensified.

These tremendous changes throughout the world are revealed in their entirety, clearly, and convincingly in the CPSU documents and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's works. All the efforts of bourgeois falsifiers of history to belittle the significance of the universal-historical victory of the homeland of the October Revolution are doomed to failure. Grateful humanity will praise through the centuries the great liberation exploit of the soldiers of the Soviet state.

III

Great attention is paid in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's book to the Soviet Armed Forces in the period of developed socialism and to the description of the new content of their basic sociopolitical and military-technological features. The author convincingly proves the substantial influence of the new stage in the building of a communist society on the functioning and development of all state organs, including the armed forces. Now they act as belonging to the whole people, expressing the will and interests of all working people. Their purpose is to guard the gains and peaceful toil of the Soviet people and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the state and to protect them from the intrigues of imperialist and reactionary forces.

The Soviet Armed Forces are also an important link in the upbringing of the Soviet youth. ". . . We cannot fail to consider," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev

said at the 25th CPSU Congress, "the tremendous role which the Soviet Army plays in this matter. The adolescents enter the soldiers' family without practical experience. However, they come out of the army as people who have attended a school of endurance and discipline and have obtained technical and vocational knowledge and political training" (p 435).

As belonging to the whole people, like the state as a whole, our army remains a class army. "The communist party and V. I. Lenin, its founder," notes Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "have always considered the armed forces of the socialist state one of the most important factors in the entire revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat" (p 101).

The further strengthening of the unity between army and people takes place under the conditions of mature socialism. The internationalist nature of the Armed Forces of the USSR, called upon to defend the cause of peace and socialism together with the armies of the other members of the socialist comity, is developed further.

One of the most important indicators of the combat power of the armed forces is their equipment with modern weapons and combat materiel. The Communist Party and Soviet Government pay tireless attention to this. In the field of military affairs, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev notes, today most profound qualitative changes are taking place. In terms of significance and consequences they exceed anything known to history so far. The appearance of nuclear missiles and the unparalleled saturation of the armed forces with contemporary varied and most complex equipment demanded a new approach to resolving the problems of Soviet military construction (see p 53). The Soviet state is appropriating substantial yet necessary funds for the technical outfitting of the armed forces. Our talented scientists, engineers, workers, and kolkhoz members are submitting the results of their toil to this cause. Thanks to the tireless concern of the party and the government, all the branches of the armed forces--strategic missile troops, land forces, antiaircraft forces, and the air force and navy are equipped with most modern weapons and military material.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev deserves tremendous credit for strengthening the combat power of the Soviet Army and Navy and for improving their technical outfitting. Leonid Il'ich is well acquainted with the situation in the army and navy. He is always in contact with their command personnel, visits military districts and groups of forces and fleets, meets with soldiers, officers, and generals, and attends army and navy exercises and maneuvers. Possessing a rich experience from the past war, and profoundly understanding the nature of modern combat operations, and as USSR Defense Council chairman, and Marshal of the Soviet Union, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev is successfully resolving the most complex problems of strengthening the defense capability of our homeland. We find in his works many important concepts aimed at the further development of Soviet military science and martial art. He has made a major personal contribution to the scientific substantiation of the harmonious development of all the branches of the USSR Armed Forces and arms in the interest of the successful solution of combat problems on a contemporary level.

Ascribing great importance to the outfitting of the armed forces, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev also points out that, "Soviet military science justifiably rejects the scholastic disputes taking place in some countries as to what is more important in modern warfare--men or equipment. We believe that success is determined by people armed with contemporary equipment which they have mastered to perfection, people who are ideologically firm and convinced of the justice of the cause they are defending" (p 172).

On the basis of the major economic, sociopolitical, and cultural changes related to the establishment of mature socialism, quality changes are taking place in army and navy personnel. The political-moral status, conscientiousness, and ideological tempering of the troops and their general and military-technical standards are rising steadily; their interest is growing in becoming thoroughly acquainted with social processes within the country and in the international arena. All this enables personnel to master military skills rapidly and to use new equipment effectively, and successfully fulfill their duty and honorable obligation to defend the socialist fatherland.

In his works Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pays considerable attention to the characterization of officer cadres. "One may have the most modern weapons and best organization of the armed forces," he states. "However, if the army does not have an adequate number of trained military cadres, infinitely loyal to the party and the people, we have no right to hope for success" (p 104).

The new requirements facing the officers and their training and upbringing under the conditions of the developed socialist society and the radical quality changes in military affairs are profoundly and comprehensively described in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's addresses and articles. The idea that under the conditions of a tempestuous scientific and technical progress and of military affairs the officers' cadres must steadily intensify their knowledge, master the contemporary achievements of science and technology, and steadfastly improve their skills in leading and training their subordinates runs throughout the book. "Anyone who thinks of living with the old stock of knowledge and past experience," the author states, "may turn out unable to resolve in a contemporary way the problem of managing the armed forces" (p 105).

Rating the command personnel of the Soviet Army, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev points out that, "Now our homeland has the necessary number of the best military cadres in the world" (p 104). Last year, during his trip to Siberia and the Far East, he noted the good preparedness of command cadres and staffs and their confident direction of units and subunits.

Combat readiness is the main, the determining indicator characterizing the combat power of the armed forces and all its most important elements. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev provides a profound scientific substantiation of its nature: "The Soviet Armed Forces as a whole, and each large unit, each military unit must always be in a state of readiness which would exclude the slightest possible opportunity for the aggressor to find us unawares. . . . The tremendous efforts and material outlays of the people for equipping the army,

conscientiousness, combat training, and the discipline of all military personnel, the ability of the command personnel in guiding the troops and many others are focused as in a lens in the combat readiness of the troops. In the final account, this grounds the combat skill of the forces in peacetime and is a key to victory in war. We have everything necessary to insure the high and reliable combat readiness of the Soviet Armed Forces. That is why upgrading further the level of combat readiness of the army and navy greatly depends on the practical activities of military cadres and on their ability, will, energy, and persistence" (pp 137-138).

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has made a great contribution to the development of the theory and practice of army-party-political work. He develops further the Leninist ideas of its role and place and enriches it with new conclusions and concepts and through his rich personal experience in organization and execution in his addresses, articles, talks with soldiers, answers to their letters, and in his books "Malaya Zemlya," "Vozrozhdeniye" [Rebirth], and "Tselina" [Virgin Land].

According to Leonid Il'ich party-political work with the personnel and its ideological tempering are our army's powerful weapon. "The power of this weapon was tried in battle. Today as well it is feared by our enemies" (p 139). This assessment of political work is based on its purpose, the opportunities for political support of training and combat assignments, and conditions for their execution.

Developing in the Soviet troops communist idea-mindedness as an alloy of knowledge, convictions, and practical actions, the purpose of party-political work is to insure the high combat capability and constant combat readiness to repel any aggression whatever its origin and successfully to implement combat assignments for the defense of the homeland.

We have everything necessary to achieve this objective. Leonid Il'ich emphasizes that hardly anywhere else are there such favorable possibilities for the organization of party-political work as in the army and navy. "It is a concentration of commanders and engineering-technical cadres who are party members and are well trained and have gone through the school of party upbringing and combat training. An efficient party-political system has been created. All the necessary conditions are found here for the all-round study of the people and for exerting daily political influence on every serviceman" (p 139).

Under present-day conditions the tasks related to protecting the country have become considerably more complex and party-political work faces stricter requirements. It is no accident, therefore, that our party points out the particular importance of comprehensively improving such work as one of the most important factors for the successful implementation of the tasks facing the armed forces. The activities of political organs and party organizations must always be on the level of the party's present-day requirements.

The outstanding significance of the ideas, conclusions, and recommendations presented by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the field of party-political work is

that they contain a broad program for upgrading its effectiveness and quality and, particularly, of the concept of the comprehensive approach to upbringing, i.e., the close unity among the ideological-political, labor, and moral upbringing in accordance with the characteristics of the various groups of working people and military servicemen.

Insuring the intensive party-political work in the armed forces, the party is always concerned with the military-patriotic upbringing of all Soviet people, recalling Lenin's behest and the USSR constitutional stipulation to the effect that the defense of the socialist fatherland is the cause of the entire people.

The party has always considered the molding of morally and physically tempered people with firm communist convictions, ready to defend the gains of socialism, one of its most important tasks. Under the conditions of the revolution in military affairs the upbringing of the young people in a spirit of infinite loyalty to the heroic traditions of the party and the people, the Soviet Armed Forces have their characteristics. "Today the defenders of the Soviet homeland," notes Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "must master the art of guiding intercontinental missiles, flying supersonic aircraft, sailing nuclear submarines, and be experts in many other most complex types of weapons. Today we need not only simply daring, fit, and muscular boys with a clear eye and firm hand but engineers and mathematicians familiar with the secrets of electronics and cybernetics. Therefore, in this field the tasks have become more complex and responsible, and have reached a new level. However, the Komsomol tenaciousness, enthusiasm, and daring of the youth, and courage and bravery are as needed today as they were in the civil war and the first five-year plans, and in the flames of the Great Patriotic War" (p 181).

Today our armed forces need educated, ideologically firm, and tempered people, capable of combining the traditions of infinite courage of their fathers with the perfect mastery of modern technology. A leading role in the training of such army and navy reinforcements belongs to the party organs under whose guidance state and public organizations operate: soviets, trade unions, the Komsomol, DOSAAF, etc. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pays great attention to this line of educational activities. In his addresses he shows the place and role of the party and soviet organs and public organizations in resolving the problems of the patriotic training of the working people and the means for improving the ways and means of mass defense work.

The Soviet people welcomed with tremendous satisfaction the publication of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's book which poses with great conviction and finds solutions to the most important problems of our time--the problems of the defense of peace and socialism. Unquestionably, the work will contribute to the more successful solution of the problems of strengthening and developing the economic and defense potential of our socialist homeland, power of the Soviet Armed Forces, and unity and solidarity among the members of the socialist comity and among all anti-imperialist and peace-loving forces on earth.

The Leninist ideas of the defense of peace and socialism and of the socialist fatherland, developed in the documents of the CPSU and Soviet state and in the works of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, inspire the Soviet citizens and the army and navy forces to new accomplishments in the building and defense of the new society, rallying even more closely around our communist party.

5003

CSO: 1802

LESSONS OF THE SHCHEKINO METHOD

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 79 pp 37-47

[Article by K. Cherednichenko, deputy minister of chemical industry, and L. Gol'din, head of the Chair of Scientific Foundations of Management, Institute for Upgrading the Skills of Leading Workers and Specialists in the Chemical Industry]

[Text] The accelerated growth of labor productivity--a decisive prerequisite for the further development of production and the prosperity of the people--is inseparably linked with upgrading the effectiveness of utilization of manpower resources. This problem is aggravated by the demographic situation developing in the country. The need for manpower continues to grow in the production and non-production areas. Yet, in the near future the effect of demographic factors will bring about a drastic reduction in the inflow of able-bodied population in the national economy. As was noted at the November 1978 CC CPSU Plenum, "Starting with the 1980's we shall have to rely even more on intensive factors of economic growth, since the other factors will be drastically reduced. This applies, above all, to the possibility for recruiting new manpower resources." Consequently, the need of industry, agriculture, and services for additional manpower will be met primarily by releasing workers from operating enterprises.

A Practically Tried Method

". . . Socialism," V. I. Lenin pointed out, "requires the conscientious and mass movement forward toward higher labor productivity. . . . Using its own ways and means or, more specifically, Soviet means, socialism will be able to insure this progress" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 178).

Among the valuable initiatives of the collectives of the Volga Motor Vehicles Plant and the Dinamo Plant, the Shchekino method has assumed a proper position in the brigade contracting system as one of the most important directions for upgrading the effectiveness of utilizing manpower resources and the growth of labor productivity under developed socialist conditions. Already in its second decade, this method is continuing to be successfully developed by the collective of Azot Production Association in Shchekino, and by its followers.

As we know, the system of stimulating highly productive labor and insuring a considerable increase in output, while at the same time reducing the size of the personnel, was applied for the first time in Shchekino.

Let us recall the basic conditions for the Shchekino experiment. According to them, first of all, the planned enterprise wage funds must remain unchanged on the level of the plan for the base year of the experiment; secondly, all wage funds savings obtained as a result of reducing the number of workers must be left at the disposal of the enterprise. Up to 50% of such savings go to the shop chiefs for additional payments to the workers for combining skills or increasing their volume of work. From the very beginning this reorganization of the economic mechanism was supplemented by extensive organizational and educational work in the collective and the extensive development of the socialist competition. The name of the then combine director, P. M. Sharov, is inseparably linked with the birth and establishment of the new method. An experienced economic manager, thoroughly familiar with chemical output, a highly cultured person who could see in a specific problem leading trends of socioeconomic development, he became a warm supporter of the new method, making a substantial personal contribution to the improvement of its economic mechanism. All this yielded outstanding results.

Between 1967 and 1975 output at the Azot Production Association in Shchekino rose by a 2.7 factor, while the personnel decreased by 1,514 people. Labor productivity rose by a factor of 3.4, while average wages, by 45%. At the same time labor discipline improved and the responsibility of the workers for assignments increased. Some important tasks related to the social development of the collective were successfully implemented. In the 10th Five-Year Plan the Shchekino people adopted high socialist pledges: to increase the volume of output 20.3% by 1980 in comparison to 1975, to raise labor productivity 27.6% while raising the average wage 12.3%, and to release from production facilities no less than 300 persons in comparison to the number of personnel in 1975.

All the released workers in Shchekino were placed in accordance with their experience, skills, and personal wishes. It is noteworthy that many of them transferred to new enterprises in the sector with higher technical level of output and more interesting and meaningful work. Thanks to the technical retooling of the production process the percentage of intellectual and creative functions of the work of the remaining personnel increased.

We wish particularly to emphasize the latter circumstance. The mechanism of influence of the Shchekino method on the attitude of the people toward labor and on the growth of labor productivity is not covered in the least by additional material incentives. The Shchekino method helps to enrich the content of the work itself and to develop its most attractive and creative aspects thanks to the scientific combination of skills, the expansion of service areas, improved technical facilities, increased skills, and the release of many workers from harmful and dangerous types of work.

Currently the chemical industry enterprises and other national economic sectors have acquired substantial experience in the practical utilization of

the Shchekino method. The party and trade union organizations, economic managers, and production collectives have done a great deal to implement the 6 October 1969 CC CPSU decree "On the Experience of the Work of the Party Committee of the Shchekino Chemical Combine in Mobilizing the Collective of Working People to Increase the Volume of Output Through Higher Labor Productivity." Following the adoption of the decree the Shchekino method went far beyond the limits of the sector. Following the chemical workers, the Shchekino initiative was taken up by workers in metallurgy, petro-chemistry, machine building, and transportation. The new method was applied in agriculture and services as well, confirming throughout its vitality and effectiveness.

"Intensive and highly productive labor must be encouraged and rewarded better," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said in the CC CPSU Accountability Report to the 24th party congress. "As the experience of the Shchekino Chemical Combine indicates, it would be expedient to give the enterprises broader possibilities to encourage workers in collectives who are making the highest contribution to the development of output, combine skills, and handle public resources more economically and thriftily." In his encounter with the party aktiv of Tul'skaya Oblast, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev recommended yet once again the broader utilization of the Shchekino method which was developed in the Tula area.

Speaking of the place of origin of the initiative, the Tul'skaya Oblast party committee did extensive work to promote its dissemination and development. The Shchekino method made it possible to release by the oblast enterprises over 35,000 people. Here 134 collectives accounting for two-thirds of the oblast's industrial output are following the Shchekino example. The party organizations are actively helping to resolve problems related to the redistribution of manpower among enterprises in different industrial sectors, and to surmount the departmental approach to the utilization of manpower resources.

Shchekino was visited by a CEMA task force, and offered a seminar for party and economic managers, sponsored by the CPSU Central Committee, with a view to the study of progressive experience in upgrading labor productivity. It has been visited by over 1,000 delegations from enterprises in different economic sectors.

The widespread system of economic training of the working people plays an important role in the dissemination of the Shchekino experience. For example, within the chemical industry the progressive experience acquired by enterprises in various economic sectors in the field of rational utilization of manpower resources is regularly studied. To this effect training classes for specialized groups have been set up. The instructors include scientists and representatives of enterprises in which the Shchekino experience has been effectively applied. In the course of their training the students formulate specific suggestions on the application of the Shchekino method at their enterprises. Problems related to the application of the Shchekino method are included in the training plans of all categories of managers, specialists, and workers. About one million people within the sector are engaged in this training.

Currently, about 10,000 enterprises of our national economy use the Shchekino or another similar method. In the chemical industry alone, between 1967 and 1978 the Shchekino method made it possible to release over 70,000 workers who went on to staff new enterprises and production facilities. The labor of the released personnel insured a production output in the sector totaling about three billion rubles. All enterprises who were able to use to an adequate extent the possibilities of the Shchekino method achieved growth rates of labor productivity of 15-20% above the sectorial average. The growth rates of wages here were also 10-12% higher than the sectorial average.

Shchekino has been visited by representatives of the fraternal socialist countries. In those countries as well the Shchekino method has become extensively widespread. Let us cite as an example the Walter Ulbricht Leuna-Werke Combine in the GDR. In five years (1974-1978) the enterprise increased its volume of output 125%, while reducing the size of its personnel. All the new production facilities were staffed by workers released from the old production facilities.

Developing the Shchekino method, the GDR chemical industry promoted the "competition of good ideas with a view to saving on manpower." The system used here to encourage the release of manpower is of interest. Along with additional payments for meeting the increased volume of work a one-time bonus totaling up to 200 marks is paid for a suggestion which would eliminate a job vacancy; should this be accompanied by the factual release of a worker, the bonus can be as high as 400 marks. In order to encourage the transfer of the released workers to the most important subdivisions, the enterprise may pay a one-time bonus of up to 1,000 marks.

In the Polish People's Republic, along with incentives aimed at limiting the size of the personnel, while at the same time increasing output, a number of penalties are imposed for increasing the number of people employed by the enterprise above the stipulated norms. In such a case the enterprise lowers the wage fund by 20,000 zloty per additional worker hired, should he increase the overall size of the personnel compared with the same period of the preceding year.

A characteristic feature of the use of the Shchekino method in the GDR, Poland, and other members of the socialist comity is its organic link with the entire system of planning and economic incentive, and the fact that it has become "built in" within the existing economic mechanism. It is precisely on this basis that the Shchekino method is being enriched and improved in the fraternal socialist countries. Today its initiators are already learning a great deal from their followers.

Reliable Instrument for Effective Economic Management

The high effectiveness of the Shchekino method is due to the fact that it was created by the vital need of economic practice and was based on the achievements of science and progressive experience. Encouraging the installation of new equipment and its fastest possible mastering, it makes it possible to

achieve substantial savings of labor and materials, embodied in productive capital. In sectorial enterprises following the Shchekino method, new production capacities are mastered considerably faster and the time for production reconstruction and equipment modernizing is substantially reduced. The Shchekino method makes it possible today to staff up to 30% of work sites at new chemical industry projects with cadres released from the old production facilities. In the near future its role in supplying new enterprises and production facilities with cadres will increase even further, since the rapidly developing national economy is always in need of more experienced and skilled workers.

For example, until recently the Saratov Nitron Production Association had a production facility for nitrile acrylic acid--a raw material for synthetic fibers, rubber, and a number of other products. Through the efforts of the enterprise's collective the capacity of this production facility was increased by 4,000 tons, totaling 20,000 tons with a certain reduction in personnel. Further improvements were possible. However, everyone realized that substantial labor savings could no longer be achieved on the previous technical basis. Therefore, the decision was made to set up a modern production facility based on an essentially new technology. In October 1978 the one-of-a-kind system with a capacity for 150,000 yielded its initial output. Output rose by a factor of eight. Whereas the old production facility employed about 900 people, the new one employs about 700. Labor productivity rose by a factor of over nine. The most important prerequisite for the successful mastering of the new production was the fact that it was entirely staffed by experienced, highly skilled workers released from the other shops. These people rapidly mastered the new jobs and, from the very first days, insured high returns from the new equipment.

Today the collective of the Polimir Production Association (Novoplotsk) is making a major contribution to the development and intensification of the Shchekino method. The association has reached the highest level of production automation in industry. This is greatly due to the efforts of association director L. V. Novozhilov, one of the youngest enterprise managers in the sector. Currently, according to all basic technical and economic indicators, the Polimir Association either matches or is superior to the level of the leading foreign firms. Particularly great are the achievements of the collective in the ahead-of-schedule mastering of production capacities, maximum utilization of the achievements of scientific and technical progress, and scientific organization of labor. Here every worker in a technological brigade (shift) has mastered all possible related skills and can do the work at all stages of the production process. In the shops using the new equipment servicing method, labor productivity has increased 30-45%, while the servicing personnel has been reduced by 25-30%.

The higher educational and cultural-technical standards of the workers made it possible to convert to the new form of labor organization even in the most organizationally and technologically complex production sectors, particularly in the facilities for the production of polymer-50 polyethylene, considered the champion of socialist economic integration in the chemical industry. The

development of new methods for polymerization, designing, and construction of production facilities was accomplished through the joint efforts of USSR and GDR specialists. Currently, through stabilization and intensification of the technological process and the development of its optimum work systems, the capacity of the system for the production of polymer-50 has reached 20% above planned capacity. At the end of the 10th Five-Year Plan, as a result of a reconstruction, the capacity will be increased by yet another 30%. At the time when the designing of the polymer-50 production system was initiated, roughly for the past three years the first section for polyethylene production has been following the Shchekino method. The experience acquired within that time in handling the equipment and in the organization of the work was comprehensively considered in designing the new system.

In the current five-year plan over 90% of the high-tonnage chemical production facilities designed and commissioned with the new sectorial construction projects call for comprehensive automation and uninterrupted technological processes. The highly productive machine units insure a reduction of labor intensiveness of output by factors of 5-10. The high technical standard of the new production facilities and the progressive organization of labor make it possible to work with a lesser number of workers without increasing their physical and mental stress. In the 10th Five-Year Plan the use of increased power machine units in the chemical industry will make it possible to save the labor of about 200,000 people (compared with the old technology and labor organization).

The Shchekino experience is used in standard plans for labor organization and production management formulated in the sector for work places, sectors, and shops of already existing enterprises. Practical experience acquired in recent years has proved that the use of such plans insures high economic results and makes it possible to substantially reduce labor outlays per unit of output. The application of standard designs at the Dzerzhinsk Plastics Plant, the Shchekino Plant of Synthetic Staples, and the Rustavi, Cherkassy, and Mogilev Chemical Fibers plants made it possible to release about 10% of the production personnel. Taking into consideration the situation developing in the country in terms of manpower resources, the Ministry of Chemical Industry decided to considerably broaden the efforts for the creation of standard plans for the organization of labor and production management. In the 10th Five-Year Plan up to 100 such plans will be formulated. This will make it possible to release approximately 30,000 industrial-production workers.

Extensive manpower reserves are found in auxiliary output, which employs about 55% of the workers in the sector. Yet, about 60% of the workers and specialists released so far on the basis of the Shchekino method are personnel engaged in basic production. Improving the organization of repair operations and technical equipment servicing promises particularly substantial manpower savings. A number of production associations in the sector, such as Azot in Grodno, Polimir in Novopoltsk, and Khimvolokno in Barnaul', for example, have considerably lowered the labor intensiveness of equipment repairs by creating specialized plant repair subunits. The further specialization and centralization of repair services on the sectorial scale will make it possible to increase labor productivity 15-16% and release no less than 10-12% of the personnel employed in such services.

The Shchekino method makes it possible to achieve a considerable increase in the productivity of managerial work. At the present time the management of many enterprises is distinguished by its cumbersome and multiplicity of stages in the organizational structures, and splintered production sectors, sections, and shops. This results in a considerable "scattering" of manpower resources and lowers the effectiveness of their utilization. The experience of progressive enterprises, the Volga Motor Vehicles Plant in particular, proves the high effectiveness of measures aimed at the further concentration of production subunits, the centralization and specialization of management functions, and the improvement of management methods. The application of standardized structures of the managerial apparatus of production associations and industrial enterprises, and of norms regulating the size of the engineering and technical workers and employees, as well as standard plans for the organization of their labor would make it possible to optimize their structure and to considerably upgrade management quality and effectiveness.

The practice of sectorial enterprises such as the Khimvolokno Production Association in Barnaul' and the Azot Production associations in Novgorod and Cherkassy, where telegraph operators, machinists, computer operators, and stenographers acquired related skills, confirms that this and similar measures make it possible to release from 20 to 50% of the personnel of such categories.

Improving the setting of labor norms is an effective means for the rational utilization of the working time and for increasing the volume of output, while at the same time reducing the number of workers. In the 10th Five-Year Plan the sector will considerably upgrade labor productivity by improving norm setting. The Shchekino method makes it possible to organically combine the two norm setting principles: scientific substantiation and utilization of progressive experience, on the one hand, and higher labor accomplishments, on the other.

We must not fail to note the inseparable link between the Shchekino method and socialist competition. All labor collectives and progressive sectors marching in the vanguard of the struggle for the successful implementation of the five-year plan are following the Shchekino method. In turn, the socialist competition makes it possible to continually enrich the Shchekino method on the basis of mastering the progressive experience of other national economic sectors.

In the 10th Five-Year Plan the chemical industry will release no less than 26,000 people. This will make it possible to open about 200 new shops and production facilities, and insure on a stable basis a faster pace in the growth of output compared with the growth rates in the number of workers, and of the growth of labor productivity compared with the growth of wages. Since the principles of labor organization developed by the Shchekino chemists are comprehensively considered in designing construction, the new enterprises and production facilities will require less manpower. Here we must take into consideration that the economic effectiveness of the released manpower is steadily growing as a result of increased output per worker, higher wages, and higher outlays for the training of cadres and for providing them with social and cultural amenities.

Along with the unquestionable economic advantages it offers, the Shchekino method makes it possible to successfully resolve a number of social problems related to cadre shortages, turnover, and labor and technological discipline. Higher wages are not the only factor in the increased prosperity of those following the Shchekino method. The sociocultural and housing construction funds of enterprises actively using the Shchekino method are growing 8-10% faster than the sectorial average. Taking into account the reduced size of the personnel, outlays per worker from such funds have increased by 15-18% and the availability of housing and children's institutions for the workers has improved.

As confirmed by sociological studies, the Shchekino method has a favorable influence on the atmosphere in the labor collectives. About 60% of the surveyed personnel have noted that following the application of the Shchekino method the psychological climate has improved, while only 4% expressed the opposite view; 58% of the personnel believe that the democratic foundations of management have been strengthened and that the participation of the working people in management has increased as the result of the application of the Shchekino method.

The main characteristics of the influence of the Shchekino method on improving economic management are the prime attention paid to the entire system of factors for upgrading labor productivity, the close interconnection between organizational and technical measures, and the encouragement of the initiative and creativity of the working people. The essential consequences related to the application of the Shchekino method include the increased effectiveness of cost accounting and economizing, reducing the gap between the levels of organization of basic and auxiliary output, stabilization of cadres and their professional growth, and improved reciprocal relations in labor collectives and within the "manager-subordinate" system. The systematic struggle for the growth of labor productivity makes it possible to link more closely each individual economic solution with the basic objectives of the building of communism.

Completing Initiated Projects

However, let us admit that the possibilities of the Shchekino method for upgrading the level of economic management have been and are being used so far way below capacity. The study of the Shchekino experience--its accomplishments, errors, and omissions allowed in the course of the experiment --is a necessary prerequisite for the broader and more complete utilization of the new method. Let us also bear in mind the following circumstance: the search for means aimed at further upgrading social production effectiveness and the growth of labor productivity will unquestionably bring to life new economic experiments, including some on the level of the entire national economy. In order to insure their successful implementation, the comprehensive consideration of the lessons of the Shchekino initiative is important as well.

The following question arises, above all: Why is it that a large number of labor collectives in the country are still not supporting it? No simple answer could be given to this question.

One of the reasons is the numerous changes induced by the planning organs in the procedure for converting the enterprises to work according to the Shchekino method, virtually all of them reducing the interest of the labor collectives in releasing personnel and maximally finding and utilizing possibilities for the growth of output and labor productivity. For example, as a result of such changes the Azot Shchekino Production Association lost 1.2 million rubles, which according to the initial conditions could have been deposited into the material incentive fund and used to encourage further release of personnel. A major merit of the Shchekino method--orienting the enterprises toward a long-term stable policy of rational utilization of manpower resources--was factually reduced to naught through constant amendments of plans and revisions of conditions governing the formation of economic incentive funds of production collectives.

At a certain stage the managers of enterprises following the Shchekino method were left, essentially, only the right to pay wage supplements for the combination of skills and expanding equipment handling. However, the directors had this right in the past as well. The entire matter was that economic managers used this right extremely rarely, since neither they nor the collectives they headed were deeply interested in steadily lowering the number of workers. The return to the repeatedly condemned principle of planning the work of enterprises supporting the Shchekino initiative on the basis of the "level reached" cut off the wings of the experiment.

We believe that the sluggish force of inertia in economic thinking, discussed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his 2 March electoral speech, played a decisive role in the fact that the application of the Shchekino method turned out to be linked with an excessively broad range of preliminary conditions and restrictions.

The restrained attitude toward the Shchekino method displayed by some economists and financial experts on the higher administrative levels was largely caused by beliefs that its application would lead to an undesirable increase in wage outlays, for wages saved by closing down jobs would be distributed among those who had assumed additional obligations. The line of thinking of the supporters of this viewpoint is extremely simple. Almost all enterprises suffer from chronic manpower shortages, from so-called incomplete staffing. Nevertheless, under such circumstances as well the absolute majority of enterprises and associations fulfill and overfulfill their planned assignments. Since such is the case, why not issue the enterprises planned indicators for labor and wages based on available personnel, and why not, finally, even contemplate personnel reductions?

However, this line would enable us to save thousands of rubles while losing millions. There are entire economic sectors in which wages account for no than 10-12% (or even less) of overall production costs. Under such circumstances, the aspiration to lower the wage fund at all cost results in substantial economic losses, for such "understaffing" lowers the effectiveness of the utilization of productive capital and capital investments.

The sluggish force of inertia may be felt on the enterprise level as well. A director may think roughly as follows: With productive capital worth several million rubles, payments for which is still insignificant, would substantial benefits result from the release of some 100 people whose wage fund cannot even be compared with the cost of the equipment? Furthermore, it is not a bad idea to have a certain manpower surplus as a reserve. The existence of such a reserve is related by the economic managers, not without reason, to the need for the participation of workers of industrial enterprises in the assistance given agriculture and construction and other organizations experiencing a factual or imaginary shortage of cadres. It is generally known that such a type of aid is not always effective from the viewpoint of the entire national economy, for frequently it is amateurish and involves considerable social labor outlays. Concern for keeping reserve personnel in the individual enterprise is aggravated by manpower shortages on the scale of the entire national economy. Frequently there are personnel shortages in one or another public production sector precisely because more people than necessary are engaged in other projects.

Yet, the basic purpose of the Shchekino method is precisely to release the surplus personnel, combine skills, expand equipment servicing, and thus maximally utilize the capacity of the equipment and eliminate the consequences of cadre shortages.

The existence of a manpower reserve at many enterprises (sometimes with a simultaneous shortage of personnel in individual shops and services) makes it possible for some economic managers not to hasten with the installation of new equipment, thus avoiding trouble and, frequently, risk. Following the Shchekino method not only additional wages for increasing the volume of work done (as the opponents of the new method consider) but the constant lowering of the size of the personnel, which is of interest to the entire collective, encourages the faster installation of new equipment and production automation and mechanization.

Practical experience has also proved the groundlessness of fears related to wage-fund expenditures. At all enterprises following the Shchekino method, the rates of increase in the volume of output and higher labor productivity outstrip wage increases considerably more than at enterprises not applying the Shchekino method. This increase, therefore, is secured by a reliable commodity output. The even fuller utilization of such advantages provided by the Shchekino method would make possible its extensive application in sectors producing consumer goods.

In April 1978 the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, USSR Gosplan, USSR Ministry of Finance, and AUCCTU established a new procedure for the application of the Shchekino method, raising the incentive of collectives and their managers for the more effective utilization of manpower resources. This new procedure substantially changed the attitude of economic managers toward the Shchekino method.

An indicative example is offered by the Kaluga Khlorvinil Production Association, which includes chemical, mining, and metallurgical production facilities.

In the course of the year the heads of subdivisions, on their own initiative, have been steadily submitting suggestions on the release of personnel. The shop chief has requested that the number of workers be reduced! How frequently could such a situation be found in our economic practice only yesterday?

How was this achieved? The enterprise operates on the basis of a comprehensive system for improving production and labor organization, material incentive, and planning. It involves an efficient procedure for determining the size of the wage fund and the size of the personnel in the shop and other structural subdivisions. The system is based on the normative wage planning method. At the same time, a base planned personnel size has been established for each shop, based on the state of personnel on 1 January 1978 and computed in accordance with the norms applied at that time. Shops and services were given the right to keep wage savings obtained during the preceding work period as a result of reducing the size of the personnel. This has raised wages by 20-25% as a result of the increased volume of work following the release of the personnel. The system, as applied by the association, created a firm interest on the part of production collectives and their managers to steadily reduce the number of workers. Currently, the number of workers in the association's shops is being reduced by 20-25 people every month.

Naturally, we can only be pleased with the current growth in the number of followers of the Shchekino method. We believe, however, that this is not merely a matter of broadening the "geographic range" of the initiative, but insuring its further intensification and development. The stressed balance of labor resources in the country is not abating. That is why it is so important to make full use of the possibility for increasing labor productivity as provided by the Shchekino method and to enrich and improve it. The Shchekino method can and must become an effective instrument in the nationwide struggle for upgrading production effectiveness and work quality.

The instructions formulated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 18th Komsomol Congress remain topical to this day: ". . . Consider the Shchekino method. It enables us to increase considerably the volume of output while reducing the number of workers. This may seem clear. However, the method has still not become properly widespread. Some economic managers and departmental workers, obviously, are totally unable to abandon the old canons and to revise and change some principles of management and forms of production organization.

"The time has come for us, comrades, to learn how to apply effectively progressive experience and apply to the fullest extent all useful undertakings."

In order to turn the Shchekino method into a norm of economic management, we must do more than merely change the procedure of its application, even though, unquestionably, this is necessary. It is no less important to "revise and amend individual principles of management and forms of production organization," so that we may firmly "build in" the Shchekino method in the existing economic management mechanism.

Improving planning is the most important prerequisite for upgrading the effectiveness of the Shchekino method. The substantiation and stability of plans is a necessary prerequisite for promoting the interests of collectives and economic managers in the all-round utilization of internal reserves. As a rule, changes in the planned assignments formulated by the Ministry of Chemical Industry entail a chain reaction which spreads to all production and management units in the sector, in which some 70% of enterprises and associations follow the Shchekino method. Today many other industrial sectors are in a similar situation.

The instability of planned assignments and economic incentive funds places in a particularly complex situation collectives which have adopted stressed counterplans. Practical experience proves that, in the final account, undermining the faith in the plan leads not only to major economic but moral losses. The pledges assumed by collectives for saving on labor outlays must be included in the counterplans. Following their ratification, they become a law whose observance is mandatory to all management units. It is important to define the conditions for the application of the Shchekino method not only for enterprises but for all-union industrial associations and sectors as a whole and stipulate, under such circumstances, stable indicators for the entire planned period and for each unit within the sectorial management system.

The further fate of the Shchekino initiative will depend most directly on radical improvements in capital construction practices. Thus, the Polimir Production Association in Novopolotsk has already established factual possibilities for the additional release of several hundred workers. However, due to planning errors the building of new projects here, which could use the released workers, has been delayed. Meanwhile, as much as 15% of sectorial capacities are not mastered within the planned time, essentially because of the scarcity of trained workers.

A number of further topical problems may be named whose satisfactory solution could be found only within the framework of the entire national economy. Thus, a number of chemical industry enterprises adopted the valuable experience of the Volga Motor Vehicles Plant on improving the organization of labor and production management. Best prepared for this were the collectives following the Shchekino method. However, this immediately created a new problem requiring thorough economic work, related to the optimum combination of the principles governing the organization and incentive of labor developed in Shchekino and Tol'yatti. Its solution presumes the interested participation not only of sectorial ministries but of interdepartmental organs and of a broad circle of scientists and production workers.

The Shchekino method increases the requirements facing all aspects of economic management. This is also reflected in the need for the profound social and economic substantiation of any long-term direction followed in increasing social labor productivity and each organizational and technical solution, and the comprehensive consideration of the influence of sociopsychological and demographic factors, and legal norms governing the optimizing of the economic

management system. It would be no exaggeration to state that the attitude toward the Shchekino method could be considered today as one of the indicators of the maturity of an economic manager whatever his level.

It is no secret that in the past some managers have used a great deal of efforts to prove that the Shchekino method is inapplicable in their enterprise. Whereas this standpoint was explainable to a certain extent when the conditions for the application of the Shchekino method had been substantially misshaped, today the attitude of economic managers toward it must be subjected to a decisive change. Naturally, explanatory and educational work alone would be insufficient in the implementation of this task. Measures of administrative influence as well would hardly help. The fate of the Shchekino method, as of any other economic experiment, depends, to a decisive extent, on the further improvement of all economic practice.

The socialist economy is a single national economic complex. Local solutions, however successful they might be, will inevitably bring about no more than limited success, as long as they are not included in the existing planning and economic incentive system. Life adamantly requires the renovation of many current norms and concepts of economic management. This, as the party points out, is the ripe task facing our economic management organs. In turn, the broadened scale of application of the Shchekino method and the fuller utilization of its advantages is not only an important prerequisite for the solution of the problems of the 10th Five-Year Plan but one of the fruitful means for perfecting the economic mechanism of the developed socialist society.

5003

CSO: 1802

KEEPING ABREAST OF CONSUMER DEMAND

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 79 pp 48-59

[Article by V. Solov'yeva, director of the Tiraspol' Clothing Factory imeni 40-Letiya VLKSM, Hero of Socialist Labor]

[Text] The production of consumer goods is a matter of tremendous political and economic significance, directly linked with the implementation of the party's program and with upgrading the prosperity of the working people. Currently the country's market is saturated with a number of consumer goods. This has radically changed the nature of demand and increased its selectiveness. The material prosperity and standards of the Soviet people and their tastes have become more demanding and varied. In this connection, as was noted in the 1976 CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree and the December 1977 and November 1978 Central Committee plenums, the production, improved quality, and increased variety of mass consumer goods assume great importance. The steady renovation of models in accordance with the requirements of the Soviet people and new fashions is the most important task of all sectors engaged in the production of consumer goods, including light industry.

In a Collective of Like-Thinking People

Having become, in terms of its scope and depth, truly national, the socialist competition in our country is steadily producing models of creative toil and contributing to the manifestation and development of the individual capabilities of the workers. "We need neither the noise nor the blathering related to competition," noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the November 1978 CC CPSU Plenum. "We need the live interest of every working person and each labor collective in improving their work." One of the most important factors for the development of the competition and the multiplication of labor successes is the existence of a common objective, and an efficient initiative stemming from the thick of the masses, enabling us to implement the specific tasks facing the enterprise at any given moment.

Initially, the movement for fabric economy became the objective which created prerequisites for the unification and the dynamic development of the collective at the Tiraspol' Clothing Factory. The point is that our enterprise, founded in the first postwar years, hired workers for the cutting shop used

to working for individual customers alone. Therefore, they found it difficult to adapt to mass-production conditions. As a result, up to 30% of the fabrics went to scrap and thousands of meters of leftovers piled up in the warehouses. The more output expanded the higher the losses became. At the beginning of the 1950's they had exceeded four million rubles.

The pattern makers were the first to join the struggle against waste. They conducted hundreds of experiments before finding the best way for the use of the materials. The workers in the cutting-preparatory shop, in turn, developed new methods for estimating and measuring fabrics and developed an effective system for the fuller utilization of fabrics with defects in the weaving. Thus, step by step, the competition for raw and other material savings broadened, and a comprehensive method for their rational utilization developed. In 1955 the factory showed a profit for the first time. Compared with the current 11 million rubles profit, it was quite small. However, it was precisely then that the people developed faith in their forces and capabilities.

The need for a universal "knowledge campaign" arose with the beginning of the technical retooling of the enterprise and the installation of progressive equipment and application of a progressive organization of labor. Progressive experience and all kinds of specific courses were set up. The students learned to determine reasons for defects in the work and find means for their elimination. Such a creative approach to cadre training enabled us to resolve the most important problem of upgrading skills and, on this basis, insuring interchangeability. Over 3,500 clothing workers learned to perfection from 2 to 5 different operations, while about 400 people learned all the operations. Competition for achieving the highest labor productivity in the country in terms of variety was launched. In 1959 the collective reached the highest output per worker for the times: 18 shirts and 10 pairs of trousers per shift. In 1960 the enterprise was awarded the title of communist labor collective. We have earned this title year after year. The level of labor productivity has been rising steadily. Today every worker exceeds 30 shirts per shift in the new automated aggregate-group production line.

It was precisely in the course of joint activities aimed at achieving such difficult yet realistic objectives that the collective developed and its unity and maturity grew. The growth of qualifications and skills, the broadened outlook of the workers, and the creation of an atmosphere of creative search made it possible to face them with an even more complex problem whose solution required a comprehensive approach: drastically upgrading the quality of output.

Our collective has always struggled to keep up the honor of the factory brand. Long before the movement of a communist attitude toward labor was initiated, two leading brigades, headed F. Staloverova and Ye. Gavrilyukova, launched the initiative of "Work Without Third Grade!" One of the first orders of the communist labor brigades became working without second grades. However, the systematic and purposeful struggle for quality developed in the Eighth Five-Year Plan, when the Saratov machine builders suggested their scientific

method for faultless output. The factory specialists adopted it immediately. Extensive work was done for the technical outfitting of work places, strengthening the technological discipline, etc. The number of alterations declined from 30 to 7% and the delivery of faultless goods reached 93%. The reduction in the percentage of alterations stopped there, as a study indicated that a system of faultless work resolved the quality problem on the level of the individual performer. We had created conditions enabling the worker to carry out his technological operations without rejects. However, in order to insure the stable output of high-quality goods the individual efforts of the worker were insufficient. The problem had to be resolved at all levels and stages of the cycle, ranging from designing the items to their use. In other words, life itself put on the agenda the question of creating a comprehensive quality control system.

The system was developed and applied in the factory in the 9th Five-Year Plan (its creators were awarded the USSR State Prize). Since it has been already been described in detail and is being applied in over half the light industry enterprises, I shall not undertake to describe it. I shall merely cite results. Since 1974 the factory's entire output is first or superior grade only. In the Ninth Five-Year Plan about 100 models were awarded the state Emblem of Quality. Savings from the application of the system exceeded three million rubles. Yet, the most important result has been the high demand enjoyed by the goods produced at the Tiraspol' Factory on the all-union and republic markets.

The systematic application of the quality control system created conditions for the development of new and effective competition methods and for reliably determining the amount and quality of the labor of every competitor. As we know, the assembly statistical control and operative study of results make it possible to assess the quality of output not at the final stage but throughout all production stages. For example, before the cut part enters the sewing shop it is controlled a number of times by the workers themselves: The layout worker controls the work of the reject sorters; the cutter controls the work of the layout workers; the assembly worker controls the work of the cutters, etc. Brigade quality control bureaus have been set up in all shops. Every day, after the shift, the most skilled workers analyze the daily results. Using the current control forms and control cards, they establish the type of operations resulting in defective goods, and their number.

This enabled us to put an end to anonymity in the assembly line and objectively to rate the work of individual workers, and actively to influence the entire technological process. The possibility arose to organize a competition for the title of "Excellent Quality Worker," the right to use a personal seal, and the right to use the "Komsomol Guarantee" seal. Tried types of labor competitiveness, such as the struggle for the title of "Best in His Profession," and "Golden Hands Master," assumed a new meaning. The quality level became the most important indicator in summing up competition results.

Today the labor competitiveness at the factory is closely linked with comradesly and mutual aid and cooperation. In conversations with clothing

workers who have allowed rejects we no longer hear words such as "Are you not ashamed," or "You are shaming the collective," etc. A thorough study is made of the reasons for defects, entered in the current control forms, and ways for their elimination are earmarked. The worker leaves the talk not depressed but uplifted, for he knows how to avoid defects and work better and more effectively.

Not only workers but engineers and technicians have become involved in the labor rivalry. As we know, the main purpose of the production organizer is not to fall out of step with life. That is why it is important to create the necessary conditions enabling every specialist to improve his skills, making work results not only an official duty but a realized need. Interest in upgrading the level of knowledge is created and supported in the factory through a variety of methods.

Every quarter an unusual report shows up on the desk of S. Chauskaya, the chief engineer. It contains two figures entered against the names of specialists: The first indicates the number of books read in the technical library and the second the number of suggested innovations borrowed from various sources of information. The economic results of their application becomes the criterion of the work of every engineer and technician, and is of decisive significance in summing up the results of the socialist competition. Thus the creative energy of the specialists is directed toward the solution of the most topical production problems. This yields good results. In 1978 the factory engineers formulated 230 individual creative plans. In the course of their implementation 650 organizational and technical measures were applied and over 200,000 rubles were saved. Workers who are upgrading their vocational training level and who formulate constructive ideas are the first to be promoted. Their salaries are raised, they are given creative assignments elsewhere, etc.

Social planning, which makes it possible to harmoniously combine the interests of the work and the individuals, plays a major role in the unification of the collective. As early as the end of the Eighth Five-Year Plan the factory sociologists and physiologists conducted studies in the shops which showed that the seamstresses become tired mostly . . . after a day off (caused by housework). For this reason, along with measures aimed at improving technical production standards and the organization of labor and management, the plan for social development gave priority to the organization of centers for the creation of comfortable working, resting, and living conditions.

The factory has long operated a pastry shop, a food store, a barber shop, and a beauty salon offering manicure and cosmetic treatment, a shoe-repair store, and a dry-cleaning center. In the past the workers lost a great deal of time in going to medical specialists in the city. Now they have not only their own polyclinic but a balneological clinic where patients take a great variety of baths. Along with a bath hall, an inhalations hall has been organized with offices for heat treatment, physiotherapy, and dental prosthetics. Every year over 1,000 clothing workers spend their leave on the shore of the Black Sea in the factory's Solnyshko Rest Home. Six preschool institutions have

built and every worker has the possibility to send her child to a nursery or a kindergarten. The newly equipped cafeteria offers lunch on a rotation basis so that no lines are formed. The balance of the lunch break is spent by the people in the solarium (lounges, benches, and a canteen have been installed on the roof of the production building). Such leisure time could be used for going to the beauty salon, purchasing semi-finished products, etc.

The implementation of the plans for social development not only helps to produce more good quality goods but reduces fatigue and leaves time for books, theater, recreation, upbringing of children, and comprehensive development of the individual.

The process of unification of the collective develops successfully only when every one of its members begins to express and promote high moral requirements, and when such traditions are shared with the newly hired workers. In my view, it is precisely such qualities that are becoming ever more inherent in our collective. Its stable nucleus, the effectiveness of the labor competition, developed feeling of comradeship, reciprocal exactingness, reciprocal well-wishingness and respect, and an atmosphere of creative activity enabled the factory to celebrate in the middle of 1978 a special anniversary—the 100th consecutive quarter of winning the socialist competition among similar enterprises throughout the country.

Today over 1,000 workers in the factory have been awarded the honor title of "Master with Golden Hands." About 200 people have won intra-factory competitions and earned the title of "Best in His Profession." Six of them participated in the all-union competition and earned the title of "Best Seamstress in the USSR." The badge "Excellent Worker in the Light Industry Socialist Competition in the USSR" has been awarded to 84 workers.

Naturally, this is not to say that we are resting on our laurels. The more significant the accomplishments of the collective become, the more serious the problems that must be set to it. Otherwise stagnation develops, putting an end to progress. In the 10th Five-Year Plan we are trying to produce precisely items most popular among the consumers.

End Objective of the Production Process

Consumption is the final stage in the national economic chain along which the expediency of the production of one or another commodity and variety is tested. Concepts such as durability and good quality, which only recently were the main characteristics of the quality of goods, are no longer determining today. Choosing clothes in a store, the customer pays attention, above all, to color, model, and finishing. That is why goods manufactured strictly in accordance all the requirements of technical conditions and state standards, yet failing to meet the requirements of fashion, will not be in demand.

Our factory has set up a new production subunit—a laboratory for the study of demand and forecasting variety. It consists of a demand specialist, a model designer in charge of developing future models, a technologist in charge

of developing the progressive technology for their manufacturing, a specialist who estimates the economical nature of new models, a mathematician-forecaster in charge of selecting methods for forecasting and establishing competition models, and an advertising engineer.

The list alone convincingly proves the comprehensive nature of the forecasts. In order to organize the study of demand scientifically, all research in this area is conducted by the factory collective in close cooperation with scientists from the Moldavian branch of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Marketing and Demand.

The study of demand is conducted systematically, based on a thoroughly formulated plan. One of its methods is the organization of exhibits-sales, organized and implemented together with trade enterprises. Here the clothing workers ask questions and conduct investigations whose data are subsequently processed with computers. They study customer comments in which the visitors detail their wishes and remarks on the factory's output. Experienced factory specialists (technologists, designers, and fashion artists) stand duty in stores in the big Moldavian cities. Summing up individual remarks, they provide a substantiated impression of demand trends, study production marketing and consumer ratings of variety and quality. Together with the trade organizations they sponsor "days of unfulfilled demands." The study covers not only the quantity of goods which customers were unable to purchase but individual articles, models, colors, sizes, etc.

Whereas previously we studied demand in general and the customer was to us a generalized consumer of our goods, characteristic of the new stage is a differentiated approach. Now, when as a whole the prestige of the factory's output is high, we are interested in demand by group of individual models. We also look differently at the customer. This general concept applies to real people with their age, professional, ethnic, and other characteristics.

For example, many people know that the Tiraspol' blouses are considered among the best in the country. Particularly popular is a fashionable tight fit. Naturally, we could be satisfied with the generalized information and increase the production of blouses in terms of the average customer. However, the detailed study of demand for this item led to substantial changes in our demand concepts. Northerners did not like bright-colored blouses willingly purchased in Moldavia and other southern republics.

The tight fit as well, it turned, was not liked by everyone. At one point the factory even began to receive complaints from elderly men on the tightness of the shirts made. We had to explain to them that this was a model for young people. In turn, we drew the conclusion that we cannot be enthused exclusively by the fashionable shape to the detriment of other customer categories.

Thus, step by step, summing up the information obtained as the result of watching stores, attending sale exhibits, and customer conferences, and in the course of expert evaluation trips, the factory collective acquires data on the

tastes of the various categories of customers, on the type of models in demand which could remain within the production portfolio of the enterprise, and the type of models which have become obsolete and should no longer be produced.

We pay particular attention to the wishes of the customers to find in one or another product features not found so far. As a rule, it is precisely such remarks that reflect the influence of fashion and must be considered in the designing of new models.

Thus, in accordance with the wishes of the customers, demand specialists advised that the idea to make "all-purpose," two-piece denim suits be abandoned and that several types of jeans be made based on age groups. For example, the following fashionable sets were recommended for young people: a denim jacket and a blouse-shirt. The design of jeans was severely criticized, as it was obviously inconsistent with the sports nature of the clothing. Customers advised a design tightly fitting and emphasizing the figure.

Steadily studying consumer taste and promptly reporting any fluctuations in consumer demand are merely some of the numerous duties of the personnel of the forecasting laboratory and the other factory specialists. Information on the possibility to satisfy such demand, particularly on the part of suppliers, is no less important.

As early as the Ninth Five-Year Plan we established close contacts with our related enterprises, jointly deciding on the elimination of the shortcomings on which the collectives should focus their efforts. As a result, the quality of the fabrics delivered to us was upgraded considerably. Today, however, we are no longer satisfied simply with good quality material. The fabrics must be fashionable, come in modern colors, and be highly hygienic. Otherwise the item will remain unsold.

For example, let us go back to those same denim suits. Demand for them had declined not only because the model has become obsolete. The fabric as well does not satisfy the customer. It rumbled strongly after a few months of wear, strained at the folds, and was worn through. Furthermore, the color was a monotonous blue gray. The personnel of the forecast laboratory reported this to the manufacturer--the collective of the Rodniki Blended Yarns Combine and recommended, in accordance with changed requirements, the development of a new type of denim fabric. Such reports were received from other enterprises and the textile workers drew proper conclusions. After a while a new type of fabric reached the factory named "Orbita." Its basic parameters--thickness, color, and structure--are equal to the best foreign samples. It will be used now for the manufacturing of denim suits for young people. Knowledge of the market and fashion trends enables the laboratory personnel promptly to report to the related enterprises the need to stop producing obsolete fabrics, develop new lining and finishing fabrics, etc. Thanks to such operative work by the forecasters next year the women will received elegant garments made of new fabrics produced by the Krengol'mskaya Manufaktura and Rigas Manufaktura Textile combines. Men's shirts will have four buttons, clothing for adolescent girls will be fashionably embroidered, etc.

It is no less important to program in future items full consistency with their functional purpose. It is only after establishing the purpose of each type of clothing that the forecast laboratory issues recommendations to the modeling organizations. Along with the recommendations obtained as a result of the extensive study of demand, they form the base of the technical assignment issued by the republic House of Models. The very existence of such information in the technical assignment proves that the development of relations with modeling organizations has entered a new stage. Whereas previously we were the simple consumers of their artistic designs, now we have become participants in the development of new models. The results were not late in coming. In the past, when modeling was done without consideration of enterprise technical possibilities, the characteristics of the market, and the functional purpose of the items, the "effectiveness" of the House of Models was rather low: We rejected over one-half of the models as unsuitable for mass production, while the accepted models were subjected to substantial changes. As a result, the customer frequently received goods quite different from the initial concept. Now all models developed through the close cooperation among designers and production workers are approved (the factory produces annually 340 models, 60% of which are renovated in accordance with consumer demand). In addition to the necessary consumer qualities now our output is beginning to be distinguished by yet another unquestionable merit--it has become highly economical.

Course Toward Effectiveness

The manufacturing of new high-quality items in accordance with demand and fashion trends frequently requires increased production outlays. The enterprise collectives are always faced with the complex dilemma: on the one hand, to meet the demand of the customers and, on the other, to achieve this with minimum outlays. It is impossible to resolve this problem on an isolated basis within the production area: Overall effectiveness is not the simple total of the effectiveness of individual sectors. The enterprise is a single organism and changes in one of its areas inevitably lead to changes in another (higher labor productivity on the assembly line could, in particular, lead to increased percentage of alterations, etc.). The various consequences of such changes must be taken into consideration in advance.

The factory is currently introducing an effectiveness coefficient for the enterprise as a whole and for the shops, brigades, and individual models. The "super task"--obtaining maximum results with minimum outlays--is the base of any major plan in one or another sector. All specific suggestions aimed at upgrading effectiveness are studied and considered on an interrelated basis. Suggestions meeting such requirements become the base of the annual plan for upgrading effectiveness. Each of its parts stipulates the implementation of measures involving the participation of the corresponding departments and production management services, public organizations, workers, specialists, and employees.

Naturally, today it is premature to say that an effective mechanism has been developed enabling us to resolve comprehensively the effectiveness problem.

A great deal remains to be refined and tried. However, we have already achieved certain successes. In particular, the factory has developed a method for analysis which enables us already at the sketching stage to determine the planned cost of the model and draw conclusions on its economical nature compared with produced items, and indicate means for reducing outlays. This complex problem can be resolved only through systematic comprehensive standardization of structural elements (parts), designs, sewing technology, organization of assembly-line production, variety of equipment required, and labor outlays.

Standardization work has already been initiated in the experimental shop. All design parts developed over a number of years have been classified by variety. Similar parts have been structurally classified and the best variants have been selected. This has considerably simplified the development of a new model, which is reduced to combining previously developed standardized parts and assemblies.

This enables the design to acquire a most important characteristic--technological suitability. Now the task of the technologist is merely to choose among the entire variety of technological processes the one which will enable us to manufacture a given part most effectively and in the best possible manner. Thus, step by step, the individual blocks of a standard process with a list of the necessary equipment and attachments appeared.

The standardization of parts and assemblies, and the use of standardized processing methods made it possible to mechanize and automate a number of operations, and to expand the area of application of specialized highly productive equipment. In particular, the design bureau engineers developed a semiautomatic machine for the manufacturing of cuffs, including standardized special attachments. Previously trimmings for blouses and suits were cut in small batches precisely consistent with the number of pieces of clothing. Now the production of standardized parts has made it possible to make optimum use of the height of the planking. This not only saves on fabrics but reduces the time spent on such operations, and so on.

A variety of ways are sought to reduce outlays: Designers may suggest the use of a more economical variant of a given assembly in a new model; production workers may improve the technology of its manufacturing; the factory's economic service may increase the planned volume of output of a given model to cover additional outlays, etc. Only when the economically optimum limits of quality have been found and the relative effectiveness chart will indicate that a new model is more profitable than the one it replaces will the group in charge of quality planning approve the sketch, and the designer will receive permission to develop the model.

However, all this applies only to the production of shirts, whose modeling takes place directly at the enterprise. The development of the other types of goods (we produce women's clothing and dressing gowns, jeans for men and cotton suits, children's clothing, etc.) is the work of the Kishinev House of Models. Like many other modeling organizations, ignoring the orders of the

USSR Ministry of Light Industry, so far the house has still not standardized designs and submitted to the factory technical-economic model indicators. This prevents us from using a progressive technology for the models they have developed and adversely affects production effectiveness.

The second stage in the cost analysis takes place after the submission of the prototype to the arts council of the factory. It refines the recommendations adopted at previous stages and issues specific assignments accordingly.

The group variety charts made on the basis of the study and demand and delivery possibilities are an accurate guideline for the personnel of the material and technical supply service in setting up "order portfolios" for fabrics and accessories. Recommendations on the use of new manufacturing methods make it incumbent upon the workers of the cadre department and the training combine to undertake the training of cadres. The assessments based on the results of the functional analysis and cost evaluation on the economical nature of each assembly are a signal to begin to look for progressive experience aimed at reducing outlays in the manufacturing of new goods.

In a word, the strategic line--satisfying consumer demand by increasing quality within the limits of effective cost indicators--acquires its tactical implementation. The cost analysis is concluded with the elaboration of specific organizational-technical measures which make it possible to prevent coordination breakdowns and insure the high quality and economy of the goods in the course of their manufacturing.

Thus, whereas the comprehensive forecast enables us to predict the standard of the new output with an optimum set of consumer qualities, the cost analysis enables us to assess the possibility for the effective manufacturing of new and better quality goods under mass-production conditions and, subsequently, to implement a coordinated action program.

Let us note that the collectives of factories and associations are far from always able to insure the economical production of all new fashionable goods. The intensification of the process of renovation of variety and the related restructuring of production and designing frequently require additional manpower and material outlays which cannot be balanced only through the discovery of production reserves. In particular, according to the existing regulation, a 10% markup to the cost of goods may be compensated only through the production of items in the "N" index--novelty--rather than on the basis of the Emblem of Quality. Yet, production outlays for such items are always higher both for materials and labor (savings are impossible in finishing operations, for this would inevitably worsen quality). Thus, in 1978 we lost about 500,000 rubles in the production of 82 "distinguished" models.

The price-setting system must be based to a greater extent on production costs needed for upgrading quality including novelty, and consistency with modern tastes and requirements. The prices of goods (and raw materials) must be differentiated more depending on consumer qualities. For example, in our

view, the production of goods bearing not only the "N" index but the Emblem of Quality as well should be encouraged (price markups should be allowed for each point exceeding the normed rating of the art council).

Topical Problems

A mandatory condition for the growth of material prosperity is increasing output and making its variety and quality consistent with the requirements of the Soviet people. However, achieving a dynamic balance between the production of consumer goods and demand for such goods remains an acute problem. What prevents light-industry enterprises from resolving this important problem?

I already pointed out the great importance of the market and fashion trends in forecasting quality. The factory's collective is doing everything it can in this respect, studying demand in Moldavia. However, such information is insufficient: It should be supported by data on general trends in the developing of modeling and designing in the country. Such information is provided to us by the All-Union Variety Institute (VIA Legprom). However, such information is frequently received with great delays, making its practical use impossible. Judge for yourselves: We received our 1978 forecasts only at the end of 1977, when the factory specialists were already working on 1980 models.

Today the variety of light industry goods is determined on the basis of market data, commodity stocks, requests by trade organizations, and contracts. There is no timely and scientific forecasting of what would be popular today or in the forthcoming years. Therefore, variety is frequently based on factual levels: If an item is in short supply more orders are placed for it; otherwise, its production is stopped. However, fashion fluctuates and that which was successful yesterday may be frequently rejected by the customer today. As a result, some goods remain in warehouses and on store shelves, the national economy loses and production effectiveness drops. This is due to the fact that industry and trade frequently seem to be chasing demand rather than outstripping it. We have still not learned how to switch production capacities properly and immediately to the mass manufacturing of promising models and shape fashion and, consequently, consumer demand.

We believe that preparing the market for the manufactured commodities should be the duty precisely of industry using the help of "promotion" advertising. Such advertising must have clear targets and be aimed not at the abstract consumer but at specific groups of people (based on sex, age, social and family status, profession, etc.), and advise the reasons for purchase preferences. Unfortunately, the possibility of advertising in molding demand remains today virtually unused. Furthermore, frequently the customer is informed only about commodities whose selling time has been extended. The view even exists that, allegedly, a good item does not need advertising. This is a profoundly erroneous view. The use of mass information media, such as television, radio, motion pictures, and periodicals, and the printing of prospectuses and catalogues will trigger in the consumers an interest in novelties and will psychologically prepare consumers to "welcome" them.

We must point out that the manufacturing enterprise rarely ventures into such publicity for an original design, for it is far from being confident that it will reach the stores at the stipulated time. Most likely, the collective will somehow find the possibility to produce a small batch of fashionable goods. However, this will merely make available goods even less desirable. By the time of the mass production of a new item has been undertaken demand for it is frequently in the declining stage.

The reason for this is the inadequate structure of the future design. The required raw and other materials must be received on time. Modern equipment must be installed, a progressive technology applied, etc., i.e., possibilities must be created for the production of the model along the entire chain of interrelated manufacturing facilities. It is high time to think of comprehensive forecasting of this work on the scale of the entire sector.

Let us recall the recent past when nylon became fashionable. The textile workers found themselves totally unprepared for this and the fabric had to be purchased abroad. Yet now, when this fabric is not in demand, the factories are producing it in abundance. Yet, such a fashion "whim" could have been predicted and not only the clothing but the textile enterprises could have been reorganized on time.

Currently several sectorial institutes are working on different problems governing the development of the country's light industry. Thus, the Central Scientific Research Institute of the Clothing Industry is working on production technology and organization; the VIALegprom deals with variety; the VNIKS [All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Consumer Demand and Market Conditions] studies demand, etc. Yet, no one is engaged in forecasting the comprehensive development of the clothing industry as a whole.

Our country has acquired rich experience in the elaboration and implementation of current and long-term plans. These plans include the consolidated overall coordination of requirements and possibilities for their satisfaction. The task is to observe these principles strictly in terms of detailed varieties and, in accordance with comprehensive forecasting, to insure the coordination, the balancing of all planned assignments and relate them to material supplies. Otherwise the volume of output of promising goods will invariably decline or else some commodities will be replaced by others not in demand by the population.

We must also improve the system for rating the fulfillment of plans for the production of consumer goods. So far the volume of goods marketed in monetary terms is the determining indicator. The result is that the enterprise is interested less in meeting demand for specific items than in producing more profitable and expensive models. We must also organically link cost with physical indicators, for discrepancies between them lead to adverse consequences.

Our enterprise is a good example of this. Out of 100 victorious quarters, the most difficult for us was the last; out of 100 labor victories, the 100th

drain the most "blood." Has the collective begun to work less well in using existing possibilities? Not in the least! Compared with 1977 gross output in physical terms has risen nearly 7%. Its quality has improved considerably. However, the lack of coordination between value and physical indicators included in the plan put the enterprise in a difficult position. In order to fulfill its gross output and marketing plans 100%, the plan had to be overfulfilled in physical terms through considerable overtime and raw material overexpenditures.

Such imbalance is not the only shortcoming in planning. The existing practice of planning "on the basis of the level reached" has outlived its usefulness and hinders progress. It is paradoxical yet with such a system it becomes unprofitable to be in the lead, steadily find reserves, and work on the basis of an intensive plan.

With every passing year our collective is becoming every more aware of the high responsibility of a leading enterprise. I already described how the factory workers are seeking reserves systematically and purposefully, resolving on a comprehensive basis most important production problems. Suffice it to say that in the past decade, with the same production area and technical base and with an almost identical number of workers the volume of output has risen by a 1.5 factor in physical terms. Nevertheless, with every passing year the plan we receive calls for a 6% increase in output—approximately as much as the other enterprises in the sector.

I believe that state planning should follow a differentiated approach which would take into consideration the factual possibilities of the enterprise: its production capacities and extent to which they have been reached, the level of technical facilities and possibilities for its further improvement. As early as 1977 we submitted to the USSR Ministry of Light Industry our suggestions aimed at changing the existing simplified method for computing the production capacity indicator. Unfortunately, so far nothing has changed. Yet, this is one of the reasons for the improper assessment of the reserves of clothing enterprises.

Further production specialization offers a tremendous possibility for reducing the cost of mastering the production of a new item. One of the reasons which restrains it at the Moldavian clothing industry enterprises is the desire of the trade organizations to obtain from the six factories operating in the republic the entire variety of clothing items. Naturally, under such circumstances it would be impossible for an enterprise, or even an assembly line to specialize. In our factory, for example, 11 out of 30 assembly lines are not specialized. Currently the nomenclature of clothing enterprises still includes a large number of items produced in small batches. If each factory or association becomes more specialized (as is the case with many other sectors) and if the optimum variety of commodities produced, based on structural and technological homogeneity is defined, the quality of output could be improved without increased outlays in materials and labor and without a lowering of profitability. The main reason for the economically unjustified dispersion and duplication of production facilities is that, essentially, the

markets of light industry enterprises is limited to the cities and oblasts on whose territory they are located. The trade enterprises placing orders with the industry are not interested in purchasing goods in greater volumes than required for their administrative-territorial area. The trouble is that reselling surplus goods to others on a wholesale basis is troublesome and risky. The marketing plan does not give credit for such sales. Yet, with a wrong assessment of future demand, changes in market circumstances, etc., trade enterprises might suffer losses. Furthermore, in the case of outside shipments, warehousing facilities must be built and the sorting of the goods must be done by the enterprise itself.

In our view, the process of production specialization should be mandatorily accompanied by the concentration of trade, even within the limits of the economic area in which it would be expedient to accomplish it from the viewpoint of material output. A radical solution of this problem could be provided by creating a union-republic trade organization with bases in republics, krays, and oblasts, and available information on the scale of the entire country on the production, need, and demand for commodities. Such an organization would insure on a centralized basis the marketing of new items and would guarantee to the industry a certain volume of sales (based on factual requirements).

In conclusion, let us mention yet another problem: The current level of development of machine building for the clothing industry is low. The clothing workers are offered individual types of machines, whereas the further development of the sector requires the creation of machine systems for highly productive assembly lines producing specific types of goods.

In order to better coordinate the production of consumer goods with dynamic and steadily growing demand we must more rapidly and firmly implement one of the most important directives of the 25th CPSU Congress on improving planning. We must make better use of economic incentives and levers and eliminate various barriers, many of which have been retained merely through inertia. It is important to insure in all sectors, from the factory conveyor belt to store shelves, a feeling of high responsibility and interest in producing and selling items which would satisfy most completely even the highest requirements of the Soviet people.

5003

CSO: 1802

EXAMPLE OF SPECIFIC CONCERN FOR PRESS EFFECTIVENESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 79 pp 60-62

[Text] The CC CPSU decree "On Improving Further Ideological and Political-Educational Work" comprehensively considers the problem of the effectiveness of press articles. The party committees and heads of mass-information media have the task of raising the level of propaganda of Marxism-Leninism and the historical experience of the CPSU, considerably broadening the topics, volume, and geographic spread of news on domestic and international life, upgrading the ideological content and level of information of materials published in newspapers and journals and in television and radio broadcasts, increase the variety of their genres, play particular attention to style and language, eliminate verbosity and cliches, and be concerned with the operativeness, persuasiveness, and clarity of published materials.

The document calls for insuring the practical implementation of the Leninist principle of publicity in the work of party, state, and economic organs and public organizations, and to help in the development of principled and open and constructive criticism and self-criticism. It calls for "striving for the mandatory adoption and publication of practical measures based on critical reports and of materials describing progressive experience with a view to its comprehensive application."

The recent discussion of cases of erroneous attitude toward critical articles published in the press, recently discussed at a session of the bureau of the Moscow city party committee, was imbued with the spirit of the 25th CPSU Congress and the Central Committee decree on improving ideological work. The decree which was passed notes that of late the organizational role of the newspaper MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA has increased in resolving economic and political problems and in the communist upbringing of the working people. It is receiving greater assistance from the city party organization in mobilizing the Muscovites for the ahead-of-schedule fulfillment of the fourth year plan and the 10th Five-Year Plan as a whole.

Covering problems of the socioeconomic development of the capitol, the newspaper has undertaken to publish a larger number of problem and critical materials showing shortcomings in the work of individual enterprises, establishments, and organizations. The number of letters to the editors has increased. The necessary measures based on the remarks and suggestions contained in the letters are being taken.

At the same time, however, the Moscow city party bureau pointed out that the critical materials published in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA and the letters and complaints by the working people directed by the newspaper to the respective organizations and establishments for further action are frequently ignored.

So far no answers have been received to the article "Intensive Arguments Are Continuing" (15 and 16 June 1978), which contained serious remarks addressed to the Main Moscow Automotive Transportation Administration, the Main Trade Administration of the Moscow City Executive Committee, and to a number of departments dealing with the haulage of goods produced by the Ochakovskiy Beer and Non-Alcoholic Beverages Combine. The Moscow Worsted Production Association, the Central Scientific Research Wool Institute, the Detskiy Mir Trade firm, and the All-Union House of Models, did not react to the critical materials published in the newspaper (18 February and 12 May 1979) on disorders in the manufacturing of school uniforms.

The domestic and communal services administration, and the Moscow City Executive Committee Main Health Care Administration failed to take the necessary measures to resolve the problems raised by Comrade Poleshchuk in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA (27 January 1979). The result has been an unjustified delay in the elimination of the shortcomings he listed in the organization of working and living conditions of workers in a number of Moscow enterprises.

The management and party committee of the Moscow Fine-Cloth Production Association ignored the article in the newspaper (31 January 1979) on repeated amendments to state plans by the association.

The heads of the Main Moscow Industrial Construction Materials Administration and the Main Moscow Construction Administration ignored a number of articles in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA (11 June 1976, 26 June 1977, and 21 January and 7 April 1978) on shortcomings in the dissemination of progressive experience at the enterprises of such main administrations.

The attempts of individual officials to limit themselves to a formal answer to critical articles in the newspaper, avoid the solution of the problem as a whole, and limit themselves to reporting the adoption of measures covering only individual specific negative facts are intolerable.

In 1978, on four separate occasions (12 February, 25 March, 26 July, and 15 October) MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA published materials on problems of improving the work of Diyettorg stores. In their answers, deputy chiefs of the Moscow City Executive Committee Main Trade Administration comrades Belkin and Petrikov acknowledged the importance of the problems raised by the newspaper. The factual situation, however, remained unchanged.

The Moscow City Executive Committee Main administrations of Public Catering and Housing, and the Household and Communal Services Administration poorly react to critical articles in the newspaper or suggestions formulated by its readers aimed at improving living conditions in the city.

Numerous cases exist of improper attitude on the part of organizations and establishments toward the letters and statements by the working people, sent to them by the editors for further action.

Since June 1975, for example, despite repeated complaints by the working people, the Main Moscow Housing Administration and the management of the Lyublinskiy Casting-Machine Plant have failed to resolve the problem of improving water supplies to housing belonging to the enterprise. The management of the Cotton Fabric Factory imeni Frunze and Sovetskiy Rayon Executive Committee have failed to take the necessary measures based on letters sent by the working people. The heads of the Main Moscow Construction Administration and House-Building Combine Number One have been considering for nearly a full year complaints on unfinished parts of a new house (Yasenevo, 9-y Mikrorayon, Korp. 72-d).

The Trade and Comestible Goods Administration of the Moscow City Executive Committee, and the Kirovskiy, Sevastopol'skiy, and Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayon executive committees are unsatisfactorily reacting to the letters and statements of working people, redirected to them by the newspaper editors for consideration and further action.

The party organizations frequently tolerate cases of formalistic attitude toward articles in the newspaper and statements by the working people sent to them by the editors. Thus, the party committees of the USSR Ministry of Timber and Wood Processing Industry, the USSR Ministry of Food Industry, the Sakko i Vantsetti Office Supplies Plant, and the Moscow Fine-Cloth Production Association failed to provide the necessary principled evaluation of this phenomenon.

The Moscow city party committee bureau has made it incumbent to the CPSU raykoms, party committees and bureaus, and economic managers to assume strict control over resolving problems raised by mass-information media and propaganda in the city, and in the letters and statements sent by working people to the editors of newspaper, the television, and the radio. Individuals who fail to take effective measures to eliminate exposed shortcomings will be held strictly liable.

The Dzerzhinskiy, Kuybyshevskiy, Kuntsevskiy, Lyublinskiy, Leninskiy, Kievskiy, and Leningradskiy Rayon party committees have been instructed to consider the question of the erroneous attitude toward critical materials published in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA on the part of individual officials of the ministries of Timber and Wood Processing Industry, and USSR Food Industry, as well as the Lyublinskiy Casting-Machine Plant, Moscow Fine-Cloth Production Association, the Office Equipment Plant imeni Sakko i Vantsetti, the Moscow Worsted Production Association, the Central Scientific Research Wool Institute, the Detskiy Mir Trade Firm, and the All-Union House of Models.

The heads of a number of main administrations of the Moscow City Executive Committee have received strict warnings regarding major shortcoming allowed in the work of departmental organizations in taking action on the remarks and

suggestions contained in materials published in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, the letters of the working people, and cases of inattentive and formalistic attitude toward criticism.

The Moscow City Executive Committee has been instructed to consider cases of formalistic attitude toward the letters of the working people and critical materials published in the press by the heads of subdivisions of the Moscow City Executive Committee and the Kirovskiy, Sevastopol'skiy, and Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayon executive committees.

Reports submitted by the Sovetskiy Rayon Executive Committee and the party committee of the Factory imeni Frunze have been taken into consideration: For unsatisfactory exploitation of housing resources and failure to adopt operative measures based on citizens' reports, Comrade Plekhanov, director of the Factory imeni Frunze was penalized; a strict reprimand was issued to Comrade Rodkin, the factory's deputy director, and a reprimand was issued to Comrade Shirayev, the factory's chief mechanic.

The Moscow city party committee propaganda and agitation department and its sectorial departments have been asked to intensify their control over the consideration and the follow up of materials published in the city's newspapers on matters related to letters received by the mass-information and propaganda media.

The decree makes it incumbent upon the editors of MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA and MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETs and the main editorial boards of Moscow television and radio broadcasts to take measure to intensify further the effectiveness of published materials and to increase responsibility for the strict and objective approach to the interpretation of facts and the substantiation of positive and critical assessments.

The KOMMUNIST editors are informing their readers of the Moscow city party committee bureau, considering this a clear example of the attitude of the party committee to its printed organ not only as a collective propagandist and agitator but as a collective organizer, management instrument, and means for education and control.

5003

CSO: 1802

LOGIC OF REVOLUTIONARY THINKING AND CLASS APPROACH IN LOGIC

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 79, pp 63-75

[Article by G. Sadovskiy, candidate of philosophical sciences]

[Text] The class approach is the most reliable instrument for proper orientation in phenomena of contemporary social life and their objective scientific analysis, and the sharpest weapon in the ideological struggle. Describing its nature, V. I. Lenin adamantly emphasized the idea that the people have always been and will remain the stupid victims of deception and self-deception in politics until they learn how to determine the interests of one or another class behind moral, religious, political, or social phraseology, statements, and promises, and the logic of thoughts behind the logic of words.

These interests determine not only the content of one or another social concept but the method for its elaboration and application, thinking, and logic. Developing in his "Philosophical Notebooks" the concept of dialectical materialism and the logic and theory of the study of Marxism, Lenin approached the study of even the most abstract logical categories from class, proletarian positions, from the viewpoint of the unity between the logic of revolutionary thinking and the logic of revolutionary action. This link between the problems of dialectical logic and those of the revolution is well understood also by the most farsighted among the ideological enemies of Marxism-Leninism, who call for attacking the theory of revolutionary action in its "abstract-logical consolidation," as the "legal Marxist" P. Struve attempted to do as early as 1905. Such attacks on the "algebra of the revolution" are still continuing, as are attempts to pit the dialectical-materialistic concept of thinking to the allegedly "strictly scientific" "philosophy of language," and the logic of terminology and of words.

Fifty years ago, when the "Philosophical Notebooks" were published for the first time, logical positivism was taking only its first steps toward subsequent "theoretical" substantiation of this petit bourgeois way of thinking, mercilessly criticized by Lenin in his "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism." However, the general direction of the "theoretical" evolution of positivism had already become clear, for it was predetermined by the practice of this thinking and by the "systems," "models," and "paradigms" of

reactionary-sophist distortion of facts and concepts used by the enemies of revolutionary Marxism, concepts which logical positivism is trying to elevate post facto to the level of the latest achievements of "contemporary logic."

The logic of the Marxist-Leninist class approach to social facts directs us to the fact that "the visible motion in a phenomenon must be reduced to the factual inner motion" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 25, part I, p 343). "The laws governing such changes" must be discovered in the empirically noted changes. "The objective logic of such changes and of their historical development must be depicted in its main and essential features . . ." (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 18, p 345). The main question here is "a question not of whether there is movement but of how to express it in the logic of concepts" (V. I. Lenin, *ibid*, vol 29, p 230).

This classical logical-dialectical formulation of the problem of movement arose, as we know, in the course of Lenin's analysis of Zeno's "Aporia," which contained proof of the inconceivability and impossibility of knowledge. However, it would be hardly accurate, adopting the positions of Leninism as a methodology for revolutionary thinking and revolutionary action, to restrict its analysis only within the frameworks of mechanical motion and problems of its manifestation in abstract mathematical models. Unquestionably, formulating his view on the problems of motion, Lenin was puzzled, above all, not by the misfortunes of the "flying arrow" or the inability of the mythically fast Achilles to catch up with the turtle, doomed to "Sisyphean labors." Studying even the most complex gnosiological problems, the leader of the working class was interested, above all, in the dynamics of real history, in the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, and in refuting reformist concepts of the "turtle-like" course of the historical process.

Lenin mercilessly struck at the "graduated flunkies of the clergy" who tried to contain the workers' movement within the limits of the bourgeois order and suppress the revolutionary aspiration of the proletariat with calls for social stability, which as basely claimed by the Machist Petzoldt, satirized in "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism," is allegedly "the most essential characteristic of all objectives of our thinking and creativity." It is entirely clear, therefore, that the Leninist formulation of the problem of motion in the "Philosophical Notebooks" is directed less against the historically inevitable limitations of the "negative" dialectics of the Eleatic philosopher than against that same "infinite stupidity of the philistine complacently spreading the most threadbare rubbish concealed behind a 'new,' 'empirio-critical' classification and terminology" (V. I. Lenin, *ibid*, vol 18, p 341), a rubbish which was inventoried in the sociological excursions undertaken by (Bley), Petzoldt, Mach, and their followers. This also proves that the factual content of Lenin's formula is not a question of whether or not there is motion but of how to express the revolutionary movement of the masses in the revolutionary logic of concepts. Lenin brilliantly resolved this problem in his theoretical, political, and organizational work, invariably guided by the principle of the proletarian class approach and the methodology of revolutionary thinking, revealing it ever more completely and accurately on the basis of the all-round dialectical study of the contradictions of the new epoch.

The theoretical core of the logic of the Marxist-Leninist class approach is found in the study of the contradictions of social development and, on this basis, the elaboration of specific historical concepts. In their light crumbles the imaginary objectivism of bourgeois ideology "which limits itself to proving the inevitability and necessity of the process without trying to reveal in each specific stage of this process its specific form of class antagonism--an objectivism characterizing the process in general, rather than the specific antagonistic classes on the basis of whose struggle the process develops" (V. I. Lenin, *ibid*, vol 1, p 526). Developing this criticism of the logic of the bourgeois-philistine view and formulating the essence of the logic of the Marxist class approach, Lenin pointed out that, "Marx's method consists, above all, of taking into consideration the objective content of the historical process in a given specific time and specific circumstances in order to understand, above all, the type of class whose motion is the mainspring for possible progress under the specific circumstances" (*ibid*, vol 26, pp 139-140).

It is precisely this approach, systematically used by Marx in "Das Kapital," that made it possible to free the dialectic of concepts, discovered and hoaxed by Hegel, from its idealistic cover, and turn into the "only proper method for the development of thinking" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 13, p 495), turning logic into an instrument of truly objective scientific research, providing an unsurpassed theoretical depiction of the capitalist system as a living and developing entity, and passing an irrefutable sentence on it. The revolutionary power of the logic of the specific-historical scientific analysis made Marx's principal work the most fearsome shell ever fired at the bourgeois.

As the experience of the struggle waged by Leninism against reactionary populism, bourgeois liberalism, and all types of varieties of opportunism and revisionism in the workers' movement, the efforts of the ideological defenders of obsolete social relations have been focused, above all, on replacing the specific truths of Marxism with the abstract truths of bourgeois objectivism. Replacing dialectical logic with concepts borrowed from neo-Kantian logic of abstract-general ideas and from Mill's logic of names, resembling it, is one of the gnosiological foundations for this sophistic falsification.

In positivistic methodology the "logic of names" is promoted to the rank of the only logic of scientific knowledge. Sophistically exploiting the "narrow horizon of formal logic" (Engels), the falsifiers of the ideas of scientific nominalism are trying to separate Marxist terminology from the concepts it expresses, considering the language of Marxism a free for all and convenient method for promoting reactionary ideas among the revolutionary masses. It is on the basis of this methodology that the most dangerous fault of opportunism in the workers' movement develops--the gap between word and action. Lenin mercilessly exposed not only its specific political manifestations but its logical-gnosiological roots as well. Noting in his article "Yet Another Destruction of Socialism" the bourgeois-objectivistic methodology of K. Struve's work "Economy and Price," Lenin pointed out that, "The author's

program is a 'a consistent empiricism' (this is the mandatory opening today of any fashionable philosopher, whatever the Elastic clericalism he may be using to promote his theory) as well as a 'strict elaboration of precise concepts and clear distinctions.' This is a familiar motif of the notorious 'criticism' so frequently reduced to verbal scholasticism . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 25, p 35).

K. Kautskiy was a master of such literature. For example, he gave his definition of imperialism with scholastic tightrope-walking, eliminating with a formal definition the conflicting specific-historical content of the concept of imperialism as being the eve of the socialist revolution. Lenin directly stated that "Kautskiy . . . mocks historical concreteness with his definition!" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 27, p 390). Exposing the reactionary thought of identifying thinking with language and concept with term, Lenin wrote: "The argument on words initiated by Kautskiy is entirely flighty: whether or not to describe the latest stage of capitalism as imperialism or as a stage of financial capital. Name it any way you wish, for it is unimportant. The essence is that Kautskiy separates imperialist policy from economics. . . . The result is a suppression, a dulling of the most basic contradictions of the latest stage of capitalism rather than the exposure of their depths, and bourgeois reformism instead of Marxism" (ibid).

Lenin characterizes as treason to Marxism and as unprincipled the substitution of eclecticism and sophistry for dialectics, along with the linguistic trick according to which the "concept" of dictatorship of the proletariat, which sums up the entire Marxian theory, is replaced by the "word" or even "petty word" of dictatorship of the proletariat, thus turning the greatest revolutionary into simply one more liberal (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 37, pp 24-242). By using word instead of concept, Kautskiy tried to replace specific-historical class analysis of phenomena by a formal analysis of the abstract meaning of the word and a "semantic analysis," as it is sometimes described, and using a meaningless linguistic wrapping as a "theoretical" argument, prove the incompatibility between "dictatorship" and "democracy." Using a formal-semantic abstraction, he tried to eliminate this contradiction in the definition of a concept, which makes it possible to assert with impeccable scientific accuracy that the dictatorship of the proletariat is in philosophical terms a contradiction: the dialectical identity of opposite definitions of one and the same sociopolitical relation. One the one hand, it is a newly democratic power (of all working people); on the other, it is a newly dictatorial power (for the protection of socialist democracy from the overthrown yet fiercely resisting bourgeoisie).

An identical way of thinking, favored by the philistines yet hopelessly sterile scientifically and politically reactionary is the method of replacing the class content of the concept with a neutral general meaning, is extensively used in contemporary bourgeois sociology as well.

In the same way that Mach and Avenarius, inventing the word "element," childishly assumed that "the fabrication of a new word would make it possible to avoid basic philosophical directions" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.,"

vol 18, p 51), R. Aron, having invented the term "single industrial society," tried with its help to eliminate the conflict between the social nature of socialism and capitalism and the conflict between them. Socialism and capitalism were presented in this concept as two "modalities" of a single kind--the industrial society. No particular intellectual efforts are needed to see in the different and even conflicting objects a certain common external characteristic, and through its proper labeling combine them within a single formal system. Yet as Engels pointed out, the fact that we may classify a shoe brush as a mammal would not make it grow mammary glands. Bringing reciprocally exclusive concepts under a common generic term does not eliminate the factual contradiction in the contemporary epoch. It is only suppressed the way that concept suppresses the antagonistic contradictions within the social structure of contemporary capitalism.

The other linguistic fiction aimed at eliminating the concept of "classes" and conceal ideologically the fact of the class struggle within state-monopoly capitalism was the terminological dummy of the "post-industrial society." With truly mercantile scope it is promoted in the book by American sociologist D. Bell, "The Coming of Post-Industrial Society." Firing at the reader the "latest word" of bourgeois-objectivistic sociology and twisting the true meaning of the social consequences of the scientific and technical revolution, the author depicts as historical inevitability the destruction (as a result of increased capitalist concentration) of the "traditional sources" of social insurance. Yet he claims that this does not mean that all its sources have disappeared. The traditional ones have been replaced by "new forms of organization, corporations in particular," which allegedly "inevitably become the realm within which the requirements of safety, justice, and respect are met" (Daniel Bell, "The Coming of Post-Industrial Society," New York, 1973, p 289).

As in the case of the concept of the "single industrial society," "here attempts are being made to resolve the real contradictions which have not been factually resolved with the help of sentences," and "verbal fiction" through changes in the vera rerum vocabula" (the proper name of things-- editor) (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 26, part III, p 85). Goethe's biting statement aimed at superficial-empirical bourgeois-philistine thinking can be suitably used as a gnosiological epigraph to such "theories": "Whenever concepts are in short supply words are used to replace them."

K. Popper is a master of this art of verbal scholasticism. Concealing methodological eclecticism and sophistry behind the vague term of "philosophical pluralism," he sacrifices to self-seeking narrow class interests the live soul of objective scientific methodology--the dialectical principle of the concrete nature of truth. When, ignoring unquestionable facts and considering the essence of the matter of social equality as a choice between democracy and dictatorship, Popper praises bourgeois rule as the truly democratic form of governing "an open society" (actually, without quotes, open to economic and political arbitrariness) and interprets socialist democracy as tyranny, the logic of his demagogy is a precise duplication of K. Kautskiy's "logic." Like Karl Kautskiy, Karl Popper raises the question

of democracy "in a liberal way, of democracy in general, rather than bourgeois democracy, avoiding even that specific class concept . . ." (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 37, p 241). Instead of it, he sophistically exploits the term of "public control of the rulers." Grossly rejecting universally known historical facts which irrefutably prove the bankruptcy of bourgeois democracy and its helplessness in the face of raging fascist tyranny, Popper claims that the "various equal methods of democratic control such as the universal vote and representative government should be considered both as tried and . . . sufficiently effective protective measures against tyranny, always open to improvements" (see Maurice Kornfort, "Otkrytaya Filosofiya i Otkrytoye Obshchestvo. Otvet D-ru Karlu Popperu na Yego Oproverzheniye Marksizma" [Open Philosophy and Open Society. Answer to Dr Karl Popper to His Refutation of Marxism], Progress, Moscow, 1972, p 355). It would be entirely pertinent to recall here Lord Palmerston's diplomatic art, aptly described by Marx, whose purpose was to "force the British people to accept words instead of deeds, and fantasy instead of reality, and fail to see base reasons behind lofty pretexts" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 11, p 63).

In this connection we cannot fail to be puzzled by statements made by some Marxist critics of contemporary bourgeois philosophy according to which, in the final account, such a convinced formalist-anti dialectician as K. Popper has approached in his works quite closely to dialectical problems, situations, and results. Grounds hardly exist for comparing this experienced bourgeois methodologist with a philosophically uncorrupted natural scientist, and to find in Popper any "spontaneous dialectics." Like R. Aron and many other bourgeois ideologues, Popper, indeed, frequently and not "spontaneously" at all comes very close to dialectical problems and situations. However, his purpose is not to accept and study them objectively but, on the contrary, juggling the language of dialectics or something similar to it, to deaden the specific meaning of dialectical concepts.

With the help of that same course of empiricism and sophistry in switching concepts in bourgeois and revisionist sociology, zealous efforts are being made to discredit the dialectics of the world's revolutionary process ideologically and the increased vanguard role of the international working class in today's social developments. Juggling with new natural scientific and technical terminology, separated from the objective-specific content of its concepts, bourgeois and revisionist ideologues pit the bourgeois intelligentsia against the working class as the exclusive bearer of scientific and technical and social progress. The intelligentsia which does not represent an autonomous political force is depicted as some kind of exclusive revolutionary ship in the stormy ocean of our time, the only one from which the shout "Land!" could be heard, as the saving sound aimed at "despairing" mankind. As to the proletariat, it has allegedly turned into an inert mass and has been irreparably "integrated" within the capitalist society.

The idea of pitting the radical bourgeois intelligentsia against the proletariat is quite old. It was nurtured on the sins of petit bourgeois democracy and its obsolescence cannot be concealed by the cosmetic modifications triggered by the revisionist aspirations to flirt with linguistics and

the problems of the scientific and technical revolution. At the very initial approaches to the theory of scientific communism, Marx and Engels exposed the slanderous sallies of the young Hegelian "critical criticism" of the "masses." Guided by dialectics as the logic of the truly scientific and objectively specific study of a specific situation, they pointed out quite clearly that, "It is not a question of what any given member of the proletariat or even the entire proletariat considers as the target at a given moment. It is a question of what is the proletariat in fact and what, according to its own existence, will it be historically forced to accomplish" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 2, p 40). Lenin's statement in one of his last articles strikes directly at the contemporary right-wing opportunistic and leftist abusers of the proletariat. The article "On Our Revolution (On the Occasion of N. Sukhanov's Notes)" reads: "In their entire behavior they reveal themselves as cowardly reformists who are afraid to abandon the bourgeoisie, not to speak of breaking with it. Yet, they conceal their cowardice behind the most reckless phrase mongering and boasting" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 45, pp 378-379).

The logic of the Marxist-Leninist class approach firmly opposes subjectivism which turns into such a "reckless phrase mongering and boasting," with the help of objective scientific truth and the logic of words--the logic of legitimately interrelated facts reflecting their conceptual logic.

Dialectically combining in conceptual logic objectively linked opposites, Lenin concretized and developed with remarkable precision the socio-theoretical concepts of "class," "dictatorship of the proletariat," "cooperation," "trade unions," "cultural revolution," and many others which have played and continue to play a tremendous creative role in the struggle for the victory of communism. The logic of the elaboration of social concepts is the heart of revolutionary theory. This logic is as party oriented as the theory itself and the policy based on it.

The concepts of "developed socialism," "State of the Whole People," and "Soviet people" as a new historical community of people, and others, developed through the theoretical thinking of our party and considered basic to its current policy, represent an outstanding proof of the highly creative effectiveness of the logic of Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary thinking. These are truly new categories which precisely sum up the understanding of the new profound social processes, rather than simply new terms used in a contemporary sociopolitical vocabulary, as the critics of the theory and practice of real socialism try to present matters, applying to them the yardsticks of positivistic logic which reduces concepts to terms and thinking to language, to the art of the use of words.

Engels wrote that in all ages theoretical thinking is a historical product. As such, it inevitably bears the imprint of class interests and ideals. Two diametrically opposite philosophical theories of thinking, and two concepts of logic correspond to the two opposite types of thinking: proletarian-revolutionary and bourgeois-philistine. One is the theory of dialectical materialism as the superior form of thinking, as the logic and theory of

knowledge of contemporary materialism which Marx considered the logical base for a communist outlook. The other is positivistic, based on the idealistically and metaphysically interpreted formal logic identified by the supporters of positivism with logic in general and considered as the only possible logical concept of 20th century science.

Yet as a science logic decisively rejects all ideological aspects. It is proclaimed non-party, and neutral in terms of conceptual, moral, and political problems, and generally indifferent in terms of truth and lie. "In logic," R. Carnap claimed, "there is no morality. Anyone could formulate his logic, i.e., his form of language, as he wishes" (R. Carnap, "Logische Syntax der Sprache" [The Logical Syntax of Speech], Vienna, 1934, pp 44-45). It is precisely in this substitution of logic as a philosophical science of thinking, as a theory of thinking in its historical development and the integrity of its functions, with formal logic, considered in its special-mathematical aspects, virtually separated from philosophy and adopting as its subject nothing but the linguistic form of expression of thought and engaging in the subjectivistic and metaphysical interpretation of this linguistic form that we see a manifestation of the socio-class orientation of the positivistic concept of this science. Juggling with the term "logic" and its traditional divergent abstract-general meaning, positivism rejects the main feature of thinking--its meaning--inflating and exaggerating its other, formalistic side. It is precisely thus that the history of the science of thought is falsified along with its contemporary reality, and dialectical logic, representing the most important result of over 2,000 years of development of philosophy, is rejected; the achievements of the dialectical-materialistic theory of thinking, and its factual problems are treated condescendingly, as though being outside the field of science.

At the same time the essence, the major historical merits, and the factual contemporary results of formal logic, which is an important and promising trend of scientific research, are rejected. The real study of the subject of formal logic aimed, as any other science, toward the study of objective truth, is replaced by frank subjectivism and conventionalism. As we know, the appearance of natural and the functioning of artificial languages are based on their objective functions and obey objective laws in the final account. Reducing thinking to language, which is indeed indifferent to socio-class conflicts, and formalistically ignoring its factual gnosiological and social role as a tool for knowledge and communication among people, is the basis for the non-historical interpretation of thinking as an allegedly above-class phenomenon.

Formal logic itself neither does nor could bear any responsibility for such a falsification of its subject, functions, and meanings. Many Soviet scientists specializing in this field are fruitfully developing its problems on the basis of a dialectical-materialistic outlook and methodology.

As we know, the language is the immediate reality of the thought. In other words, it is only its external, its material-sensory cover, indifferent to the specific meaning of depicted phenomena. Raising the language to the level

of the only form of thinking, idealistically interpreting its nature and ascribing to semantic structures, "abstract objects," and "theoretical structures" formal structures of a universal gnosiological significance, positivism excludes from the scientific consideration of reality the gnosiological forms of thinking and the categories of dialectical materialism as stages in deepening our knowledge of the nature of things and the laws governing their dynamics.

In this connection the attempts on the part of individual philosophers to study the nature of dialectical categories on the basis of the positivistically emasculated "logic of names" seems strange. "In order to study the specific (!) content of categories," G. D. Levin writes, "we shall use two ideas of the J. S. Mill's theory of names . . . (G. D. Levin, "The Concept of 'Dialectical Category.'" *FILOSOFSKIYE NAUKI*, No 3, 1974, p 30). However, the attempt to develop the concept of "dialectical category" on this basis is the equivalent of sustaining life in an airless space. From the very beginning positivism rejects any possibility for the objective study of dialectical categories as forms of factual thinking, as logical categories which provide a knowledge of the nature of objects, for it either idealistically and metaphysically distorts or openly discredits the very category of "essence." Assessing this basic category of Aristotelian logic and of dialectical logic in general, B. Russel wrote: ". . . 'Essence' seems to me to be an non-interpretable concept lacking precision" (B. Russel, "Istoriya Zapadnoy Filosofii" [History of Western Philosophy], Moscow, 1959, p 185). "A word may have an essence but an object may not" (*ibid*, p 222).

Pointing out the bourgeois-philistine nature of this position and the theoretical helplessness it creates, Engels noted: "Naturally, the clumsy, heavy draft-horse of daily bourgeois thinking becomes confused when reaching the ditch which separates essence from phenomenon and cause from consequence. However, a heavy draft-horse should not be used if we intend to hunt on the very rugged grounds of abstract thinking" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 13, p 495).

The modern bourgeois view whose superficiality and clumsiness can no longer be concealed behind the highfalutin meaningless words of a natural language zealously tries to create the appearance of marching in step with the scientific and technical revolution with the help of formalized idle talk. Some bourgeois philosophers detect here a truly magical skill. The "genius" of such "philosophical-materialistic" acrobatics may be found in the article "Line of American Philosophy" (*Journal AMERIKA*, September 1978) (naturally, despite the will of its author who is choked with admiration for his "character") by Princeton University Professor Sol Kripke, a specialist in modality logic, head of a group of philosophers "supporting the union between philosophy and mathematics," openly proclaiming his militant anti-materialistic position. The author of this biographic essay, who was "given the honor" to interview the "cautious and circumspect revolutionary in the world of contemporary philosophy" (who, on his own admission, conceived of his becoming a second Aristotle), describes his impression of the lecture "Theory of Truth," delivered by Kripke in 1976 as follows: We find that "Kripke's

mental calisthenics charmed the audience," whose heads were "spinning from the headlong cascade of computations." The speaker "energetically paced on the podium, as an actor in good form." Once the lecture had reached its full scope, the non-initiated had to accept all statements on faith. . . . "To the liking of the audience belonging to the school of linguistic philosophy, Kripke engaged, together with them, in a few mathematical somersaults. . . ."

It turns out that this mathematically embellished carousel of professorial phraseology was given such a dizzying motion for the sake of giving the overwhelming brilliance of innovation to the petty, threadbare and base positivistic idea according to which the question of truth is, allegedly, a problem of language rather than essence. Apparently, the trick worked. Fearing to jump the ditch separating phenomenon from essence, bourgeois thinking, as represented by David Caplan, dean of the philosophy department of UCLA, stated enthusiastically after Kripke's lecture that, "This new theory of truth is a major event in the history of philosophy."

After Hegel, discussing the inadmissibility of identifying forms of speech with forms of factual thinking, L. Feuerbach noted that "otherwise the biggest chatterbox would become the greatest philosopher" (L. Feuerbach, "Izbrannyye Filosofskiye Proizvedeniya" [Selected Philosophical Works], vol 1, Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1955, p 66). As Kripke's amusing story shows, this change is easily accomplished at the approaches of contemporary bourgeois philosophy where "with the help of 'reckless phrase mongering and boasting,' following the scholastic rule that 'systems are made of words,' logical categories are either considered useless (see B. Russel, op cit, p 185), or else are deadened in the clutches of formalistic-linguistic analysis (see, for example, James A. McGilvray, "Becoming: A Modest Proposal," PHILOSOPHICAL STUDIES, No 3, vol 30, 1976).

It is precisely this nihilistic rejection of the great logical heritage of Aristotle, Hegel, Marx, Engels, and Lenin--a theory of the dialectics of logical categories as inner, essential forms of development of scientific-theoretical concepts, in the efforts to ascribe a logic to language, metaphysically separated from the logic of concepts, the status of the only form of existence of thinking, and in the attempts to assert on this basis the conceptual principles of idealism, clericalism, and agnosticism--that the party orientation of the positivistic concept of logic and its reactionary class approach to the problems of the philosophical theory of thinking is expressed in its full clarity. The final purpose of this approach is to block to theoretical thinking the path to the study of contradictions within the very nature of objects, and above all to exclude the objective and scientific analysis of the sociohistorical contradictions of the present age.

Lenin's criticism of positivism in sociology and the natural sciences convincingly proved that the most scientifically suitable logic of the development of theoretical thinking and the only weapon capable of coping with any fideistic diversion on the part of bourgeois ideology and of systematically defending the class position of the proletariat in any ideological conflict is dialectic, as the logic and theory of knowledge of contemporary materialism.

The focal point of the dialectical-materialistic concept of logic, systematically developed in the "Philosophical Notebooks," is the thesis that "logic is a theory not of the external forms of thinking but of the laws governing the development of 'all material, natural, and spiritual objects,' i.e., the development of the entire specific content of the world and its knowledge, i.e., the result, sum total, and conclusion of the history of the study of the world" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 29, p 84). Lenin emphasized that introducing a content to logical consideration, "not objects but the laws governing their dynamics" become the subject of logic as a philosophical science" (ibid, p 86). The essence of all motion is contradiction, the transition of opposites. Hence the Leninist understanding of the role of concepts in the study of the dialectical laws of motion: "Concepts are not static but by their very nature are a transition" (ibid, pp 206-207). It is precisely this that defines Lenin's understanding of the subject of logic as a philosophical science. It is a reflection in the conflicting forward movement of the concepts of the real historical process of the appearance, development, and resolution of dialectical conflicts as a source of motion of all natural, social, and spiritual phenomena.

Initially this may appear to be substantial and important only to a specialist in the field of the theory of knowledge and logic. In reality, matters are quite different. The Leninist understanding of logic, which revolutionized this science, whether the enemies of Marxism-Leninism wish to acknowledge it or not, is related most directly to the solution not only of philosophical but of social and political problems, and problems of the ideological struggle. Revolutionary thinking which combines a class approach with scientific objectivity is organically inherent in the revolutionary movement. In philosophical terms, it represents its attribute. That is why Lenin's work in the field of dialectics as the logic and theory of knowledge is an essential element of his program for the struggle for the victory of the proletarian revolution and for socialism. This can be clearly seen in comparing the Leninist concept of logic with the neo-Kantian and positivistic ones.

The focal point of the concept of logic hostile to dialectical-materialism is its interpretation only as a science dealing specifically with the "external forms of thinking," and, consequently, the concept of logic as being less a science of thinking than of the forms of its linguistic expression. This is directly linked with the identification of the concept and meaning of the word, of terminological "semantics," and of reducing concepts to linguistic, to semantic abstractions. Since the meaning of linguistic terms, universally accepted by all people speaking a given language, is characterized by a certain permanency, stability, and constancy, a direct or indirect conclusion is drawn concerning the scientific groundlessness of dialectical-materialism as a methodology of revolutionary thinking and revolutionary action, for the laws governing such thinking must be found beyond the limits of formal "universally meaningful" laws of "thinking in general," unaware of class distinctions. In this case, deliberately ignored is the fact that the identical use of words and their "meaning," which is a prerequisite for communication among people through language, does not presume in the least a

mandatory identical understanding of phenomena indicated with such words. This is confirmed by the entire history of the struggle waged by Marxist-Leninist ideology against bourgeois ideology. It is a struggle for a scientific understanding, against what is nonscientific and anti-scientific, and for "true thinking" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 20, p 524). It is a struggle against thoughtlessness rather than in favor of one or another use of terminology.

On the other hand identifying concepts with abstract-general ideas based on the fixed significance of terms is an argument for rejecting dialectics as a theory of finding the contradictions within the very nature of objects and a "proof" of the inconceivable, irrational, and logically groundless nature of the very idea of a revolutionary change. The opponents of revolutionary theory have always perfectly understood that if dialectical-materialism is the logical foundation of the communist outlook, the strike at its very foundation must be the strongest. This is precisely the main center of the struggle between the two conflicting concepts of logic and the two class approaches to the problems of this science.

An essential element of the Leninist concept of logic is resolving the problem of the areas in which concepts and verbal definitions of general ideas are either identical or gnosologically different.

V. I. Lenin proves that a conception can be both close to reality and distant from it. It is closer to an immediate phenomenon but more distant from its essence. "A conception cannot encompass motion as a whole . . .," while thinking encompasses and must encompass it. However, "to achieve this, thinking must be dialectical" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 29, p 209). Seizing motion as a whole, and expressing its nature as the identity (transition) of opposites cannot be achieved by "thinking borrowed from conceptions," by formal thinking. It is precisely such formal thinking that "considers the factually linked aspects of an object separately." Noting (and describing it as "true!") this basic Hegelian view, Lenin draws the following conclusion: "We cannot conceive, express, measure, and depict motion without breaking the continuous, without simplifying, coarsening, splitting, or killing the animate. The depiction of the dynamics of thinking always represents such a coarsening and deadening--not only the thought but the sensation, and not only the motion but any concept at all" (ibid, pp 232-233).

Lenin considered the surmounting of such deadening of "thinking based on conceptions," and of motion and all concepts at all the essence of dialectics, which consists not only of "dividing the unity" (where Kantian dialectics stopped) but, most importantly, knowledge of the identity of its opposite aspects. That is why the nature of dialectics "is expressed by the formula: unity, identity of opposites" (ibid, p 233). Materialistically reworking Hegel's ideas, Lenin drew the conclusion which represents the deepest essence of dialectics as Marxist logic and theory of knowledge that human concepts are single in their opposites. "They are not fixed but eternally in motion, passing from one to the other, and flowing one into the other, without which they cannot reflect animate life" (ibid, pp 226-227).

Lenin's conclusion firmly revealed the deepest roots of the very skillful methodological form of philistine 20th century vulgarization of the principle of development. The essence of this method is the absolutizing of the logical-semantic principle (found as early as in the Eleatic philosophy), according to which the objective nature of motion as an embodiment of contradictions and as the contradictory nature of one and the same relation cannot be expressed through discrete linguistic abstractions (the formulation "within the same relation," used in publications, is not entirely apt, for it contains a subjective aspect, an understanding of "relation" as the "angle of vision" of the subject concerning the object). The most popular "proof" of the inconceivability of the contradiction and its revolutionary solution is based precisely on such an identification of concepts and meanings of terms, and of the logic of thinking with the logic of its linguistic manifestations ("fixed concepts").

Quite indicative from this viewpoint is the article by the notorious "legal Marxist," P. Struve, "The Marxian Theory of Social Development." (The frankly class-political purpose of this article as the ideological lightning rod for a proletarian revolution is also confirmed by the fact that it was published as a separate pamphlet in Kiev in December 1905.) Its purpose was to prove the "utopian" nature of the concept of the social revolution of the proletariat and the "realism" of the concept of capitalist evolution.

While trying to substantiate the thesis of the possibility to eliminate social antagonisms without exceeding the boundaries of the system which created them, the reformist ideologue was also well aware of the fact that the Marxist theory of the social revolution is a logical theoretical system, for which reason it could be criticized only on the basis of theoretical-cognitive studies. "The 'theory of collapse,'" the pamphlet states, "must be attacked in its abstract-logical strength. It must be replaced by science."

What are the requirements of the "science" from whose positions alone one could "attack" the logical-gnosiological foundation of the theory of social revolution? Ch. Sigwart's neo-Kantian "Logic" is chosen as the standard for the scientific method directly opposing dialectical-materialism, which is being discredited by identifying it with idealistic dialectics. Citing its definition of concept as a verbally codified fixed general conception, Struve draws the conclusion that an unbreachable gap exists between thinking and reality: "Whereas reality is 'dialectical,' logical and, consequently, scientific thinking is, in its nature, non-dialectical. . . . Only static thinking with its constant conceptions and images reaches the practical and theoretical surmounting of the 'natural anarchy,' and the 'dialectical' reality, i.e., the world of direct perceptions."

In other words, whereas the "direct perception" openly indicates crises of continuous aggravation of social antagonisms, and if people with ears can clearly hear the powerful peals of revolutionary thunder, "science" with its "static thinking" must plug the ears of the people and squeeze the dialectics of life on the procrustean bed of "stable" and "universally meaningful" abstract concepts and terms, directing all social classes to move along the

tranquil path of capitalist evolution. Such is the true political meaning of the revisionist apologetics of the logic of "static concepts," and of the concept of reflecting the "current in the permanent."

Historical experience of the 20th century, the most revolutionary in history, totally destroys this positivistic concept of the "logic of names," frankly aimed at proving the impossibility of a revolutionary solution of social antagonisms and the fact that the fast Achilles will never catch up with the turtle, as well as the philistine wisdom of "slowly but surely." This attempt most clearly blows off the positivistic and bourgeois-objectivistic illusions of John Stuart Mill, who excluded the party-class approach to logic and who deluded himself and others with judgments according to which logic was neutral grounds on which, allegedly, materialists and idealists, the followers of both Locke and Kant could meet and shake hands (see John Stuart Mill, "Sistema Logiki Sillogisticheskoy i Induktivnoy" [System of Syllogistic and Inductive Logic], Moscow, 1914, p 11), and the myth of philosophy (identified with formal logic) as neutral territory located between science and religion, and R. Garaudy's revisionist concept of "conceptual neutrality," an attempt to impose upon the communist party the idea that "it must not have an 'official philosophy,' it must be neither idealistic nor materialistic, neither religious nor atheistic."

It is truly amazing that to this day there are people who dare to offer "this dull, flabby, helpless clerical thinking" to "the most revolutionary party known to history!" (Engels).

This logic of bourgeois-philistine thinking is today firmly countered by the most important stipulation for Leninist party mindedness, most clearly defined at the 25th CPSU Congress: "In the struggle between the two outlooks there could be no place for neutralism and compromise. It requires high political vigilance, active, operative, and persuasive propaganda work, and prompt rebuff of hostile ideological diversions." The live soul of contemporary scientific outlook, the Leninist concept of dialectics as the logic and theory of knowledge of Marxism, is the most reliable and most victorious weapon in the logic of revolutionary thinking in this ideological confrontation.

5003

CSO: 1802

CIVIC PRINCIPLE--ARTISTIC PRINCIPLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 79 pp 76-84

[Article by theater director G. Tovstonogov, people's artist of the USSR, laureate of the Lenin and State prizes]

[Text] Soviet art is developing on a firm ideological foundation: Our credo is socialist realism and consistent party-mindedness of creative work. The men of culture in our country are united on the major philosophical-esthetic problems. They defend the same ideological positions. While calling for artistic variety and the blossoming of different genres and styles and for vivid individualities, we have no right to abandon the principles on which domestic realistic art has stood and will continue to stand. Our present mastery could acquire a life-bringing force only because it mastered the great democratic art of the past. Naturally, all traditions die without innovation. However, there is no need to invent a shovel when the excavator has long been invented. It would be stupid and wasteful to begin one's search from zero, ignoring what has already been discovered, understood, and accumulated.

This is firmly confirmed by our theatrical life. A performance whose director is an autocrat and a despot lacks the oxygen, the healing spring which has always generously nurtured the Russian and, subsequently, the Soviet theater. No single problem in the search for new means of expression can be successfully resolved, and no style in modern directing can reveal its artistic significance unless it is expressed through the actor. The task of the director cannot be such as to violate the natural, the organic life of a person on stage. Infecting the actor with his intent, the director must maximally loosen up the creative activity of the performer, converting the originated flame into an eternal fire.

The break with Stanislavskiy noted in some productions is the still existing reaction to the dogmatizing which by the will of circumstances the brilliant theory of the reformer of Russian and Soviet theater was subjected to in its time. (Essentially, the entire universal progressive stage art has been built on it and the motion picture itself cannot develop without it.) The artistic practice of those years was not entirely consistent with the proclaimed theses. A discrepancy developed between theory and practice, fatally

reflected on the perception of the theory itself. At that time matters reached the level of oddities. Zealous but ignorant theater directors would issue orders, such as "As of 10 February I order all actors to perform according to Stanislavskiy's system."

Stanislavskiy himself was the least guilty of this. The time since then has most clearly proved that the laws of the stage recreation of the truth of life and the struggle of the human spirit he discovered are imperishable. It is not such laws that should be abandoned but their vulgar utilization and the simplistic interpretation of the method of this great director. Naturally, awareness of this fact does not free us from creative search, for any theory is strong only when it develops, when it is on the march. The basic principles of realism are not destroyed but are strengthened and enriched if we rediscover them again and again.

We cannot fail to be excited by the main problem facing artists of all times: What is contemporary? The art of the theater is contemporary by virtue of its nature and the content of "contemporaneity" has a great deal of meaning. It includes the thirst for truth, objection to falsehood, and desire to see life in its entire richness and true beauty. The concept of "contemporaneity" blends the civic with the esthetic principle.

Refracted through the lens of the stage, contemporaneity is not found in pretentiousness or fictitious plausibility. Some features of today's theater have already become apparent: brevity, maximum cleansing and concreteness of means of expression, meaningful details, developing into realistic symbols, and intellectualism in acting. However, in the final account, all these characteristics would turn into hackwork if the play is not contemporary in its main features, if its author is not participating in the historical creativity of his people. The ideological trend, the air of the time that one's contemporaries breathe marks the beginning (or not) of art.

How to find the shortest way to the hearts and minds of our contemporaries? What must we do for art to be consistent with and needed by its age? Naturally, all of us are well aware of what the purpose of the theater is and what the audience expects of it. However, every autumn--the beginning of the season--mercilessly faces the theater workers with these age-old problems and demands new answers.

The nature of the theater is such that its frames of yesterday are small today and today's will be too small tomorrow. A play may be performed 100 or 1,000 times. However, it is impossible to create a "theater of the recurrent production." Contact between living people--the exclusive prerequisite for a theatrical performance--is always unique as life itself. That is why a new play, a new season, a new audience is always a virgin canvas awaiting new colors and images, a different freshness in the perception of the world, a different level of knowledge, and a different depth of summation. Is the theater ready for such a dialog with the audience, using performance components unchanged over several millenia? Yet, even the great composers who gave mankind a universe of harmonies have done so with a music scale of only seven notes.

Of late there have been more complaints that, abandoning former cliches, the theater has acquired fresh ones. A number of them are cited as examples: lack of curtains, conventional settings, motion-picture projections, and revolving stages.

Indeed, over the past few years a certain uniformity of stage productions has been established. On the one hand, this confirms that an arsenal of contemporary means of expression has been accumulated; on the other, it confirms the familiar truth that frequently an innovation creates imitations. An interesting performance without a curtain will be "produced serially" by the hacks who decide that this, precisely, is the secret of success.

However, we must understand the nature of phenomena and realize that in poor performances we are irritated not by the absence of a curtain but of major civic thinking and independent artistic intent. Had the stumbling block been nothing but a curtain the problem would be resolved very simply: Hang a few meters of plush and cover major gaps in a performance.

The merits of a form can neither be studied nor assessed isolated from its content. Means of expression in themselves are neither good nor bad: Their qualities are defined only in terms of the reality depicted in the play, the idea, the meaning of the work, and the characteristics of the outlook and poetry of the author. Conventional settings or imaginary trees, or else a revolving or fixed stage in themselves cannot make a production innovative or old fashioned, outstanding or dull. The cliché develops wherever the production comes to light without a clear and profound ideological intent and specific artistic solution.

Hackwork is inevitable if theater is not concerned with the search for truth and the poetry of animate life, if the artist proceeds not on the basis of observations and considerations of reality but uses second-hand literary associations. In my view, in order to struggle with mediocrity we must neither canonize nor reject one or another stage method or technical accessory to the art but develop in the artist an understanding of his noble purpose and true civic mindedness and responsibility to the people and to our great multinational culture, and upgrade his professional skills and creative exactingness. This is the direction to which we are led by the authoritative view of the party expressed in the familiar decree on creative youth, a decree which we read with profound attention and adopted for practical use.

Thinking of the daily bread of our art today and of its future concerns, we cannot fail to ask the question asked by Mayakovskiy himself "on the place of the poet in the workers' line." In particular, I am concerned by the still-encountered simplistic understanding of the functions of art in society.

"Well and good that you performed Gor'kiy," some would say. "But when will you stage something which will help the audience to resolve topical problems?"

Could we agree with such an exaggeratedly utilitarian understanding of the specific function of the theater? I think not. Would we not seriously

presume, sinning against the truth, by assuming that having seen a performance in the evening, the next morning the viewer will begin to surmount difficulties, whether personal or at work, guided by the prescriptions he received from the stage. Naturally, however, it is not a case merely of such practical considerations, as a similar approach to art conflicts with its characteristics as a particular, integral, practical-spiritual form of mastering the world by man, according to Marx, and its prime importance to the individual and society. Art is one of the many manifestations of the creative activities of man, fully representing the intensive richness of life, containing an organic and merciless clarity of the mind, warmth, genuine feelings, and the crystal purity of duty. Whatever the topic of art may be, and whatever special matters it may deal with, it is possessed and strong with one main topic and one passion: man, with the general, integral meaning of the always unique event of his being.

Occasionally, it seems to us that such an overall artistic view of man is something strictly contemporary. Yet for ages it has represented the qualitative distinction of the thinking and creativity of the artists who have factually promoted the development of mankind and embodied its growing self-awareness. I am not speaking of philosophers such as Diderot, Hegel, or Feuerbach. Such a view was the essence of their approach to the world. Nor am I speaking of the brilliant revolutionary philosophers Marx, Engels, and Lenin to whom such a view was the essence of their struggle for the reorganization of the world. It is the artists I have in mind.

Shakespeare has always amazed me with one characteristic of his artistic thinking and means for reworking reality: the ability to insert man in mankind. Is there anyone unfamiliar with the encyclopedic variety of human individualities and of the tremendous sociological range of Shakespeare's plays! He is the refined master of the individual portrait. Nevertheless, his individual portrait is always the portrait of a type, precisely the way society in his plays is mankind. Who could blame Shakespeare for ignorance or neglect of the concrete life of the people of his time or of scorning the real, the daily life of his characters? The cup of life in his plays is brimming! At the same time we always feel the correlation between man and mankind. This is his miracle, his secret, his method. It constantly amazes us. Such global vision of "current" human life is found in all great artists: Chekhov, Gor'kiy, Vishnevskiy, and Leonov.

This means that the influence of art itself is felt indirectly by the viewer, the listener, or the reader, through his emotions and convictions and the entire complex system of his feelings and practical experience. The multi-dimensional world of the individual responds to the spiritual impulse stemming from a work of art in an original and unexpected fashion.

Naturally, art is always involved in the ideological battles of its age. It is propaganda but propaganda in the lofty meaning of the term. Without this lofty meaning there is no art. It cannot be limited to the performance of purely cognitive or popularizing functions. It will stop being art if it fails to penetrate the loftier areas of the mind and if serious philosophical thinking is replaced by moralizing or didacticism.

What makes the best literary or stage characters of the past attractive? Why have they so generously enriched our spiritual experience and become durable, loyal, and needed fellow travelers? We believe that it is because, above all, their personalities have reflected and concentrated within themselves the age which created them, the unique historical experience of the generations. As we know, there are no abstract heroes and the only character in art who retains his civic, his moral influence, and his ability to influence later generations, is the one linked with thousands of unbreakable ties with his age, the bearer of its typical features. The universal does not exist without the concrete-historical.

However, it may happen that at any given moment this character, precisely as a result of his significance and vitality, captivates us so strongly that, sometimes without noticing it ourselves, we begin to expect, to demand not the appearance of new characters possessing the same strength and nature, the heroes of our days, but the duplication of the standards and absolute repetition of such standards in new works of literature and the stage. In artistic practice such mental inertia leads to attempts--usually undertaken with the best possible intentions--of taking the character out of the "context" of one age, thus disturbing his complex and varied interrelationships, and mechanically "transplanting" him in another. As a result, both the character and the age become exceptionally impoverished. History does not stand still and the hero of Soviet plays (which we shall now discuss), seen in reality, retains a continuity in the main, in the basic features, developing and changing in time, losing something, abandoning something, while accumulating and acquiring a great deal.

Retaining in its field of vision the permanent, the general, at the same time art must seize changes and interpret them. Only then could we have works which will represent our present properly and truly artistically.

Naturally, the creation on the stage of a character expressing his time in his dynamics is a very complex, perhaps the most complex part of our work. There is frequently lack of talent and the ability to think on the proper contemporary level. One can easily err by taking the accidental as the legitimate or, conversely, underestimate that which is truly durable and fundamental in life. It is necessary to mention such errors and assess them critically, guided by the only true Marxist-Leninist esthetic principles. The desire to avoid criticism or to protect the artist from it has never been beneficial to art. Here it is very important not to allow any mental inertia, which inevitably keeps art on the level of already conquered and mastered positions.

Art influences life if it penetrates deeply within it, if it unravels trends as yet hidden yet gathering strength and imposing their influence on events. Whenever art is at the tail end of events it loses its profound ties with the life of the people. It becomes schematic and loses creative initiative. The characters of many plays, occasionally written even by noted and recognized playwrights, occasionally undertake to resolve a conflict which may even be real yet has already been pushed into the background, eliminated

by social development itself, or whose essence and origins have already been understood and are in the stage of being surmounted. Unquestionably, this lowers the interest of our public in such plays.

The realm of reality in which the artist undertakes to study the human soul is extremely varied. In some cases, for example, the character will be seen and interpreted at the time of accomplishing his main deed in life and of displaying the highest manifestation of all spiritual forces; in another, the play, the production will depict the daily life of the character. By virtue of the characteristics of their talent, the different artists may prefer one or another approach and one can never claim with abstract firmness that, basically, one approach is far better than another. There may have been no need to discuss such elementary matters in particular had there been no aspiration on the part of some critics to engage in making something like a chart of stages levels determining the artistic value of a work, based on a topic classification, which in my view is quite arbitrary and dryish.

Yet imagine that we are discussing Gogol, let us say. Should we classify the play "Enemies" as belonging to the workers' topic, while the play "Petit Bourgeois" as a family, as a morality play, and on this basis consider the former a creative stage accomplishment and the latter as something insignificant and secondary? The one-sidedness of such an approach is obvious.

One could describe an ordinary day of an ordinary family in such a way as to create a work of tremendous internal dimension and philosophical content. An important historical event could be brought down to a petty level, substituting pomposity for significance. At the same time, historical accomplishments become the topics of major plays such as "Optimistic Tragedy," while plays "on the family topic," presenting the external characteristics of contemporary life frequently do not rise above the level of philistine moralizing. The topic, the plot, the place of action, and the selected material may be global or local. In the final account, it is the extent of the talent and skill of the artist, the depth of penetration within reality, the accuracy of positions held, and the breadth of the philosophical-historical perspective of the work that decide the matter. Furthermore, it is simply impossible to imagine a serious play on the life of a modern engineer, worker, or kolkhoz member which would not involve problems of morality or psychology. On the other hand, all moral conflicts which captivate us, depicted in the most successful psychological productions, always indicate the dynamics of the life of the entire people. Today a communist morality upbringing and the struggle for the soul of the people is one the most important tasks of our society and, consequently, of our art.

Mental schematicism, the moment it is a question of the character in a contemporary play, is detected, in addition to everywhere else, in the conscious or subconscious aspiration to make his way straight, to eliminate obstacles, from the fear that the depiction of a struggle and the surmounting of obstacles may not be impressive, that such a path would be too difficult, or may cast aspersions on our reality as a whole. Such a view on things is wrong because of its lack of understanding of the dialectics of the development of life and its scorn for the basic laws of esthetics.

How could our progress, our struggle for the new, take place without surmounting obstacles, or without fierce clashes with the old! The burden of the struggle is laid, above all, on the shoulders of the most progressive, the best people, developing their characters, and strengthening their morality and convictions.

Is not true that smoothing things and hiding the real complexities of our development impoverish the Soviet person, the creator and builder, diminishing the real scale of his works and accomplishments?

Yes, this diminishes and impoverishes. The very nature of playwrighting quite sensitively reacts to such impoverishment, making it obvious, and inevitably exposing it. Conflict is the basis of playwrighting, and the depiction of human character in a play without a conflict would be inconceivable. No living character can be created in a play unless the author gives the character the possibility to show himself in action. In such a case the audience will take on faith the positive characteristics and would hardly trust the groundless statements of the character

Here we confront the interpretation of optimism in art, an optimism which ignores the specifics of artistic creativity and particularly of plays and the theater. Following such a "logic" one can easily cross the line separating optimism from complacency and smugness. Art expresses general trends and processes through individual human destinies; as art it has no right to ignore the infinite variety of such destinies. In the final account the specific situation of one or another play, the character may even be defeated. In themselves, a defeat or a victory of a character do not determine the spirit of the play or its direction. The importance is found in the civic, in the moral lessons which will become available to the audience. Courage, love for life, and confidence may have a happy or a dramatic end. An optimistic outlook, which is natural and essentially important to the Soviet artist, is expressed in the entire comprehensive entity of the play which presents the author's view on the world adequately and is not found necessarily in the least in the plot.

Personally, I am more impressed by plays and productions where the moral conclusion and the result desired by the author may be beyond the range of the external plot line, gradually maturing in the heart of the audience, forcing it mentally, again and again, to go back to the play. Such a conclusion, not imposed but suggested by the theater, reached independently by the audience through spiritual effort, will be truly convincing and durable.

The question of the dialectical unity between content and form in a play equally applies to modern plays and the performance of plays inherited from past ages. The great artist is always ahead of his time. Turning to the plays of the past, it is not in the past that we should seek the means for their staging. Would it be possible today to literally reproduce a performance from the times of Fonvizin? To accomplish this we should use candles, abandon stage technology and all the accomplishments in the field of staging acquired in a century. However, even were we to restore all external

attributes of such a play, using candles instead of floodlights, dressing the actors in wigs and camisoles, etc. Would we be able to bring to the present-day audience the magnetic force of influence of the truth of life (shown through historically changing esthetic means) which shook up the audience of those times? The link between a stage classic and each living generation is complex and fine. We must take fully into consideration the esthetic effect of the time distance: Many esthetic categories die with their age, and new ones appear.

No one has said that director or actor, addressing himself to a work written long ago, is released from the main requirement facing the Soviet artist. Whether you are performing a play written 200 years ago or written just recently, your art is dead if you do not address yourself to the real feelings of the contemporary living person.

A classic is a classic precisely because in every age one or another work pertaining to it presents to the people a new facet. The treasury of world culture is not an ethnographic museum visited from time to time to feel the fragrance of the past, but the inexhaustible spiritual wealth of mankind. We preserve the spiritual continuity with our classical heritage. We see to it that a classical work, teaching us how to understand the past, would help us to think, live, and build the future, for one of the foundations of this future is the moral perfection of man.

This is not to say that the works of past artists could be considered as something abstract-humanistic, ignoring their social, their class content. Classics are historical as is any other work of art. Turning to the classics, the best performances of the Soviet theater are distinguished by their precise and profound exposure of the ties linking the work with the social circumstances which created it.

As we know, in the theater the process of creativity and its perception occur simultaneously. For this reason alone it cannot fail to be contemporary. Whether a classical or contemporary play is performed, it mandatorily refers to what excites us today, using the entire arsenal of its ideological and artistic possibilities. The art of the theater is open by its very nature: It is open to the masses, to all topical social problems, and to discussion and criticism. V. I. Lenin inseparably linked the question of the attitude toward the classical heritage with the building of the new culture: In his view, socialist culture had not only to master the cultural wealth accumulated by mankind but to rework it critically, in the light of its own tasks; it was to develop the best models and traditions of classical culture from the viewpoint of the Marxist outlook and the positions of the current life of the people.

A non-creative approach to the problem of classical works is a reason for the failure of its staging. The very best classical work performed by the best actors will find no response in us unless its problems affect us today. Plays dealing with the past, whose characters wear very old-fashioned clothing and live in houses the building of which has long been abandoned, must contain the thoughts with which the people live today.

Classical plays have their own destiny. Some of them were enthusiastically welcomed at first and forgotten several years later. Others gained their true birth many years after their first performance. Even the most "classical" among the classics were not always identically welcomed on the stage. During the civil war Schiller was more willingly staged than Shakespeare. This was natural, for Schiller's "Don Carlos" could sound as a call to the struggle against the interventionists and the enemies of the revolution. The 60-year old history of the Leningrad State Bol'shoi Drama Theater imeni M. Gor'k'y includes the following case: The regiments of seamen who were the first audiences of the first performance of "Don Carlos," shouted, attacking White Guard units, "Beat the Albas!" Such a harmony between the art of the theater and the harmonies and discords of the age is the entire point.

The main, the decisive feature in the selection of a classical play is the ideological, the moral, the civic position of the artist (be he the actor or the director). The problem of the form of the classical play is exceptionally essential. However, in itself a "contemporary" or "traditional" form is not a prerequisite for success. Historically accurate features of life or characteristics of the age do not make the play archaic or a museum exhibit if the thought of the play, the emotional conflict, are contemporary.

In a classical play as, in fact, in a contemporary one, the theater does not have the right to include a thought not expressed by the author. The director and the performers are free to emphasize aspects of a work they consider close to them and present as important something previously left unnoticed or considered secondary. The enduring opinion of a play is frequently the result not only of the play but of a favorite staging. Perception changes with revision. However, one may emphasize, boost, or underscore only that which is found in the play. Otherwise, any attempt to innovate invariably turns into putting on an act or the arbitrariness of the director who adapts the fame of a great artist to circumstantial considerations or, worse, to the callous assertion of his own personality.

No one today disputes the leading role of the director, even though this is the youngest profession in the ancient art of the theater. However, even when the name of the director did not appear on the marquee he existed, he was there. In some cases these functions were performed by an actor; in others, by the playwright himself.

The key position of the director in the theater is explained by the fact that, carefully presenting the spirit of the play, including a classical play, its characters, structure, and artistic style, and implementing his ideas through the living like-thinking actor, he creates (or, in any case, should create!) a new, an independent work of the theater stage. The very word "classic" includes the viability of the work for all times and willynilly, as children of our time, we perceive through "fresh present-day eyes" and, subsequently, embody the play the play our own way. Failures along this way are possible, for any type of creative work presumes a search, innovation, and risk. It is far more difficult to follow untrodden paths to repeat the familiar.

The live and complex process of the development of art, naturally, would be impossible without creative arguments, heated discussions, and conflicts of opinions and assessments. Our purpose in such arguments and discussions, based on identical ideological principles, is to help one another and the entire art of the theater in attaining new heights.

The memory of poor current performances will disappear the way poor performances of the past have been forgotten. The passing of time makes it easier to establish the best examples of theatrical art. Admiring the masterpieces of the past, and realizing the unequal worth of our present works, we are steadily moving ahead. The esthetic criteria related to the social and spiritual development of Soviet society, enriched by major artistic gains in the related arts, are rising steadily along with the cultural standard of the people. The spiritual potential of the audience has risen immeasurably. All this opens new creative possibilities and prospects for the Soviet theater.

The scope and variety of such opportunities determine our artistic duty and conscience as well: Adopting the high and exacting measure of the party, which sees in the best results of our efforts--talented works of art--a national resource, we approach our own work and that which we are doing and are trying to do. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized at the 25th CPSU Congress, "The party approach to problems of literature and art combines a sensitive attitude toward the artistic intelligentsia and assisting it in its creative efforts with principle-mindedness." The main criterion in assessing the social significance of any work is its ideological direction.

The Soviet theater has acquired tremendous experience. It has the most important and precious feature without which it cannot live and develop: The recognition of the people and a feeling of its position in social life. The reason for which I drew attention in these notes on some as yet unresolved problems was for the sole purpose of earmarking through joint efforts the most accurate and reliable ways for the further progressive development of the Soviet multinational theater, whose prestige and progressive role have been acknowledged the world over.

5003
CSO: 1802

AT THE SOURCES OF THE CONTEMPORARY COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Moscow **KOMMUNIST** in Russian No 11, Jul 79 pp 85-97

[Article by A. Sobolev]

[Text] The international communist movement acts as a most important political force of our age. It is precisely the international communist movement, consisting of autonomous, equal, and independent Marxist-Leninist parties, that offers a scientific substantiation and constructive solution to the most complex social problems affecting mankind on a qualitatively new, revolutionary basis, exerting an ever growing influence on the course of universal history.

The need for the creation of such parties legitimately arose in the period which marks the beginning of the imperialist age and the immediate struggle for the triumph of socialism.

Relying on the profound study of the basic trends within the workers' movement and the development of the world as a whole, with the perspicacity of a revolutionary strategist, on the eve of the 1918 revolution in Germany and Austria and Hungary, V. I. Lenin stated: "The greatest trouble and danger in Europe is that it does not have a revolutionary party. There is the party of traitors, such as Scheidemann, Renaudel, Henderson, Webb, and company, or else of flunkies, such as Kautskiy. There is no party of revolutionaries.

"Naturally, the powerful revolutionary movement of the masses could correct this shortcoming. However, it will remain a great difficulty and a great danger" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 37, pp 109-110).

The communist parties appeared and matured in most complex historical circumstances, in times of severe social upheavals, surmounting the dominance of political opportunism in the workers' movement and ideological-theoretical revisionism.

The Great October Socialist Revolution which inaugurated the age of the universal proletarian revolution and, at the same time, proved the powerful vital force and transforming role of theory, strategy, and tactics developed at the turn of the century by the Bolshevik party, was of determining

significance to the establishment and strengthening of parties of a new type. "Bolshevism," Lenin pointed out, "created the ideological and tactical foundations of the Third International, which was truly proletarian and communist, and which took into consideration the gains of peacetimes and the experience of the beginning revolutionary age" (ibid, p 304).

The appearance of the communist parties was legitimate, as a manifestation of the vital needs of the workers' movement in one or another country requiring the creation of a truly revolutionary vanguard capable of opposing revisionism, reformism, centrism, and all opportunistic social democratic currents. The experience of three revolutions in Russia proved that only the existence of a truly revolutionary party could enable the working class to carry out its universal-historical mission--heading the struggle of the masses against all forms of exploitation and oppression and for the triumph of socialism.

The organization of communist parties was based on the combat and revolutionary basis of the proletariat of each country. In this process the international Marxist groups and the noted leaders of the workers' movement standing on Marxist positions played an outstanding role.

A decisive step in the struggle for the victory of the truly revolutionary direction in the workers' movement and the creation of proletarian parties of a new type was the Communist International, organized in March 1919 on Lenin's initiative.

Lenin gave invaluable aid to the revolutionaries of other countries in the creation of communist parties. He attentively followed the development of the workers' movement in the capitalist countries, studied its experience, supported new developments, and organized contacts, in person or by correspondence, with communists from different countries. With his advice Lenin helped the young parties to master the theory, strategy, and tactic of the revolutionary struggle. In his view the main task was to help the communist parties to strengthen organizationally, become ideologically armed, and politically tempered. To this effect Lenin believed that it was important above all for the communists to creatively master that "which is universally applicable, universally significant, and universally mandatory in the history and contemporary tactics of Bolshevism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 41, p 30).

At that time social reformism and centrism held important positions in the workers' movement. They were an international phenomenon. This phenomenon could be surmounted only through the international efforts of the Marxists of all countries.

The Leninist approach to the organization of the revolutionary vanguard was highly rated by the international communist movement and its noted leaders. Thus, P. Togliatti, the leader of the Italian Communist Party, wrote: "The Italian Communist Party was able to follow a proper way of development as a result of the struggle waged on two fronts for the mastering and application of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the party and the revolution. The great

Lenin made a tremendous effective contribution to this struggle with his addresses at the Third and Fourth Communist International congresses. First Gramsci, and then his followers were raised through their study of the experience of the Bolshevik party and Lenin's works" (P. Togliatti, "Izbrannyye Stat'i i Rechi" [Selected Articles and Speeches], in 2 vols, vol 1, Moscow, 1965, p 674).

In turn, Maurice Thorez, the leader of the French communists, pointed out that, "The French Communist Party always enjoyed the attention and concern shown by Lenin and his best fellow workers, and their fraternal reliable advice" (M. Thorez, "Izbrannyye Proizvedeniya" [Selected Works], in 2 vols, vol 2, Moscow, 1959, p 538).

In his works Lenin enriched in a number of aspects the great ideas of Marx and Engels, raising them to a qualitatively new level and making them consistent with the new requirements and tasks of the struggle against capitalism and for a transition to socialism. The main merit of the Third International is that, under Lenin's guidance and on the basis of the creative mastery of the experience of Bolshevism and the entire international workers' movement, through the collective efforts of its sections the ideological-theoretical, political, strategic, tactical, and organizational foundations of the activities of the communist parties as truly revolutionary parties, were formulated.

The ideological struggle around the history of the creation and activities of the Comintern remains unabated. Bourgeois ideologues, right-wing social democrats, and revisionists of all hues are doing everything possible to distort its role in the organization of communist parties and their guidance, and its significance in world history.

The foreign press has claimed that, allegedly, the attention paid to the history of the Comintern is due to nostalgia for a centralized organ within the communist movement, that allegedly there have been "concealed" attempts to establish centralization and hegemonism in some kind of "indirect way," etc. However, even the authors of such and similar statements hardly believe this. Today there is no communist party in the world which would consider expedient the creation of any kind of organ which would control and guide our movement. The CPSU has repeatedly emphasized that the Comintern reflected a certain stage in the establishment and development of the communist movement, and that under contemporary conditions the problem of returning to this form does not arise. The CPSU strictly supports the principle of autonomy and independence of each fraternal party.

At the same time, the comprehensive specific-historical study of the activities of communist parties indicates the vitality of the Leninist ideas and traditions which developed in the international communist movement in the Comintern period and their topical significance to the solution of contemporary problems.

Lenin had a tremendous influence on the ideological-theoretical strengthening of the communist parties which acted as the true creative heirs of K. Marx and

F. Engels. They adamantly mastered Leninism and implemented it. At the same time, a process of enrichment of revolutionary theory was under way through collective efforts and the attentive study and scientific summation of the steadily gained experience in the class struggle. As a result of the intensive ideological-theoretical and political activities of the Comintern and its sections Marxist-Leninist theory was linked with the international workers' movement and the workers' movement in the individual countries. This led to the formation of truly revolutionary, communist parties. At each specific stage of the struggle and turn of events, their strategy and tactics were given a creative scientific substantiation.

The requirement of a scientific substantiation of communist party activities is the most important Leninist tradition in the communist movement and a source of combat capability of the communist parties and of their revolutionary successes.

After Lenin's death at the Fifth and Sixth Comintern congresses Leninism was acknowledged as the scientific foundation of Comintern activities. ". . . In its theoretical and practical work the Communist International adopts entirely and unconditionally the viewpoint of revolutionary Marxism, further developed in Leninism . . ." its program emphasized ("Kommunisticheskiy Internatsional v Dokumentakh" [The Communist International in Documents], Moscow, 1933, p 3).

The concept of Marxism-Leninism as a single international doctrine and combat ideological-theoretical weapon of the working class was codified in a number of international and national documents of the communist movement and in the theory and practice of the communist parties.

Yet today when the social conflicts in the capitalist world are becoming ever more aggravated, various enemies of the revolutionary action of the working class are trying to compromise Leninism, using one or another pretext, and to ascribe it a limited historical or merely strictly national significance. The authors of a number of books and articles are trying to prove that the acknowledgment of Leninism as the Marxism of the contemporary age is, allegedly, wrong, that Leninism has become obsolete, and that it does not contain a theory of the socialist revolution applicable to the developed capitalist countries. Of late, unfortunately, some communist theoreticians as well are trying to dismember Marxism-Leninism--the single international doctrine.

However no single claim of obsolescence or limitation of Leninism has either acquired or could acquire any substantiation from the methodological or factual viewpoints. As the study of such works indicates, in some cases the authors simply distort the truth; in others we find a striking ignorance of Leninism, and of the theoretical wealth which Lenin brought to Marxism; in yet other publications individual twisted sentences, arbitrarily taken out of their Leninist context, are criticized.

Practical historical experience itself, the building of the first developed socialist society in the world in the USSR, the successes of world socialism,

the crumbling of the imperialist colonial system, and the intensification of the revolutionary process which developed on its wreckage, and the strengthening of the communist and workers' movements are convincing proofs of the scientific accuracy and historical rightness of Leninism, which pointed to the working class and all working people the way to social liberation. What could the critics of Leninism oppose it with in fact, rather than in words? Nothing real!

The claim that Leninism reflects merely the specific conditions of backward Russia is groundless. As we know Lenin lived and worked not only in Russia but in the developed capitalist countries as well. His works clearly confirm his attentive and scrupulous studies of the birth and development of imperialism in Europe and America, and the experience of the workers' movement in Germany, France, Britain, Italy, the United States, and other countries. Lenin actively participated in the activities of the Second International, where he held truly revolutionary positions. Leninism provided scientific answers to the basic questions raised by the entire development of history.

V. I. Lenin not only defended Marxism in the struggle against revisionism but enriched it as well. He brought to light the creative nature of Marxism with exceptional depth. He proved that Marxism is steadily developing as a result of the summation of the steadily acquired experience of the entire international revolutionary movement. This naturally leads to the dialectical interconnection among the objectivity and stability of the basic laws governing social development and the continuity of Marxist-Leninist science, on the one hand, and the steady enrichment and, to a certain extent, creative renovation of such laws, on the other. The Leninist formulation of the question is directed against dogmatism, quotation-mongering, as well as against the absolutizing of individual Marxist concepts and, even more so, against their automatic use.

Under Lenin's influence the vitally important tradition of insuring the unity between revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice in the activities of communist parties was developed within the Comintern. This tradition has always had tremendous importance in upgrading their combat capability. Under contemporary conditions, when class and liberation battles have spread through virtually the entire capitalist part of the world, the question of the unity between theory and practice assumes a truly prime significance. It is particularly important to emphasize this, since there have been occasional cases of the violation of this unity and of the underestimating of theory; occasionally we note an attraction for the pragmatic approach to political problems and an ephemeral utilitarianism in practical matters.

Under these circumstances the struggle for loyalty to Lenin's legacy, linking each step of the workers' movement with its comprehensive theoretical substantiation is an important prerequisite for the achievement of new successes by the world's revolutionary forces.

The Marxist-Leninist concept of the need to be guided by the unity between the dialectical-materialistic method and revolutionary theory in the study of social phenomena is of basic significance in the theoretical and ideological armament of the communist parties.

V. I. Lenin gave models of the dialectical-materialistic study of the processes within the workers' movement and the prospects of its development. He emphasized that the leaders of the Second International, the reformists, may have called themselves Marxists while, however, "totally failing to understand the decisive feature of Marxism: specifically, its revolutionary dialectics. Even Marx's straightforward statements that maximum flexibility will be required during the revolution were totally misunderstood and even left unnoticed by them . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 45, p 378).

On the basis of Marxist methodology, bearing in mind that in defining the political line a specific study is required of a specific situation and of all aspects in the development of the workers' movement and the class struggle, Lenin criticized the sophistry of the reformists, revisionists, and left-wing sectarians. "The entire spirit of Marxism, its entire system," he wrote, "require that each concept be considered (a) only historically; (b) only in relation to others; (c) only in connection with specific historical experience" (ibid, vol 49, p 329).

Dialectics requires the all-round study of a given social phenomenon in its development and the ability to see behind external manifestations the basic motive forces of the class struggle and of social progress.

It would be very useful for some critics of our revolution to consider this Leninist, this truly scientific approach. They proclaim themselves supporters of dialectics, while in fact they extract from the comprehensive history of Soviet society a petty fact, a given event which they link to the malicious shrieks of the "dissidents," sophistically mixing all this in their metaphysical sauce pan, proclaiming: "This is it, the Soviet experience!"

Let us note that among the communists as well there are theoreticians who persist in their attempts to separate the Leninist dialectical method from Leninist revolutionary theory and to pit one against the other. Standing on such shaky grounds, on the one hand they praise Lenin as the master of revolutionary dialectics, while on the other they reject his role as the creator of revolutionary theory. Yet separating the Leninist method from Leninist theory means to divide the live and integral doctrine--Leninism--and to undermine its foundations. In Leninism revolutionary method and revolutionary theory are a single entity, embodying both spirit and letter of Marxism.

V. I. Lenin was systematic in observing the dialectics of continuity and creative enrichment of Marxist doctrine. Accordingly he provided a Marxist analysis of the new phenomena in the development of capitalism in the new historical epoch and developed the theory of imperialism, which is a scientific base of the strategy and tactics of the communist parties. He proved that imperialism is parasitical capitalism, decaying capitalism, and the last of its stages and the eve of the socialist revolution. Without the Leninist analysis of imperialism and the understanding of the trends of the growth of monopoly capital into state-monopoly capital, one cannot explain the processes occurring today in the capitalist countries. One cannot understand the sources of the power of the monopolies, the mechanism of their rule, and the

reasons for the aggravation of contradictions within monopoly capital. A scientifically substantiated political line of struggle cannot be formulated without such an analysis.

Taking into consideration the trends and contradictions in the development of imperialism, Lenin developed the concept of the world socialist revolution, substantiated its general laws valid for all countries, and at the same time proved the need to consider dialectically the way such laws operate in different socioeconomic and political conditions. Lenin formulated the essentially important sociological conclusion of the wealth of ways to achieve social progress as a manifestation of its general laws under different circumstances. He proved the possibility and inevitability of the variety of forms of the socialist revolution, the variants in the organization of the socialist society, and the multivariance of the methods of the revolutionary transforming activities of the working class.

In the light of the dialectics of the general, the specific, and the single, Lenin revealed the nature of the dialectical interconnection between the general laws governing the revolutionary process and the infinite number of forms of its development and manifestation, according to specific-historical conditions. ". . . Different nations," he said, "follow the same historical way but with highly different zigzags and paths . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 38, p 184). That is why the "basic revolutionary principles must be adapted to the characteristics of the individual countries" (ibid, vol 44, p 19).

The Leninist theory of the socialist revolution also provides a profound interpretation of the ever-growing dialectical interaction among objective material factors in the development of the change, the role of the revolutionary initiative of the masses, their level of organization, their political parties, their leaders, and the increased importance of the subjective factor.

These Leninist concepts dealt a crushing blow at the economic fatalism of the right-wing leaders of the Second International, who considered all revolutionary processes directly dependent only on the growth of production forces and preached evolutionary reformist development of social life. At the same time, Lenin exposed the total groundlessness of subjectivistic voluntarism and petit bourgeois revolutionarism, which rejected the role of objective processes in the growth of a revolutionary situation. In accordance with Lenin's formulations the communist parties launched a struggle against the "left-wing" petty critics, the compilers of artificial structures of revolutions, adventuristic manifestations, etc. This struggle helped the communists in many countries to assume a principled position and to put an end to the domination of sectarian elements.

V. I. Lenin firmly opposed a doctrinarian attitude toward Marxism and categorically objected to the automatic use of the experience of one country in the conditions of another. He taught the young communist parties to creatively apply theory in the study of specific reality and to be able to find, to determine what was specifically national. Effective political leadership

consists precisely of the ability to determine on the basis of a knowledge of the general laws governing the socialist revolution how such laws act in the socioeconomic and political life of each country, and draw on their basis the strategy and tactics of each communist party, and to learn to see through the lens of the specific-historical conditions of the struggle of each nation the requirements of the revolutionary time and the vital interests of the masses.

Very indicative in this respect is Lenin's polemics with some Italian communists. Emphasizing that the basic revolutionary principles should be adapted to the characteristics of the different countries, he said: "The revolution in Italy will develop differently than it did in Russia. . . . We have never asked Serrati in Italy to imitate the Russian revolution. This would be stupid. We have sufficient brains and flexibility to avoid such stupidity" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 44, pp 19, 21).

The Leninist idea of the need for a specific-historical approach to the policy of each communist party was developed in subsequent Comintern documents. A major contribution to the further creative elaboration of this concept was made by its seventh congress and by noted leaders of the communist movement.

The CPSU is continuing to make an invaluable contribution to the development and enrichment of this Leninist idea. It would be of some interest to remind the "latest critics" who proclaim the "dogmatic codification" of Leninism by its heirs of one of the outstanding cases of creative development of theory. In December 1936 the Soviet leadership sent a letter to the government of republican Spain. "The Spanish revolution," it stated, "is making its own ways which are different in a number of respects from the way covered by Russia. This is determined by different postulates of social, historical, and geographic order, and the different requirements of the international circumstances compared with those the Russian revolution had to deal with. It is entirely possible that the parliamentary way will prove to be a more effective means of revolutionary development in Spain compared with Russia."

The Leninist concept of the wealth of ways for the development of a revolution was further developed at the 20th CPSU Congress, the documents and materials of the 24th and 25th party congresses, and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's addresses. "Historical experience," he noted, "confirmed most clearly Lenin's thought that characteristics in the development of the socialist countries 'may not apply to the main fact.' The main fact is that both the path to socialism and the socialist system itself are characterized, as the fraternal parties emphasize, by a number of basic laws inherent in the socialist society of any given country" (L. I. Brezhnev, "Leninskiĭ Kurs" [Following the Leninist Course], Vol 2, 1979, pp 589-590).

Following the defeat of the revolutions in the West, after a thorough study of the existing circumstances and the condition of the workers' movement, Lenin reached important conclusions. Above all he noted the considerable intensification of the reactionary nature of monopoly capital and its assault on democratic rights and freedoms. Lenin further noted that the revolution in

Europe "will not come as quickly as we expected. This was proved by history and must be accepted as a fact. We must take into consideration that the world socialist revolution in the leading countries cannot break out as easily as did the revolution in Russia . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 36, p 15).

V. I. Lenin studied the way big capital was perfecting the entire mechanism for the protection of its rule. ". . . The German and the entire international bourgeoisie, splendidly armed and organized, and taught by the 'Russian experience,' hurled itself on the German revolutionary proletariat with raining hatred" (ibid, vol 44, p 88).

The political system, the tools of the repressive machinery and of information, the economic apparatus, the church, universities, schools, trade union bureaucracy, and traitors in the ranks of the social democratic movement were all used, and still are, by big capital, which is attentively taking into consideration the "Russian experience," to undermine the faith in socialism, weaken the combat power of the working class, increase its division, and split its ranks.

Through the collective efforts of the communist parties, and with Lenin's direct participation, the new important aspects of the strategic orientation of the struggle for socialism following the abatement of the revolutionary wave at the beginning of the 1920's, were formulated.

First of all a scientific substantiation was provided to the important strategic concept of combining the struggle for democracy with progress toward socialism in the developed capitalist countries. Lenin tirelessly explained that the working class always defends democracy. In Russia, for example, the bourgeois-democratic problems were resolved only under the leadership of the proletariat. In the West, after the October Revolution, priority was given to the implementation of socialist tasks. However, the lessons of the battles proved the importance of democratic slogans in leading the masses to revolution. That is why Lenin proved that in the imperialist epoch the democratic tasks become ever more closely interwoven with the socialist tasks. However he also noted that in the course of the struggle for democracy a revolutionary leap, a qualitative transition occurs from bourgeois to socialist democracy.

V. I. Lenin emphasized that the universal-historical prospects lead to socialism and that this must not be forgotten whatever the developments of the struggle may be. At the same time he indicated the "gigantic break" made "by the history of the revolution." The "pace of development will be even faster and the twists will be more complex." In order not to be confused and to keep a general view in the course of such zigzags and historical breaks, one must be able "to see the link binding the entire development of capitalism and the entire way to socialism" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 36, p 47).

Taking into consideration the holdup of the revolution in the West, the increased reactionary nature of the monopolies, and their perfection of the

entire mechanism for the suppression of the workers' movement, Lenin and the Comintern drew the conclusion that the course of direct assault on capitalism had exhausted its possibilities under such circumstances. In this connection the tactic was elaborated of expanding the work among the masses, the creation of broad alliances among working people, and the elaboration of new methods for leading them to a revolution.

The Leninist concepts of the complexity of the struggle for a transition to socialism in the developed capitalist countries and the characteristics of this struggle in the averagely developed capitalist countries were accepted by the leaders of the communist parties and, particularly, by A. Gramsci, who creatively used them in the development of his views on the maneuvers and positions in the development of the revolution.

Another new problem was that of the possibility and even necessity of transitional political forms in a period when the revolutionary movement in the developed capitalist countries is growing, yet when the working class does not have enough strength to insure the full overthrow of capitalism. The documents of the Third and Fourth Comintern congresses stipulated that under the changed historical conditions brought about by the broadening of the democratic tasks of the revolutionary movement aimed against total monopoly power and its reactionary policy directed against the entire nation, the more realistic way would lie not in the direct establishment of a dictatorship of the working class but the creation of transitional forms of revolutionary power in the guise of a workers' government supported by the communists or with communist participation. The possibility for the creation of a worker-peasant government was further intensified and formulated in the course of the further development of this idea.

The renovated strategic orientation of the revolutionaries in the capitalist countries, developed by Lenin, underwent its vital test in the subsequent stages of world history.

Lenin's works and the materials of the Comintern provide a substantiation of the ways for molding the motive forces of the revolutionary process under the circumstances. This enriched the political tradition of the struggle for broadening class alliances and enhancing the role of the working class as the leader of all working people. It is a question above all of elaborating the concept of the united proletarian front as the most important prerequisite for the intensification of the revolutionary role of the working class, the implementation of its historical mission as a hegemonistic class, and the unification of the broad masses around it.

The Comintern indicated the various possibilities and ways for the organization of a united front. In some cases it recommended the creation of a united workers' front; in others, unity of action based on general or specific problems; in others again, the creation of united sectorial, national, or international trade union organizations, etc.

This was an essentially new and flexible line aimed at surmounting the division within the working class, and insuring the unity of action among

workers, whether communists, socialists, Catholics, or non-party. The purpose of the united-front policy was to involve the broadest possible workers' masses in the struggle for the solution of current and long-term problems of the workers' movement. It was believed that in the course of the struggle for the creation of a single proletarian front the workers influenced by the social-democratic, religious-Christian, or anarcho-syndicalist organizations will undergo jointly a revolutionary training based on their own experience, and would enhance their level of organization and combat capability. As a result the working class would be able to act as a hegemony class more effectively.

V. I. Lenin and the Comintern considered the political line of the struggle for a united front the most important component of the strategy of the communist parties in training the motive forces of the revolution during the entire period of struggle. ". . . The tactic of the united front," state the resolutions passed at the Fourth Comintern Congress, "will be of decisive significance to the new epoch" ("V. I. Lenin i Kommunisticheskiy Internatsional" [V. I. Lenin and the Communist International], Moscow, 1970, p 466).

The new Leninist concepts substantially enriched the theory of the revolution. For the first time in the theory of scientific communism Lenin proved that it would be more difficult to initiate a socialist revolution precisely in industrially developed countries. Some Western "theoreticians" believe that in this area Lenin "revised," "reconsidered" Marx's theory. Actually, systematically deepening Marxist theory, he discovered new phenomena in the development of state-monopoly capital and new aspects of its organization. He substantiated the new paths to revolution in the capitalist countries.

Studying the intensification of the process of internationalization of all aspects of social life under imperialist conditions, Lenin reached the conclusion that the development of the revolution on earth is a single worldwide process. "The social revolution," he wrote, "can occur only as an age combining the civil war of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in the progressive countries and an entire number of democratic and revolutionary, including national-liberation, movements in underdeveloped, backward, and oppressed nations" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 30, p 112).

Lenin's works and the documents of Comintern congresses defined the strategic tasks of the national-liberation movement and proved its organic link with the development of the world's socialist revolution. Lenin theoretically substantiated the factual possibility of the nations in economically backward countries to bypass, with the help of the socialist states, the painful stage of capitalist development and after experiencing a number of transitional democratic phases, to reach socialism. The program documents of the Fourth Comintern Congress reveal the basic strategic and tactical content of this struggle: acquisition of independence, agrarian reform, elimination of all feudal rights and privileges, democratization of the political system, etc. In practical terms this was the concept of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, democratic revolution with the possibility for its growth into a socialist revolution. The Comintern substantiated the need for the creation of a single anti-imperialist front as a decisive means for the implementation of such tasks.

V. I. Lenin advised the communists in the Orient to autonomously develop their political line for the revolutionary reorganization of their countries on the basis of Marxist theory and the experience in the building of socialism and the class struggle. "The task," he said, "is to awaken the revolutionary activeness for the action and organization of the toiling masses, regardless of the level they have reached, translate the true communist theory aimed at the communists in more advanced countries into the language of each nation, and implement the immediate practical assignments and join the common struggle waged by the proletariat of other countries.

"Such are the problems whose solution you will not find in any communist pamphlet but in the common struggle initiated by Russia" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 39, p 330).

Thus already then Lenin formulated as an important long-term task the unification of the communist movement with the national-liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples. All subsequent universal developments, ranging from the victory of democracy and socialism in Mongolia to the destruction of colonial empires, the triumph of the ideas of socialism in individual Asian countries and in Cuba, and the powerful movement for the implementation of the concepts of a socialist orientation in a number of developing Asian and African countries--are the triumph of the Leninist theory of the paths of social progress followed by the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies.

The Leninist theory of the socialist revolution organically combines the prospects for the building of socialism in the USSR, the revolutionary struggle of the international working class, and the anti-imperialist actions of the national-liberation movement. As a whole this was a concept of the development of a worldwide socialist revolution, reflecting the latest phenomena in the development of capitalism and the international revolutionary movement, and the nature and future of the confrontation between the two socioeconomic systems.

The Leninist traditions of mastering the laws of the leadership of the class struggle by the proletariat developed within the frameworks of the Comintern. Lenin understood this problem in the broad meaning of the term, including the steady upgrading of the combat capability of the communist parties, the scientific substantiation of their policies, and the improvements in the ways and means of work of the communists among the masses.

Lenin provided a concentrated interpretation of the basic principles of the science on the leadership of the class struggle by the proletariat in a number of works. However, particularly important in this respect is his outstanding work, "The Infant Left-Wing Disease in Communism." Summing up the experience of the Bolsheviks and the entire international revolutionary movement, Lenin proved that "politics is a science and an art, which does not come from the skies, is not given for free, and that the proletariat, if it wishes to defeat the bourgeoisie, must develop its own proletarian 'class politicians,' who would be no worse than bourgeois politicians" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 41, p 65).

The Leninist formulation of the problem is a step forward in understanding the dialectics of the objective and the subjective. It shows the ways for the intensification of the subjective factor and of the active forces within the revolutionary process.

V. I. Lenin directed the party toward systematically mastering the universal experience of the revolutionary movement, creatively mastering Marxist-Leninist theory, actively fighting right-wing and left-wing opportunism, closely linking at all stages transitional requirements with final tasks, insuring the organization of work among the masses and work in all mass organizations, even reactionary ones, and steadily preparing the working people to fight for the triumph of democracy and socialism. The communist parties learned to scientifically define their subsequent steps and to steadily enhance the standards of the working class and the entire labor movement.

Having mastered the laws of guiding the revolutionary struggle of the working class, Lenin pointed out, the communist parties will be able to compensate with their accurate policy individual weaknesses in the deployment of class forces; errors and omissions in leadership frequently lead to defeat.

The example of many victorious revolutions and failures in class battles in individual countries in recent years convincingly prove the vital force of the Leninist formulation of the question of the creative mastery of the laws governing the leadership of the class struggle by the proletariat.

V. I. Lenin and the Comintern organically linked the development of the worldwide socialist revolution with the struggle for peace. They defended and increased the proletarian tradition of fighting for the safety of the peoples and against imperialism and aggressive, including colonial, wars waged by the imperialist states. This tradition was strengthened in the decisions of the Seventh Comintern Congress, which proved the unity and inseparable nature of the demands for peace, democracy, and socialism. This political line was consequently confirmed in the heroic struggle waged by the communists against fascism, in the resistance movement, and in the powerful development of the contemporary peace movement. It was codified in the documents of the international conference of communist and workers' parties and in their decisions.

Lenin elaborated the foundations of the policy of peaceful coexistence and substantiated the dialectical interconnection between the struggle for peaceful coexistence and for socialism. Subsequently, in the course of the confrontation between the two world systems, Lenin's ideas were developed further. At the present stage the CPSU is steadfastly implementing and enriching the Leninist concept of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems. It has raised it to a qualitatively new theoretical level and brought to light the dialectics of peaceful coexistence and the worldwide revolutionary process. The CPSU proceeds from the fact that the systematic implementation of the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence is the only alternative to a thermonuclear war. All countries are interested

in its implementation. At the same time the policy of peaceful coexistence creates more favorable conditions for all nations in the struggle for national freedom, economic prosperity, intensification of all aspects of democracy, and conversion to a higher socioeconomic system.

Relying on the very rich experience of the Bolshevik party he created and summing up the latest phenomena in the activities of communist parties in other countries created after the October Revolution, V. I. Lenin steadily developed and enriched the theory of the party as the highest form of socio-political organization of the working class. Lenin's works depict the following important features of the party of a new type: It is a party of revolutionary action whose purpose is the seizure of power by the working class allied with all working people; it is the most conscientious detachment of the working class, mastering a truly scientific theory and steadily developing it; it is the revolutionary vanguard of the working class and all working people, inseparably linked with the masses, drawing its strength from the masses, and able to unite and organize them in the struggle against capitalism and for the building of socialism; the communist party is a party of true internationalists who at all historical turns remained loyal to the great objectives of international solidarity; the communist party is organized on the basis of the principles of democratic centralism which insures freedom for discussion and solution of all problems and unity of action; the party of a new type continually improves the "science and art" of the leadership of class battles waged by revolutionary forces. These Leninist principles governing the organization and activities of communist parties proved their viable strength at all stages in the development of the communist movement. Experience also proves that neglect of such principles weakens the revolutionary potential of the party and its leading role.

From the very beginning, on Lenin's initiative, the Comintern developed the traditions of collective study and solution of basic problems of political activity. All noted leaders of the international communist movement who worked with Vladimir Il'ich repeatedly underscored his desire to discuss matters jointly, his attentive attitude toward different viewpoints, his concern for surmounting erroneous views and errors, and his ability to help, in a comradely way, to get rid of erroneous concepts.

The Leninist tradition of the development of the dialectics of the international and the national, and of problems of expanding international relations was of exceptional importance to strengthening the communist movement.

The experienced and influential leaders of the communist parties were molded in an atmosphere of collectivism and internationalism. The process of their political, ideological, and organizational growth was intensified. Their abilities and skills to autonomously develop basic problems of politics, strategy, and tactics were tempered. Once the ideological maturity of the communist parties had become a fact the need for a centralized guiding organ--the Comintern--disappeared.

Subsequently new forms of international relations among communist parties were developed: international conferences, regional conferences, and multilateral and bilateral meetings. Presently the communist movement has reached a new stage in its development. It has its problems and difficulties and different viewpoints and even differences of opinion on some matters.

However this is not determining in the development of the international workers' movement. Established 60 years ago on the initiative and under the direct guiding influence of Lenin, and tempered in the course of severe class battles, it achieved outstanding historical accomplishments. Today it is in a state of new upsurge with all its characteristics reflecting radical changes in world circumstances.

The communists are marching in the vanguard of the social progress of mankind and the battles for peace, democracy, and socialism. They carry high the banner of the Leninist traditions. Thanks the loyalty to such traditions the communist party has become the most influential, widespread, and organized political force of our time.

5003

CSO: 1802

VIENNA: AN IMPORTANT STEP FORWARD

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 79 pp 98-106

[Article by Ye. Grigor'yev]

[Text] Briefly, the Soviet-American summit meeting, held in Vienna on 15-18 June, is rated as an event of prime importance to the entire world and the overall development of international relations. The talks held between L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, and J. Carter, U.S. president, and their results were welcomed throughout the globe with great satisfaction. The results of the meeting are approved by the broad popular masses and the realistically thinking state leaders. As numerous observers believe, a new factor has appeared in world politics which will influence not only the state of Soviet-American relations but all international life.

The Vienna meeting was marked by the initialing of a number of documents in the interest of detente, restraining the arms race, and consolidating the peace and security of the peoples. This includes, above all, the USSR-U.S. Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II) and its protocol. The thick folders--red with the Soviet seal and blue with the American seal--containing the documents signed by the heads of the two countries also include the Joint Declaration on the Principles and Basic Directions of Subsequent Talks on the Limitation of Strategic Armaments, and the document "Joint Declarations and Common Understandings Related to the USSR-U.S. Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty"; the joint Soviet-American communique sums up the talks and earmarks areas for possible interaction between the two most powerful countries in the world.

As noted in the document issued by the CC CPSU Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers on 22 June, the "Vienna meeting marks an important step forward in the improvement of Soviet-American relations and of the entire international political climate. The full implementation of the documents initialed in Vienna opens new opportunities for terminating the growth of nuclear missile arsenals, and for insuring their effective quantitative and qualitative limitation. The solution of this problem would be a new stage in restraining the arms race and open the path to a substantial reduction in armaments and to the implementation of the high objective of totally interrupting the production and eliminating stockpiles of nuclear weapons."

The four-day Soviet-American summit meeting was crowded with intensive work. It took place essentially behind the conference table. There were two daily sessions to which private work-lunches were added. The talks were held alternately in the Soviet and the American embassy.

To a certain extent the scant presentation of the events complicated the lives of journalists representing the press, radio, and television, registered at the press center of Hoffburg Palace. Yet the political content of the Vienna meeting which excited commentators and columnists was exceptionally great. The information provided in the evening at press conferences showed that it was a question of problems of tremendous importance: all most important and most topical problems of world politics were discussed in their essence.

The problem of the Soviet-American SALT treaty held a central position at the meeting. This is understandable. Today there is no more burning and urgent task than restraining the arms race and preventing the threat of a nuclear world war. The military rivalry absorbs huge material resources, costing the nations over \$400 billion per year. The main thing however is the endless increase in armaments, nuclear missiles in particular, fraught with tremendous danger to mankind. Hence the primacy of SALT II--the task of limiting the most terrible destructive and expensive types of modern armaments. Vienna became the final stage of the gigantic work in this respect, a work which took almost seven years. A number of obstacles had to be surmounted, delicate circumstances considered, and intensive political and diplomatic struggle waged on the way to the Redoubt Hall of Hoffburg Palace where SALT II was ceremoniously initialed.

As we know this work was started following the initialing of the USSR-U.S. provisional accord on certain measures in the field of limiting strategic armaments (SALT I), of 26 May 1972. Its article seven contained the obligation for the parties "to continue their active talks on limiting strategic offensive armaments." One year later the basic principles of the such talks were ratified. At the end of 1974 the essential parameters of the new agreement, codified in the familiar Vladivostok agreements, were defined.

Nevertheless, it was precisely the subsequent stage, when a new treaty, as was frequently pointed out at that time, was "90% ready," that turned out to be the most difficult and lengthy. On the one hand the principle of equality and identical security, laid as a base for the accord, required exceptional thoroughness in the search for compromises and balanced interests. In itself, this was a difficult and time-consuming matter. On the other hand the talks were repeatedly complicated and delayed as a result of the fierce opposition of the overseas opponents of detente and the circles of the military-industrial complex who have major levers of influence in Washington. A great deal of persistence, endurance, and tactfulness were needed to reach a positive outcome in the talks.

Life itself, the entire logic of international development, called for achieving an agreement on limiting strategic armaments as the cornerstone of Soviet-American relations in recent years. In addition to the constant

meetings between the respective delegations in Geneva, in 1977-1978 alone the USSR minister of foreign affairs and U.S. secretary of state met on nine separate occasions to discuss problems of preparations for SALT II; on six occasions such talks directly involved the heads of the two countries. In the final account common sense assumed the upper hand and the parties were able to find the necessary balance of interests based on the principle of equality and identical security. The world was provided with a convincing and very substantial proof, from the viewpoint of further prospects, that the USSR and the United States could jointly resolve even very complex and delicate problems.

Like any compromise, from the Soviet viewpoint SALT II could have been better in one or another aspect. However, this is a sensible compromise which considers on an equal basis the interests of both parties and, as a whole, is a major and good accomplishment.

By virtue of a number of circumstances, the political essence of SALT II made it a document of universal significance. Its purpose is not only to offer an effective break to the nuclear missile race. The hope has been everywhere expressed that the treaty will have a beneficial influence on the possibilities for progress in other directions of military detente, on bilateral Soviet-American relations, and on the further improvement of the entire international climate. It is natural, therefore, that the Vienna discussion of SALT II and its related problems, and its final ratification and conclusion, comprising the main objective and main item of the Vienna meeting, were also the criteria of its success. These assignments were totally carried out, which unquestionably is the main result of the meeting.

The initialing of SALT II means the implementation of one of the stipulations of the foreign political program of the 25th CPSU Congress. In the interest of terminating the arms race, converting to a reduction of stockpiles of armaments and to disarmament, it specifically called for "doing everything possible for completing the preparations for a new agreement to be concluded between the USSR and the United States on limiting and reducing strategic armaments." This was the target of the lengthy and adamant efforts of the CC CPSU Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers. Well aware of this problem, Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev steadily followed the main basic lines of the talks and actively dealt with their various aspects. It is no accident that the international public and the press of many countries noted the outstanding personal contribution made by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev to the success of SALT II, the strengthening of universal peace, the restraining of the arms race, and the development of mutually profitable cooperation among countries with different social systems. As G. Kennon, the noted American diplomat and public figure stated, "One can only envy the endurance, patience, and persistence with which the Soviet leadership, headed by L. I. Brezhnev, urged all these years a reduction in the nuclear armaments of the two countries."

"The treaty is realistic and specific," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out. "Its essence is the quantitative restriction of armaments and the containment

of their qualitative improvement. It is based on the principle of equality and identical security. The implementation by the parties of all treaty obligations can be reliably controlled.

"This is the result of long years of efforts and a just balance of interests. Every stipulation or, I may even say, every word of this treaty has been weighed and considered tens of times."

Each side pledges to "limit offensive strategic armaments quantitatively and qualitatively, show restraint in the development of new types of strategic offensive armaments, and take other measures as stipulated in this treaty." The political and practical sense of these obligations is, as the preamble to the treaty notes, to make a contribution to the improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, and to help lower the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war and to strengthen international peace and security.

Compared with SALT I, the new Soviet-American treaty goes much further. Its content is far richer. The realm of restrictions imposed on strategic offensive weapons is broadened. For the first time SALT II covers all systems carrying this armament: ICBM's, SLBM's, heavy bombers (including bombers carrying cruise missiles), and, finally, air-to-surface ballistic missiles. For the first time equal numbers of carriers of offensive strategic armaments have been established--2,400 units per side and, as of 1 January 1981, 2,250. Within such overall indicators restrictions have been introduced for strategic missiles with multiple independent warheads and for heavy bombers armed with cruise missiles and with a flight range in excess of 600 kilometers. Each side can have a maximum of 1,320 such means of delivery, and so on. The 19 articles of SALT II indeed define in the greatest detail obligations related to the second stage in the limitation of strategic offensive armaments.

Also very important are circumstances which restrict the further perfecting of existing strategic armaments. The treaty allows for the development by each side of a maximum of one new type of light intercontinental ballistic missile. The quality limits introduced with SALT II apply to the power of the missiles, the warheads, the deployment of such weapons, and other parameters. The protocol, which is a fixed part of the treaty, introduces a number of additional restrictions. The purpose of all this is to restrain the growth of the destructive power of nuclear missile arsenals.

The material content of SALT II speaks for itself. Enacted, it will factually and effectively restrict the growth of armaments along the most dangerous directions.

The total elimination of the threat of war is an exceptionally difficult problem. This problem has remained insoluble throughout human history. Today, however, we are living in different times which have brought about not only new dangers but new opportunities. The tremendous significance of SALT II consists, in particular, under conditions of complex international

circumstances, in its convincingly demonstrating once again the existence of such opportunities and stimulating obligations related to the process of restraining the arms race codified in it and initiated by the CPSU and the Soviet state.

The tasks of the struggle for a reduction of armaments and for disarmament do not become obsolete but, as before, remain urgent. It is no secret to anyone that SALT II narrows only one—even though the most dangerous—channel of the arms race. The arms race, however, is continuing along other channels. Furthermore, the imperialist pioneers of this dangerous and senseless rivalry are even trying to urge it on.

The NATO camp continues to follow its course of further increase in military expenditures. According to the American Brookings Institute, for example, the Pentagon is planning an annual 7-8% budget increase in military expenditures over the next five years. The U.S. militaristic circles are also considering the implementation of a number of expensive armament programs, ranging from the development of mobile MX intercontinental missiles and Trident-class missile submarines to the modernization of the airforce, and the purchasing of new weapons systems for land forces, the building and reconstruction of navy ships, and the equipping of aircraft carriers with new model aircraft. The Pentagon and NATO are concocting plans for the production and deployment in Western Europe of a new generation of missiles with a so-called medium range of action. The question of the production of neutron weapons has not been removed from the agenda in the least. Ever greater quantities of weapons are piling up in a number of other areas on the planet. The only sensible alternative to this dangerous development is to stop it and, subsequently, go back toward disarmament.

In itself SALT II is not a self-seeking objective, an end, but a major stage on the way to limiting and reducing strategic offensive armaments. The next stage--SALT III--will also be very important. In all likelihood, this will be an even more complex project. A number of important strategic and geographic factors will have to be considered which so far appear to have been excluded from the talks on strategic arms limitation. In particular, such talks cannot be conducted endlessly on a bilateral basis only. They must be joined by the other nuclear powers. Equally timely is the discussion of the question of American military bases aimed, from the military-strategic viewpoint, at our country.

The special joint declaration signed in Vienna stipulates the clear principles and objectives of SALT III talks. They must also be based on the principles of equality and identical security of the sides. The Soviet Union and the United States intend to achieve a substantial reduction in the number of strategic offensive armaments and their further quality limitations and to resolve the problems included in the protocol to SALT II, whose validity (the protocol) covers three years only. SALT III, however, is matter for the future. It depends on the ratification and enactment of SALT II, since, otherwise, it would have no starting base.

At the same time, currently a number of other talks are being held covering various aspects of restraining the arms race and disarmament. So far, returns and specific results based on such activities have been insignificant. Therefore, it is logical for the participants in the Soviet-American summit to pay great attention to other problems of limiting rivalry in the military area, bearing in mind that SALT II could and should provide an impulse to the progress of such talks.

Having an extensive and constructive program for action covering virtually all problems of disarmament, in the course of the Vienna talks the Soviet side actively promoted for discussion various related matters. In its section on limiting nuclear and conventional armaments, the joint Soviet-American communique reflects the broad spectrum of the topics discussed. The conclusion reached by both sides that a nuclear war would be a calamity for all mankind, as well as the declaration that neither party "aspires or will continue to aspire to achieve military superiority, since this could only bring about a dangerous instability, raising the level of armaments and threatening the security of both sides" is of great importance.

As a whole, the results of the Vienna summit meeting convincingly prove that a useful exchange of views was held on the condition of the talks conducted between the USSR and the United States or with their participation regarding a number of problems related to limiting armaments and to disarmament. Agreement was reached to give a new impulse to the joint efforts to achieve practical results at such talks. Now it is a question of the fastest possible implementation of this important agreement. As to the Soviet Union, as A. A. Gromyko, CC CPSU Politburo member and USSR minister of foreign affairs, stated at his 25 June Moscow press conference, "We shall continue to struggle against the arms race. We shall wage the struggle, if you wish, from even better positions than yesterday. We shall rely on the Vienna treaty and on other agreements directly or indirectly hindering the arms race."

Yet another set of topics discussed in Vienna included central problems of the international situation. This was a straightforward discussion and a frank comparison of positions, including problems on which different views are held.

The Soviet Union and the United States have experience in successfully interacting in international affairs. In 1973, for example, their joint efforts helped to put an end to the outbreak of the Middle Eastern war. Soviet-American cooperation played an important role in preparations for the Helsinki European conference. However, serious differences separate the USSR and the United States. Some of them are the result of the objective complexity of contemporary international problems. In other cases, their assessment reflects ideological differences. Quite frequently efforts to achieve reciprocal understanding, as required by the interests of peace, and interaction at one or another turn in international developments are deliberately complicated by circles interested in maintaining international tension and aggravating Soviet-American relations.

In particular, the enemies of mutual understanding between the two countries actively use the fabrication of the so-called "Soviet military threat." This is the only "argument" of the militaristic forces promoting the continuation of the arms race. The American opponents of SALT II as well essentially base all their views on this argument. Innumerable attempts have been made to depict the legitimate processes of social development in one or another country and the struggle of the peoples for national independence and social progress as being, allegedly, the consequence of "Moscow's intrigues and machinations." At the Vienna talks the Soviet side properly assessed the malicious propaganda of the promoters of mistrust and hostility who are trying to aggravate relations between the USSR and the United States and promote a clash between them.

Yet, the power and influence of both states impose upon them a particular responsibility for insuring the peace the world over. Here again not propaganda sallies or the juggling of "combinations of forces" are required but wise restraint, respect for the legitimate interests of the other partner, and honest aspiration to find a common language in the building of a more sensible and safe peace. Such is the principled Soviet approach to the current international circumstances as displayed in Vienna as well.

In the course of the discussion of international and regional problems, the participants in the Vienna meeting paid particular attention to European affairs and the situation in the Middle East, southern Africa, and Southeast Asia.

Favorable possibilities have developed on the European continent for strengthening the peace, good-neighborly relations, and mutually profitable cooperation. Major positive changes have occurred here, reflected in the Final Act of the European Conference. Now political detente in Europe must be strengthened through military detente. In this connection reaching an agreement in the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe could be very useful. Also topical is the task of strengthening the measure of trust on the continent. It is important that as a result of the discussion of European affairs both parties to the Soviet-American summit talks expressed themselves firmly in favor of the further intensification of detente in Europe.

The other areas covered in the talks dealt with the so-called "hot spots" where the peoples are struggling against aggression and its consequences and for freedom, independence, and justice. The Soviet Union maintains a principled attitude on the side of the peoples defending their just cause. Naturally, for example, it could not support the separate Israeli-Egyptian deal concluded under U.S. patronage, making the circumstances in the Middle East even more dangerous. The USSR is loyal to its principled line in Middle Eastern affairs: the just and durable settlement of this problem is possible only on the basis of Israel's return of all seized Arab lands, the recognition of the right of the Arab people of Palestine to set up their own state, and securing the independence and safety of all countries in the area.

Also conflicting are the views of the USSR and the United States on the problems of southern Africa where the peoples are waging a fierce battle against the colonizers and for freedom and human dignity. The Soviet Union, as was reasserted in Vienna, favors the full and fastest possible elimination of all vestiges of colonialism and racism, and respect of the right of all nations of autonomous and independent development. The United States and its allies are practically on the side of the forces of the past, hindering the elimination of racism, colonialism, and neocolonialism.

The question of China was discussed as well in Vienna. Both sides presented their positions in this matter. Dominating in the statements of the Soviet side was the idea of the inadmissibility of any country, the United States in this case, to use its relations with China to the detriment of the Soviet Union and the interests of its security, since this would have a very adverse effect on Soviet-American relations and the international circumstances as a whole. The future will show the nature of U.S. present policy and practical steps in this area.

The task of resolving all central international problems was neither formulated nor could be formulated for the Vienna meeting. However, unquestionably, the dialog which took place was useful, for it led to a clearer understanding of reciprocal positions. Essentially, the broadening of the realm of Soviet-American agreements on international matters can serve the general interests of the peace and security of the nations. With reciprocal willingness and strict observance of the achieved agreements a great deal of fields of cooperation could be found related to both regional and global matters.

All this is inseparable from the task of improving American-Soviet relations themselves. At the beginning of the 1970's a good base was created for this purpose. This includes, above all, the documents "Foundations of Mutual Relations Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America" (1972) and the "Agreement on the Prevention of a Nuclear War" (1973). Both documents have made it incumbent upon our countries to base their relations on principles of peaceful coexistence and sovereignty, equality, and non-interference in the domestic affairs and reciprocal benefits, and to do everything possible to prevent the outbreak of a thermonuclear conflagration. Since then--not in the least by the fault of the Soviet Union--the development of Soviet-American relations was uneven and, occasionally, was even turned back. This influenced the entire international atmosphere.

The leaders of the USSR and the United States frankly discussed in Vienna these important problems as well. As a result, good prospects and real possibilities for straightening out existing twists may be found in Soviet-American relations, along with possibilities for developing even Soviet-American relations on the basis of the recognition of the realities of the contemporary international situation. However, this will require the great efforts and goodwill of both sides.

Vienna, 18 June. The big Redoubt Hall of Hoffburg Palace is flooded in light. The solemn concluding act of the meeting between L. N. Brezhnev and J. Carter

is taking place. They have signed the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty and other documents. The talks have been concluded successfully. A major and important event has taken place. There is excitement in the hall, and the uplifted atmosphere of a historical event. There are long tempestuous ovations.

"An event has taken place," states L. I. Brezhnev, "long expected by the Soviet and American peoples, the peoples of other countries, and anyone who wishes a durable peace and is aware of the danger of the further growth of nuclear arsenals. Signing this treaty we help to defend the most sacred right of every person--the right to life."

"No country on earth," J. Carter states, "No nation, no human being can suffer, be threatened, or be harmed by this victory in the struggle for peace. This is a victory for all."

Day after day more and more time is passing since the Vienna summit meeting. Yet, the Soviet-American talks in the Austrian capitol and their fruitful results remain the leading topic in world politics and international discussions. The response to this meeting throughout the globe was truly tremendous. Governments, parliaments, parties, and public organizations in the socialist, the developing, and many capitalist countries gave a high rating to its results and significance. SALT II is finally approved by the nations.

The range of responses has been exceptionally broad. For example, warmly welcoming the results of the Vienna meeting, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee Presidium and the Czechoslovak Government stated that the conclusion of SALT II confirms the correctness and effectiveness of the active peace-loving policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state. The signing of the treaty is an event confirming the triumph of common sense, emphasized G. Hall, secretary general of the U.S. Communist Party. On behalf of hundreds of millions of people the World Federation of Trade Unions expressed its support of the treaty. The French Council of Ministers and the heads of the governments of the FRG, Italy, Britain, Japan, Denmark, and many other countries expressed their positive attitude toward SALT II. Essentially, Beijing alone expressed open discontent at the results of the Vienna meeting.

The circumstances in the United States are complex. According to a poll SALT II is favored by the overwhelming majority of the population and supported by noted political leaders. At the same time the relatively small militaristic circles, influential because of their links with the military-industrial complex, were energized in their opposition to SALT II and detente in general, favoring the continuation of the arms race. As the London OBSERVER pointed out, "The debate in America on SALT II is a debate on America's position in the world compared with the Soviet Union."

Some American circles are unwilling to accept the principle of equality and identical security for the United States and the USSR, promoting the continuation of the senseless and dangerous pursuit of the ghost of military

superiority. The future will show the outcome of the struggle on the ratification of the treaty by the American Congress. It is clear, however, that any attempt to shake up this complex structure, erected with so much effort, and to change some of its parts would be unpromising. This could lead to the crumbling of the entire structure, bringing about severe and even dangerous consequences both in terms of bilateral Soviet-American relations and the global situation as a whole.

This has been justifiably pointed out by many members of the U.S. Administration, many senators, and representatives of the business world and public organizations in the United States. "We must increase the progress achieved, for the alternative would be a return to unlimited rivalry in the growth of armaments," stated C. Vance, U.S. secretary of state, addressing the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee. Senator E. Kennedy noted that "SALT II will help us to initiate the long-awaited process of reduction of nuclear armaments," and that "the treaty confirms the intention of both sides to continue with their talks on the reduction of strategic armaments."

The Vienna meeting left a deep trace in current international life. The great importance of the holding of summit meetings between the leaders of the USSR and the United States was reasserted. The nations welcome SALT II as a treaty in favor of peace and detente. The broad positive response proves, yet once again, that Soviet-American agreements which contribute to the termination of the arms race and to the consolidation of detente and peace are consistent with the interests of all countries and all mankind.

The Soviet people unanimously support the policy of peace successfully pursued by the Leninist party and the socialist state. The results of the Vienna meeting give a profound feeling of satisfaction to the working people of our country. Through their inspired labor they are strengthening even further the material foundations of the Soviet policy of peace.

5003
CSO: 1802

STEEL AND FRIENDSHIP

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 79 pp 107-113

[Essay by Zdzislaw Romanowski, Katowice. Translated from the Polish by P. Kazin]

[Text] On 22 July 1979 the People's Republic of Poland celebrated its 35th anniversary. In the thousand years old history of the Polish state this period plays a particular role. It is justifiably described as the age of the Polish renaissance, inseparably linking the national with the social liberation of the fraternal people. People's Poland is the loyal friend and ally of the USSR and an unbreakable link in the comity of socialist states marching in the vanguard of the struggle for democracy, social progress, peace, and socialism. Its achievements are inseparable from the new international relations, relations of a socialist type, inherent in the fraternal internationalist mutual help among cooperating countries, and the common interest in the blossoming of each one of them and of the entire comity.

The following essay by the Polish publicist deals with the fraternal cooperation between the People's Republic of Poland and the Soviet Union.

The Katowice Foundry is the biggest construction project in Polish history. Currently the second part of the gigantic metallurgical combine is under construction here. I, however, recall the decisive days when the construction project was gathering strength. In my visits here I usually climbed a hill next to blast furnace No 1. From this point I could see virtually the entire environment. At that time the steel-smelting and rolling shops, located in the vicinity, were almost empty. The sites held structures and equipment, as though presenting an exhibit of the latest metallurgical equipment in the world. This was equipment produced by Soviet industrial enterprises: equipment produced by Uralmash, known far beyond the borders of the USSR by the UZTM brand, and Elektrosila machines, giants built at the Zhdanov Heavy Machine Building Plant. . . . Actually, it would be impossible to enumerate all Soviet enterprises at which the Katowice Foundry was being born. All in

all, there were about 200. By the logic of socialist integration, the Katowice Foundry will be of both Polish and Soviet origin.

The first year of construction here entered history as the year of the soil. The few low trees were uprooted and a small settlement was moved to the new area. This was followed by planning the territory and digging the foundations. Twenty million cubic meters of Silesian sand and clay were removed. Many years ago, when the building of Nowa Huta was being undertaken near Krakow, newspaper photographers photographed rows of peasant carts loaded with dirt. The favorite photographic sites in Katowice are powerful bulldozers slicing through mountains of earth with their two-meter wide blades.

The second year of construction was named the year of concrete. Blast furnace No 1, near which I am standing, has the most solid foundations ever laid in Poland. Over 13,000 cubic meters of concrete.

The third year was the year of steel structures. That year 1,000 columns and beams were put up, supporting shop roofs and walls.

This was followed by the year of assembly. In a few months the entire equipment standing on the sites next to the shops had to turn into convertors and rolling mills. The 100-meter high 3,200 cubic meter capacity blast furnace was rising. No such furnace had yet been built by Polish metallurgy. It rose on site of the works as an exclamation point, reminding us of the fact that quite soon Katowice will produce its first cast iron. That iron was to be converted immediately into steel, expected at the wharfs of Gdansk and Szczecin, at plants and village cooperatives, and house-building combines in Warsaw. The pace, therefore, was fast.

By April 15,000 tons of machines and equipment had been put together. This was a great deal. However, the schedule for the completion of the steel-smelting shop and the rolling mill--the entire technological chain--called for a faster pace. In May 20,000 tons of equipment were assembled. This was the equivalent of a train of equipment per day.

. . . Engineer Nikolay Ivanovich Rakov and I moved slightly to the side, so that the thumping of the metal and the clamor of tens of welding machines would not hinder our conversation. The May sun was hot even here, in smoky Silesia, and Rakov removed his white hard-hat.

Nikolay Ivanovich has blue eyes and thick hair which not even the hard hat can conceal. Engineer Rakov seems to embody tranquility at a construction site crowded with people, maintaining an intensive rhythm.

He did not find it astonishing that I was fluent in Russian. He accepted the fact as self-evident. This may be because a number of combine builders speak Russian, not only because they studied it at school. Waldemar Kowalski, first secretary of the PZPR in charge of construction earned his diploma as an engineer in the Soviet Union. He still remembers his stay in Magnitogorsk as a great training and practical school. Engineer Romuald Kozakewicz, deputy

minister and general director of the construction project, fought with the Polish Army against fascism, shoulder to shoulder with his Soviet comrades. Thousands of workers and technicians worked together with Soviet specialists at other Polish construction sites. That is why the services of interpreters are rarely needed.

"Shall we succeed with the steel-smelting shop?" said Rakov, repeating my question. "You, newsmen, are asking exactly the same questions as the management. I agree, however, that this is now the main problem. . . ."

Nikolay Ivanovich Rakov is the chief specialist in the installation of the convertors, member of a group of Soviet specialists who are helping to install the equipment procured from the USSR. He is one of the major personalities at the project, a creative person totally dedicated to his work.

"Shall we succeed? How to tell you"

I admit, I expected a firm "Yes!" Yet, it is as though Rakov was weighing his answer, looking at the site where 10,000 tons of equipment were surrounding the steel-smelting shop.

Unexpectedly, he said:

"Naturally, I could simply answer you a 'yes' or a 'no.' In fact, however, things are not so simple. I better describe to you the creative friendship between two friends, both engineers: The Soviet Pavel Maksma and the Pole Jan Malcher. Then you may be able to decide whether we will succeed or not.

"Usually convertors are assembled inside the shop," Rakov began his story. "Yet, what to do when the shop itself is not yet ready? To wait for its completion? Such is not the nature of our friends, to wait. The circumstances themselves made it impossible to stand idle. The agglomeration machine was nearly ready. Blast furnace No 1 was already part of the landscape, while the completion of the steel-smelting shop depended on whether or not the convertor could be assembled in a new way. It was decided to assemble its base ring on the site next to the shop. This took place in the winter. When the spring sun began to shine the ground thawed and the ring began to shift its position. It was propped firmly.

"However, the most difficult part lay ahead. In order to assemble the ring half of it had to be welded, then turned over and the other part welded. One could imagine how labor consuming this was, considering that the ring weighs 310 tons and is 10 meters in diameter. Engineers Maksma and Malcher, or the "M-M duo," as they were known to their colleagues, invented a method which made turning the ring over unnecessary. Their innovation reduced assembly time by a full month."

Rakov fell silent, looked toward the site with the equipment, and asked me:

"Tell me now, could we fail to deliver the convertor on time with such people?"

Listening to Rakov's story, I was thinking that, from the very beginning, metaphorically speaking, the building of the steel-smelting shop could be compared with an innovational relay race. I leafed through my notes and saw that when Nikolay Ivanovich Rakov was still working in Lipetsk, while the convertors to be sent to Katowice were just beginning to be built at the Zhdanov Heavy Machine Building Plant, the Mostostal' workers and engineers had already reduced the time for setting the pillars under the main building of the steel-smelting shop by one fourth.

"We have already accomplished a great deal," Rakov went on. "The first support ring of the convertor is ready and we are completing the second. The body of the convertor, or the pear, as we call it, has already been assembled. The most important part now is putting together the assembly carriage."

On that occasion I did not have the opportunity to ask Nikolay Ivanovich about the carriage. Rakov was in a great hurry. He suggested that I call on engineer Boris Aleksandrovich Klinov, at the agglomeration shop. On the way, as I stood aside to let trucks pass, I was thinking that the building of the Katowice Foundry had become the area with the heaviest traffic in Poland. Previously this honor went to the crossroads of Marszalkowska and Jerosolimska Alleja streets in Warsaw crossed by 2,900 cars an hour. When the construction project in Katowice reached its full strength the capital lost its championship. The main crossroads of the construction project handles a traffic of 3,200 trucks per hour. Every day 200,000 tons of freight are hauled.

Finally, reaching the agglomeration shop, I asked one of the workers where engineer Klinov was. He answered:

"Comrade Klinov is there, by the conveyor belt." He respectfully added: "He must check everything personally."

I approached the future machine of the agglomeration shop and saw a group of people. I thought I would recognize Boris Aleksandrovich, about whom I had heard a great deal and whose photograph I had seen, immediately. However, the people standing around the machine assemblies resembled one another unusually. It was not a question of the hard hats or identical overalls. Involvement with tranquility, confident movement, and brevity of speech were what made Boris Aleksandrovich Klinov, chief engineer of the equipment assembly group for the agglomeration shop, Lukasz Palka, shop sector chief, engineer Yevgeniy Gavlikovskiy, and brigade leader Kazimirz Joachimjak similar.

Boris Aleksandrovich had already built metallurgical plants in Lipetsk and Novokuznetsk, and traveled for Uralmash to India and Zambia.

"Poland has excellent construction workers," I was told by Boris Aleksandrovich. "It is precisely in difficult circumstances, when time is short, that they show everything they are capable of. It might have appeared the tasks were above their possibilities. However, it is precisely that which gives them strength and enthusiasm. Such is the force of enthusiasm."

Engineer Lukasz Palka began to speak enthusiastically of the new technical solutions developed at the agglomeration shop.

"Full mechanization and automation begins the moment the freight cars carrying the ore, coke, and lime are unloaded. Labor productivity per worker will average 12,000 tons per day. It is one-half that at Nowa Huta. This is understandable, for Nowa Huta was built a long time ago."

Soviet specialists may be found at work at each major project. Yevgeniy Salov, Ananiy Buzhinskiy, and Nikolay Zakharchenko are working on the building of the blast furnaces; Sergey Fadeyev, Vyacheslav Kapitonov, and Aleksey Vasil'yev are participating in the building of the oxygen shop. It would be impossible to name all of them. . . .

Unquestionably, however, Hero of Socialist Labor Dmitriy Yemel'yanovich Kuz'menko is the most experienced of them at the Katowice construction site. Before coming to Poland he was chief of Glavlipetskstroy. Kuz'menko heads the group of Soviet specialists. He is known in all the sites. Should the making of a complex decision become necessary, as inevitably happens, someone would say, "Let us see what Dmitriy Yemel'yanovich has to say."

In the course of our meeting, Dmitriy Yemel'yanovich told me the following:

"The Central Committee of the PZPR and the Polish Government are providing the construction site with tremendous assistance. In the course of our daily work we try to insure the timely completion of the production facility of the entire Katowice Foundry. We spare no effort. The decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and 7th PZPR Congress gave us an incentive to work even more efficiently. We are profoundly confident that the machines will be delivered to a well-trained collective. As of now about 500 future steel smelters in Katowice have already been trained at Soviet metallurgical plants. The same number will be trained in the immediate future."

Soviet experience. . . . Engineer Bronislaw Wasilewicz recalls how after the war he arrived in Moscow with a daring plan as the Polish specialist thought. The plan was to build with USSR help a metallurgical enterprise with an output of 700,000 tons of steel per year. At that time the biggest Polish plants could produce no more than 150,000-200,000 tons. Yet, the Soviet comrades objected: "Seven hundred thousand tons is too little. Today we must think on a different scale."

That is precisely the way the plan for the Nowa Huta Combine came to life. Its current output exceeds six million tons of steel per year!

It is thus that the experience of our Soviet friends is becoming our own in the course of building big enterprises. I recall the well-known petrochemical combine in Plock. It represents not simply equipment and technology but the Soviet scale of the concept of economic development, the Soviet scope. USSR specialists generously shared with us their experience and knowledge. This is a special and very important form of cooperation in the course of which the partner grows, gathers strength, and becomes able to resolve ever more complex problems.

However, the Soviet experience does not consist merely of scales but of human characters. Those were the words that brigade leader Janusz Tabor and Emil Oleksa wrote and remembered on the difficult day of the tests. Oleksa is the best crane operator of the project or, perhaps, even of Poland. He is always called for particularly complex installations. Oleksa controls huge cranes to the centimeter. He has the hands of a pianist. True, should Oleksa play a "wrong note" on the control panel of his crane the consequences would not be musical in the least. . . .

Whenever Oleksa demonstrates his work artistry he does not gather a crowd. This day, however, everything was different. People closely watching Oleksa's work crowded the steel-casting shop. "Mostostal" or "Elektromontazh" were written on their helmets--names of leading Polish organizations engaged in the building of the Katowice Foundry. Romuald Kosakevicz, the deputy minister, was present as well. No one in Poland had ever seen such assembly!

That day I understood why Nikolay Ivanovich Rakov was so concerned with assembling the carriage on time. The idea of the carriage, as of the entire tremendous assembly, was his. Usually, the convertor is assembled on a 10-meter-high base. However, this method requires a great deal of time. Engineer Rakov suggested that the convertor be assembled at the bottom, on a special carriage and only then to raise the assembled 1,100 ton colossus and place it on the base. Should Rakov's idea prove to be successful, two and a half months would be saved.

The Tabor and Oleksa brigades were to carry out Nikolay Ivanovich's idea. The body of the convertor or the pear, as it is simply known here, was already on the carriage. The support ring was lying next to it. It was then that Oleksa began his solo performance. His crane came to life and slowly lifted the huge metal ring. The 30 steel cables tied to the ring screeched. The crane's contactors heated up. Oleksa made brief stops to let the contactors cool off.

"Oleksa will now begin to place the ring on the pear," excitedly explained one of the technicians. "Will the carriage hold? Rakov claims it will."

The ring was lifted to the height of a second story. It was now possible to put it on the pear. Meanwhile, a summer storm broke out over Katowice. The work stopped but the people did not scatter even though there was no roof over the shop. They were all waiting for the storm to end. The last rain-drops fell from the metal structures as from trees, and we heard Tabor's order to Oleksa:

"Begin!"

Oleksa was handling a crane developing a 450 ton lifting capacity. Such cranes are new to Poland. However, Oleksa controlled the machine as though he had worked with it for many years. In a few minutes the ring was hanging over the pear.

The noise in the shop quieted, for the most important part of the operation was beginning. Now the ring would be put on the convertor structure. The operation was controlled by a small staff. Tabor issued orders to Oleksa but himself received instructions from Rakov and Malcher. As usual, Nikolay Ivanovich was calm even though everyone else in the shop was excited. Actually, no, brigade leader Tabor was as calm as Rakov. At that point they had to be calmest of all. Their coolness and Oleksa's skill was to determine the outcome of the entire operation. Slowly Oleksa dropped the ring on the top of the pear.

"What is the clearance?" Tabor asked the workers watching the lowering of the pear. The workers waved their hands with concern.

The person in charge of the installation is usually compared to an orchestra conductor. However, Tabor did not use his arms. He held a shortwave transmitter.

"Crane, do you read me?" Tabor asked calmly. "Raise the cross-arm, you hear me, raise it!"

One could easily imagine what would happen had a bulky object weighing several tons hooked up with another.

Rakov and Malcher consulted on how to proceed. Tabor joined them. After a brief conversation Tabor spoke into the transmitter:

"Crane, drop both hooks! Heave-ho!"

The ring softly slid along the convertor's body.

When the ring landed on the pear, Nikolay Ivanovich congratulated Tabor.

"Beautiful work," said he. "Truly beautiful."

The Polish brigade leader and Soviet engineer shook hands.

"We took the risk together, we shall celebrate together," Rakov added.

The day when this captivating installation of the convertor was taking place, an orchestra was playing at the recently built Stszemeszice Railroad Station, built especially to serve the Katowice Foundry. The first train with ore had arrived here from Krivoy Rog.

"There is ore," Boris Aleksandrovich Klinov said. "This means that we must complete the agglomeration shop. We hope to deliver the first line ahead of schedule. We will be installing the equipment and, at the same time, prepare the agglomerate for the blast furnace." He smiled broadly. "I am happy that help has arrived. Fifty people who were trained in the Soviet Union have returned to the agglomeration shop."

Boris Aleksandrovich introduced me to one of them, electrician Rudolf Gebel.

"Work at the Novolipetsk Metallurgical Plant is the best training for a metallurgical workers. Do you know the pace at which it was built?" asked Gebel of the workers around us. "It was in the First Five-Year Plan. The project was initiated in 1931 and already in 1934 cast iron was being produced."

Unfortunately, I was not present in Katowice when the first steel came out of the convertor. Here is the way it was described by the newspaper "Voice of the Katowice Foundry":

"Once again I am in the steel-casting shop. The time is 0900 hours. It is hot, even though the new arrivals have fresh snow on their shoes.

"Saturday morning. It is crowded. . . . Somewhere on the side is Nikolay Rakov, modestly standing by the convertor. He is wearing a white hard-hat, with a scarf rolled around his neck. Rakov is the chief specialist in the assembly of the convertors.

"'Everything will go well. Be calm' . . . he says.

"Someone is moving the people on the gallery.

"'Move back . . . the steel is about to flow.' . . .

"It does! Everything becomes light and sunny. Once again I can see the opening of the convertor. The tear bends slowly and then ever more confidently. Then an entire river of steel comes flowing out! People embrace, elderly men kiss like youngsters, someone is shouting 'All right!' and this piercing 'All right!' is taken up by the excited crowd.

"That is all. The dispatcher's telephone rings.

"'The first steel at the Katowice Foundry was recorded at 0909 hours. A total of 300 tons'"

Two days later I visited the operating steel-smelting shop. The flaming metal was pouring from the convertor into a vat and people weren't kissing one another. This was daily work. The smelting shop was operating at a normal pace precisely like the agglomeration and oxygen shops and the blast furnace. I asked engineer Rakov what had been the sources of his constant optimism and calm in the difficult month of May and in the first days of July when the convertor was assembled, and the day the first steel was smelted at the Katowice Foundry.

"Experience. Faith in the people with whom I work," he answered. "Look how keenly your steel smelters are working."

I looked at the convertor and saw the name Kolya written on it in big letters. Occasionally the steel smelters, normally serious people, become sentimental.

. . .

"To the Soviet specialists," I was told by Waldemar Kowalski, first secretary of the PZPR committee at the construction project, "the delivery of the combine on time was a matter of personal honor. This enhanced even further their prestige among us. As the saying goes, every day they proved their Soviet character."

Indeed, everyone could see the Soviet specialists. Every engineer at the Katowice Foundry, every brigade leader, and virtually every worker in the thousands-strong collective met with them, saw their work style, and could learn from it. What made such encounters even more useful was the fact that on the Polish side as well there were experienced specialists. Poland had sent its best concrete workers, assembly men, electric welders, crane operators, electricians, and specialists in industrial automation and cybernetics to participate in the building of the biggest combine in its history. That is why the joint efforts of the Polish and Soviet builders were so fruitful at the metallurgical combine.

The arrival at Katowice of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, and Comrade E. Gierek, CC PZPR first secretary, was an unforgettable event for the builders and steel smelters. This was not Leonid Il'ich's first visit on Silesian soil. During the war he fought here for the liberation of Poland from the fascist aggressors.

"There were thousands and thousands of people who welcomed the soldiers-liberators with tears of happiness in their eyes. There were spontaneous meetings and emotional words of friendship," recalled Comrade L. I. Brezhnev during his trip to Katowice. "Already then loyal to the friendship, regardless of the continuing blood-shedding battles, the Soviet troops hastened to help the Polish workers and, together with them, began to rebuild the Silesian mines and plants."

That is why the interest which Leonid Il'ich displayed in the construction project was entirely understandable. Everyone with whom he spoke felt that Comrade Brezhnev was well familiar with metallurgical problems. Then, a solemn instant occurred, one of those that are remembered forever. On the suggestion of the collective, at the construction site itself combine director Zbigniew Szalajda presented Leonid Il'ich with a certificate making him honorary member of the collective of the Katowice Foundry No 1.

The Katowice Foundry is the pride of the Polish engineers, technicians, and workers. It proved the tremendous economic, technical, and scientific possibilities of socialist Poland. I visited Katowice again quite recently. Once again I rose to the hill next to blast furnace No 1. The view was splendid. The blue colored buildings of the shops, the bronze-red furnaces, and the rich green of the forest belts were harmonious with the Silesian landscape. Today, after the completion of its first section, the Katowice Foundry consists of 1,500 different production sites distributed on 800 hectares, totaling 9 million cubic meters. This includes the agglomeration shop, two big blast furnaces with a 3,200 cubic meter capacity each, a steel-

smelting shop, a medium-sized rolling shop, and a big rolling shop whose production capacity is 1.2 million tons of finished goods per year. There are also computers, telemetry facilities, and automatic equipment controlling production processes.

This most modern metallurgical combine has become to the Polish people a symbol of Polish-Soviet friendship and cooperation. The steel foundations of our economy were laid thanks to the fraternal help of the Soviet Union.

Speaking in Katowice on the occasion of the completion of the building of the first part of the combine, Comrade Edward Gierek said:

"The Katowice Foundry is the material expression of the fraternal attitude of the CPSU and, personally, of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, the government of the USSR, and the great Soviet people toward Polish people and our country. It is an example of interaction in developing the power of socialist Poland and its successful progress. . . ."

These words express the thoughts and feelings of all working people in People's Poland.

The construction of the second part of the combine is in full swing in Katowice. Every day new pages are written in this outstanding novel about steel and friendship.

5003
CSO: 1802

COUNTRIES WITH A SOCIALIST ORIENTATION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 79 pp 114-123

[Article by R. Ul'yanovskiy]

[Text] I

In the contemporary world the role of countries liberated from colonial dependence continues to grow. As was noted at the 25th CPSU Congress, a "great increase in the influence of the countries which only recently were colonies or semicolonies" has taken place. Attaining political independence, they acquired the factual possibility to choose their way of sociopolitical development and participate in the solution of international problems

As the Marxists-Leninists have always claimed, the proclamation of national state sovereignty does not automatically lead to the solution of the complex socioeconomic problems created in the previous age of colonialism and neo-colonialism. The burden of backwardness weighs unabatedly on Asian and African countries.

More than ever before a differentiation based not on the national but the class principle and the separation of the forces of social progress, peace, and freedom from the forces of imperialism, reaction, racism, and war has become typical of the contemporary Afro-Asian world. "In many liberated countries," L. I. Brezhnev emphasized in the CC CPSU Accountability Report to the 25th congress, "a complex process of separation among class forces is occurring." The class struggle is intensifying. This is being manifested in a variety of ways. New progressive forces have entered the economic and political life of Arab, African, and Asian countries with a socialist orientation. There also are countries whose development has gone further along the capitalist way." To an ever greater extent such processes are being felt on the Asian and African continents. The regrouping of class and political forces is in full swing both within and among the countries. As before, the main problems remain the struggle against imperialism, eliminating the exploitation of international monopolies, and insuring the peace, true national independence, and democracy. However, these problems are inseparably linked, above all, with the internal political course, with the choice of a social orientation, the choice of a way of development of domestic and foreign policy and of the entire social system.

A tendency to compromise with the former mother countries, with the imperialist countries, is intensifying in some countries. Such tendencies are supported by the local neocolonialist bourgeois elements who act under the banner of national reformism, concealed behind slogans of national and, of late, "democratic socialism." Essentially, they favor the domination of exploiting classes and strata, using the national-liberation struggle of the masses for their self-seeking interests. They are striving toward progress through capitalist modernization, thus firmly linking themselves to the world capitalist economy and facilitating the penetration of international monopolies in their national economies and, with them, increased economic dependence. Capitalist corruption and the parasitical utilization of foreign aid are their important power levers. The other side of the rapprochement with the developed capitalist countries is mistrust of world socialism. This weakens the Afro-Asian peoples in their difficult struggle against the giants of the world's capitalist economy who are exploiting the labor and raw-material resources of former colonies and semicolonies.

A policy of decisive and uncompromising struggle against imperialism, the monopolies, and neocolonialism, and for insuring true national--including economic--independence has predominated in other developing countries whose number is growing. Naturally, this policy leads, on the one hand, to a rapprochement with the socialist countries and, on the other, to limiting and weakening the forces of internal reaction allied with imperialism, i.e., in the final account, to a socialist orientation.

The socialist countries are systematically promoting the expansion and strengthening of their relations with all developing countries, encouraging and strengthening their anti-imperialist potential. Above all, the socialist comity is intensifying its relations with countries directing their development toward a socialist future, considering them not only allies in the struggle against imperialism but supporters of the type of social changes which bring socialism closer and, to a certain extent, as sharing the ideals and the final direction of the movement.

II

When our party's documents discuss the big group of socialist oriented countries existing today they refer to countries, without being socialist yet, which have rejected capitalism as a system, and are undertaking radical social changes which facilitate and accelerate their possible conversion to socialism. Such countries pursue an anti-imperialist policy of peace and security among nations, democracy, and social progress. They are marching in the front ranks of the contemporary national-liberation movement.

Ever since the establishment of the international communist movement, the idea of a national-democratic state as a form of non-capitalist development of an Afro-Asian country (beginning of the 1960's), of socialist orientation (or, which is virtually the same, a non-capitalist way of development) has unquestionably stopped being a theoretical hypothesis. It has gained nearly 20 years of historical experience. Naturally, the countries with socialist

orientation have reached different distances in their way to social progress. Countries in which profound social changes have been long underway include, specifically, the Algerian People's Democratic Republic, the Socialist Republic of the Burmese Union, the Republic of Guinea, the People's Democratic Republic Yemen, the People's Republic of the Congo, the Syrian Arab Republic, and the United Republic of Tanzania. A number of countries have undertaken relatively recently to promote changes which give their development a socialist orientation (such as, for example, the People's Republic of Angola, the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, the People's Republic of Mozambique, Socialist Ethiopia, etc.).

The new form of progressive social development is very attractive. The number of developing countries choosing a socialist orientation is rising steadily. Recently, it was joined by Afghanistan. These countries are stabilizing their political systems. They have achieved major successes in the development of their national economies and education. They have implemented anti-feudal democratic agrarian reforms, introduced progressive labor legislation, etc. Assessing the effectiveness of socialist orientation on the basis of the sum total of economic and sociopolitical factors, its positive result becomes fully obvious. A socialist orientation has become a historically developed reality over the past 20 years, a structural part of the world's revolutionary process, and the course followed by the true vanguard of the national-liberation movement.

On the other hand, over the past period, the non-capitalist development was interrupted in a number of countries (Ghana, Egypt, Mali), or else a withdrawal from the progressive course has been noted (Somali). The opponents of this idea savor the failures and local termination of the socialist orientation, and try to prove its unrealistic nature. However, these temporary zigzags could develop skepticism only on the part of those who displayed a simplistic and one-sided understanding of the idea developed by the international communist movement, and those who tend to identify a socialist orientation with a socialist revolution or with the already familiar historical experience of "bypassing" the stage of developed capitalism which occurred under conditions which were more favorable for the systematic establishment of the socialist principles.

Indeed, the transition from socialism, bypassing the developed capitalist stage, took place and is continuing under the conditions of a socialist state, either soviet (Soviet Central Asia, Kazakhstan, the European and Asian North of the RSFSR) or people's democratic (Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Korean People's Democratic Republic, Republic of Cuba, and the Laotian People's Democratic Republic).

In today's countries with a socialist orientation steps in this direction are taken within the framework of the national-democratic state. Something similar was noted in the Mongolian People's Republic until 1940. In that country, as a result of a lengthy internal evolution, national democracy assumed a consistently proletarian nature, benefiting from the all-round support and aid of the victorious socialist revolution in the USSR and

avoiding the decisive influence of the world's capitalist economy. So far no such conditions exist in today's Afro-Asian countries with a socialist orientation.

By virtue of a number of reasons such countries have no possibility to put an end to their dependence on world capitalism, since their economy, as was the case in the colonial age, is largely dependent and peripheral in nature. Despite the strengthening of economic relations with the socialist states and their use as levers in the struggle for revising relations with the capitalist world, presently the countries with a socialist orientation are solidly economically linked with the world capitalist market and, in a number of cases (one-crop countries) cannot be separated from it.

Unlike the earlier types of "bypassing" the stage of developed capitalism in the USSR (1920's-1930's) when this "bypass" was within the framework of the proletarian state, under the guidance of the Marxist-Leninist party, the present socialist orientation of almost 20 Asian and African countries is taking place under the guidance of the revolutionary national-democratic parties which have reached different stages of closeness to scientific socialism. They reflect the interests of the broad toiling and exploited masses and the average intermediate strata. Of late new phenomena have been noted: Angola, Afghanistan, Mozambique, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Ethiopia, and a number of other countries have proclaimed the leading role of the working class and the ruling parties of these countries have proclaimed scientific socialism as their ideology. This step, unquestionably, is of a positive nature, even though by virtue of the low numerical strength of the proletariat in those countries, it is more of a political significance and is an indication concerning possibilities for the immediate future rather than established reality.

Subjectively, the revolutionary national democrats are convinced socialists. However, their awareness reflects the entire contradictoriness and the poorly differentiated social structure of the former colonial countries, the predominance in such countries of the petit bourgeois and peasant elements, the relative autonomy of the intelligentsia and the middle classes (who usually supply the political leaders and the power bearers in the developing countries), the influence of a nationalistic ideology, and the existence of patriarchal-tribal relations.

Are real steps toward socialism possible under such complex and contradictory conditions? The CPSU and the international communist movement have given an affirmative answer to the question. They proceeded from the understanding of the unquestionable fact that in the overwhelming majority of former colonial countries, even though as a symbol of foreign domination here has been discredited, prerequisites have not as yet developed for a direct making of a socialist revolution so that, consequently, so far we could speak only of separate steps taken toward socialism and of a preparatory, so to speak, pre-socialist stage of historical development.

The solution of a number of general democratic problems put on the agenda by the fact of attaining state sovereignty is possible, initially, even without

the building of a socialist state per se, for which no adequate conditions exist as yet. This concept, consistent with the requirements of real life, freed the initiative of revolutionary forces and was aimed at giving them decisive support in pursuing an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, anti-monopoly, and, partially, anti-capitalist policy. It contained no illusions whatever on the ease with which such a totally untried way could be followed. It took into consideration its contradictoriness, a certain insecurity, and possible deviations and even sharp turns.

In this case there have been no irreversible revolutionary processes as yet. The dominance of the non-proletarian intermediate strata, the influence which petit bourgeois concepts have on them, the political and economic weakness of the working class, and, occasionally, its total absence, the power of feudal, semi-feudal, and tribal and patriarchal conditions, the tremendous cultural backwardness, and the predominant influence of the world capitalist market which occasionally makes it necessary to take into consideration the dictate of international monopolies, represent the factual political, economic, social, and ideological lining of occasional deviations noted in the foreign and domestic policies of countries with a socialist orientation. All this was taken into consideration by the international communist movement in its elaboration of the concept of the non-capitalist way--a socialist orientation which did not exclude possible failures, hindrances at the general democratic stage, turn to the old order under the aegis of neocolonialism, and backward movement rather than progress toward socialism.

On the basis of the general laws governing social development and the study of domestic and foreign conditions of the developing countries in the final third of the 20th century, the Marxists-Leninists reached the thought-out conclusion that with an unsystematic political line, adverse conditions expressed in a nationalistic degeneracy of the leadership, and an underestimation of the theory and experience of scientific socialism, it may occur that the stage of socialist orientation fails to insure the necessary preparedness for a transition to a socialist society. Such is the Marxist formulation of the matter, marked by historical optimism combined with health realism.

Occasionally, views on the socialist orientation expressed in publications are characterized by identifying it, essentially, with socialism. This is a hasty conclusion which leads to the idealizing of national democracy, neglect of its internal contradictoriness, uncritical attitude toward pseudo-revolutionary phraseology, and elimination of the distinction between subjectively conceived and scientific socialism. The inevitable consequence of this is that any failure along the hard way of socialist orientation has led to the unjustified denial of the revolutionary potential of national democracy and doubts concerning the possibility for taking preparatory steps toward socialism under its management. This concept was based on a lack of understanding of the specific nature of socialist orientation as a characteristic transitional and pre-socialist stage in the history of developing countries.

III

Today not only theory but historical experience have enabled Marxist scientists to establish quite extensively the essential characteristics of this complex phenomenon.

Characteristic of a socialist orientation are the following:

Changes in the class nature of political power--depriving the national bourgeoisie (national-bourgeois and feudal elements) of its power monopoly; shifting the power to the progressive forces acting in the interests of the broad popular masses; creation of a new, revolutionary-democratic state and a new state machinery;

Elimination of the political and undermining the economic domination of imperialism and the monopolies;

Establishment of state and cooperative sectors and creating prerequisites for their priority development;

State control of and, at a certain stage, restriction of the private capitalist sector, including the nationalization of foreign capital or the organization of effective state control over it;

Organization and development of comprehensive cooperation with the socialist states;

Tireless struggle against corruption;

Implementation of profound social changes in the interest of the people's masses (agrarian reforms, elimination of social privileges, elimination of illiteracy, elimination of the inequality of women, establishment of progressive labor and social legislation, etc);

Struggle against the ideology of imperialism, neocolonialism, and national-reformism, and for the assertion of a revolutionary-democratic ideology, historically linked the world liberation process, and with the theory and experience of scientific socialism.

Therefore, the content of a socialist orientation is determined by the domestic and foreign political course aimed at anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, and, partially, anti-capitalist changes whose purpose is to create state-political, socioeconomic, and scientific and technical prerequisites for a gradual approach to socialism in the future. Such changes, while not as yet being socialist, are profoundly democratic in nature and that is precisely why Marxist science draws the conclusion of the possibility of their successful implementation at the pre-socialist stage with the existence of a revolutionary party which takes into consideration the principles of scientific socialism and its universal-historical experience, a party which truly fulfills the role of vanguard of the people. The program for such

changes, with their systematic and skillful implementation, could offer the peoples of countries with a socialist orientation prospects for the growth of the national-democratic stage of the revolution into its socialist stage.

In this case, the inadmissibility of a hasty, unprepared, "direct transition to socialism," an artificial acceleration of political, economic, and other processes, is entirely obvious. Such actions undermine the faith in socialism and the possibility for a successful socialist orientation, a possibility which prepares for a gradual transition to it. The need to outlive simplistic concepts of the transition to socialism, and establishing among the national democrats a more correct approach takes into consideration the relative length of the pre-socialist stage with its number of transitional steps, is obvious.

These conclusions have been taken into consideration in documents such as the Algerian National Charter (1976), the Program of the Congolese Labor Party (1972), the program of the MPLA-Labor Party (1977), the FRELIMO program (1977), the Program of the National-Democratic Revolution of Ethiopia (1976), and other programmatic documents and some of the most recently adopted constitutions of socialist oriented countries such as Algeria (1976), Madagascar (1975), etc. As a result, the countries which took the path of socialist orientation in recent years (Angola, Benin, Madagascar, Mozambique, Ethiopia, and others) have been largely able to avoid the errors made by the pioneers of this movement in Ghana, Mali, and other countries.

IV

A socialist orientation mandatorily requires the comprehensive consolidation of the new state, its people's institutions, and the entire developing political system. This presumes, above all, an effective political leadership of the state on the part of the vanguard parties or alliance of parties forming the progressive forces front. The idea of establishing vanguard parties close to the parties of scientific socialism in their nature is a constructive one, formulated by a number of revolutionary democrats. The unification of proletarian and non-proletarian social strata and among all progressive and most systematic anti-imperialist and patriotic forces, occurring at the national-democratic stage of the revolution, contributes to the process of conversion to Marxist-Leninist positions. True, occasionally such a transition is proclaimed despite the lack of a corresponding social, ideological, and political base. This is one of the variants of a voluntaristic attitude toward a socialist orientation.

The creation of a truly vanguard party gravitating toward Marxism-Leninism and working under the conditions of a postcolonial yet still extremely socio-economically backward society, is an exceptionally complex process. It cannot be reduced to the approval and proclamation of program for scientific socialism, which is obviously easy to do, taking into consideration the authoritativeness and influence of basic Marxist-Leninist concepts. It is considerably more difficult to truly master scientific socialism at all party levels, make it the base of party practical activities, and acquire an

awareness of the social, ideological-political, and organizational structure of the vanguard party in accordance with the task of directing the majority of the people in a socialist direction.

As in the case of the party, it is not a question of an artificial and insufficiently grounded and accelerated reorganization of a national-democratic state into a socialist state. However, this requires the steady strengthening of the revolutionary-democratic state, the gradual replacement of the old state apparatus with a new sociopolitically reliable one, the reorganization of the army and the security organs, their officer corps above all, and the firm protection of the socialist orientation from the encroachments of the internal and external counterrevolution. The most important guarantee for this process of consolidation of the revolutionary-democratic state is insuring the corresponding and ever-growing role of the people's masses and, above all, the working class and the proletarian and semi-proletarian elements, in the political life of the country. This requires the democratic self-determination of the working people, the growth of their political awareness and activeness, the freeing of their initiative, and the establishment and strengthening of the class organizations of workers and peasants.

A socialist orientation has been defeated a number of times as the result of a coup d'etat made from above or the treacherous change of the line followed by the leadership. This would have been impossible had the toiling masses had a decisive influence on the political circumstances as has been repeatedly stated in the programmatic documents and constitutional acts of national-democratic systems. The conversion of national-democratic states from a system which proclaims as its objective observance of the interests of the working people into the factual power of the working people themselves, based on their class and political associations, would guarantee the inviolability and irreversibility of social progress based on socialist orientation. It would also mean a development toward socialism "not through capitalism" but by "circumventing" capitalism and opposing it with the help of an alliance with world socialism.

The unification within a popular front of all systematically anti-imperialist political forces and parties, Marxists-Leninists and revolutionary national democrats above all, convinced of the need for a socialist choice, is an important and a necessary prerequisite for successful progress. In the course of the world's revolutionary process, they have developed a long-term firm community of interests in the struggle for national independence and democracy, and the choice of a worthy social future. Isolated differences neither should nor could prevent the establishment of an alliance among them, based on reciprocal respect for views and ideological and organizational autonomy.

The Marxists-Leninists in Asian and African countries have fully realized this fact. They have extended their hand of friendship and cooperation to the progressive national forces. It is becoming clear that the national democrats and, among them, the best, the progressive leaders, the activists,

and the sincere supporters of a socialist orientation are becoming gradually imbued with the conviction that such an alliance is desirable and inevitable, since both its participants are seriously fighting for socialism. Even if not all of them fully understand or accept scientific socialism, at a given stage of the revolutionary process this does not turn into a mandatory and insurmountable obstacle on the path of a progressive policy.

The fact that, subsequently, at the higher stages of the revolution, the full adoption of scientific socialism objectively becomes an imperative demand of life, a prerequisite for the success of a socialist orientation and the victory of the chosen course for the sake of bypassing or circumventing, shortening, or simply putting an end to capitalist development, and beginning to build socialism, is a different matter. Mistrust of Marxists-Leninists or even their open persecution and deprivation of the chance to openly express their convictions and work among the masses make the socialist slogans of some national-democratic parties questionable and undermine the front of progressive forces, opening a loophole for conciliation with the reaction and imperialism. Wherever the persecution of communists and supporters of scientific socialism is undertaken, to one or another extent the socialist orientation is sacrificed to narrow nationalism whose consequences are very dangerous. Unfortunately, history is familiar with such cases which must be firmly condemned.

A socialist orientation can be successfully developed only by pursuing a realistic economic policy. Unquestionably, it must be based on the priority development of the state and cooperative sectors. Practical experience has indicated that this, in itself, does not exclude foreign investments to a certain extent or the use of private national capital, medium and petty private enterprise, and the use of foreign and local private investments, naturally, mandatorily closely controlled by the national-democratic state. The complexity of such economic policy lies in the proper combination of economic expediency and effectiveness and the material incentive of the working people with a socialist future which would exclude a return to the capitalist order.

Another major aspect of economic policy is that of gradually improving the prosperity of the working people. Without this ideas of socialism may lose their attractiveness in the eyes of the people's masses.

In the area of national relations, a major prerequisite for a successful socialist orientation is the pursuit of a democratic national policy, the elimination of tribalism, and insuring the equality and the regional autonomy of peoples and ethnic groups within the framework of a single centralized state.

It could be stated that a socialist orientation is factually strengthened with the growth of political, economic, scientific and technical, and cultural cooperation with the socialist countries, and as long as vigilance is maintained toward imperialist intrigues, and treacherous and dangerous neo-colonialism is rebuffed. Any manifestation of mistrust of, not to mention

hostility toward the socialist world, and any tendency toward an agreement in terms of imperialist policy and the neocolonizers, the new "gift-bearing Greeks," is usually an indication of a withdrawal from the principles of socialist orientation.

V

Summing up the results of the positive experience of a large group of Afro-Asian countries with a socialist orientation, we should point out that its popularity continues to grow, as confirmed by the fact that ever new Asian and African countries are choosing this path. The socialist trends in a number of countries which have chosen this orientation are being gradually strengthened and deepened. This process is backed by the broad popular masses, the proletarian and semi-proletarian strata, and the democratic and patriotic intelligentsia, headed by the left wing of the national democrats, favoring a rapprochement with scientific socialism and accepting it as the source of its ideology.

There are a variety of ways for "bypassing" capitalism, shown not only in their historical retrospect but existing today as well. Each country introduces specific features in following a socialist orientation. It could be said that the countries which entered this path later, armed with the experience of their predecessors, benefit, to a certain extent, from greater experience and display greater consistency and ability to pursue an overall progressive course, which includes coming closer to the practice of scientific socialism. The intensification of such closeness is a widespread feature of present-day revolutionary national democracy in the Afro-Asian countries.

This is shown in the adoption of a number of Marxist or Marxist-like programmatic concepts by a number of national democrats, such as defining the national-democratic state as a state of revolutionary-democratic dictatorship, as codified in the constitution of the People's Democratic Republic of Angola; the concept of a vanguard party, on which the reorganization of FRELIMO, the MPLA, and other parties into parties of the working people is taking place; acknowledgment of the alliance between workers and peasants, relying on the bloc of all progressive classes and population strata, as the social foundation of the governmental system, as reflected in the programmatic documents of Angola, Benin, Madagascar, and Mozambique; the idea of the new, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist, social nature of the state sector and its leading role in the economy, as codified in the constitutions of Algeria, Benin, Mozambique, etc.

An important feature of the policy of socialist orientation is the strengthening of comprehensive relations with the socialist comity, and close interaction with it in the international arena, and reciprocal understanding and mutual support between socialist countries and countries with a socialist orientation in the area of the gravest problems of the struggle for peace and security of the nations, the termination of the arms race and disarmament, detente, opposition to colonialism and racism, development of a new world economic order, etc.

In conclusion, let us also mention that no less important are the negative lessons of non-capitalist development and the determination of the reasons for the abandonment of this way. The study of the experience of countries where socialist orientation was interrupted has indicated that their difficulties may be explained, essentially, with the existence of three groups of factors.

First, the strong dependence on the world capitalist economy and its markets and credits, age-old backwardness, low level of development of production forces, one-crop nature of the economy, and subversive activities carried out by foreign and local reaction, not countered promptly.

Second, the specific contradiction of the non-capitalist way under present circumstances related to the class-political instability of petit bourgeois democracy, the pressure exerted on it on the part of big bourgeois and neo-colonialist strata, the extensive use of private enterprise and foreign capital, tremendous corruption, and the establishment of an active, non-mercantile bureaucratic bourgeoisie.

Third, the lack of a strong vanguard party and the subjectivistic errors of the leadership: promotion of development tasks regardless of domestic economic and cadre possibilities, chauvinistic feelings, and inability and unwillingness to organize the cooperation among revolutionary democrats, communists, and all other anti-imperialist and progressive forces.

However, it is easy to realize that such principles do not negate in the least the significance and effectiveness of the concept of the non-capitalist way of development. On the contrary, they may even be considered a proof of the opposite.

Looking at the past and comparing the present situation in the developing countries with the beginning of the 1960's when the international communist movement undertook the theoretical elaboration of the contemporary variant of the concept of non-capitalist development reflecting the new correlation among class and political forces in the Afro-Asian countries and favoring social progress, we could state quite confidently that never before has a socialist orientation been such a noticeable and influential development factor as it is today; never before had it offered such a realistic and promising way of struggle for a new life by the peoples of the world, oppressed by imperialism for centuries.

5003
CSO: 1802

REORGANIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS AND IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 79 pp 125-128

[Review by Professor G. Skorov, doctor of economic sciences, of 11 books]

[Text] The fifth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) held in Manila, the capitol of the Philippines, May-June 1979, was the arena of a major confrontation between the representatives of developing countries and imperialist states on problems of the reorganization of international economic relations. The appearance of a compromise based on guaranteeing the supply of the capitalist economy with energy and raw materials in exchange for an increased flow of factual resources in the direction of the developing countries was substantially undermined by the economic crisis experienced by capitalism in the mid-1970's and the related upheavals in the capitalist economic system. Under conditions marked by growing economic difficulties, the capitalist countries which were already trying to reduce such reorganization to a minimum factually went back on their word on a number of previously agreed-upon matters. Naturally, this triggered the sharp objection of the young states and the gap separating their position from that of the imperialist states failed to be bridged.

The results of UNCTAD-V were very scantily covered by the world press. The leading organs of the Western bourgeois press even claim that the conference yielded no results. In our view, this assessment is groundless. Naturally, UNCTAD-V did not pass impressive resolutions such as the Declaration and Action Program for the Establishment of a New International Economic Order--documents passed by the United Nations General Assembly in 1974. At that time, however, the question of a new economic order had only been raised. Now it was a question of its practical implementation. It is not astounding that this triggered the fierce opposition of all forces whose privileges and interests find themselves threatened. It is equally natural that, defending their economic positions, the ideologues of the capitalist West are trying to conceal the true meaning of the struggle underway and to distort its results and prospects.

In our view, the main importance of UNCTAD-V is that the conference proved, yet once again, the radical conflict between the interests of imperialist countries, on the one hand, and the overwhelming majority of developing

countries, on the other. At the same time, it reasserted the fact that in terms of the basic, essential problems of the reorganization of international economic relations, the positions of the developing and the socialist countries are either similar or coincident. It also proved most clearly that the reorganization of international economic relations is not a one-time act but a complex and lengthy process in the course of which progress could only be the result of a systematic anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly struggle rather than of voluntary concessions on the part of international financial capital.

This struggle is being reflected ever more extensively in the ideological realm. The main topic of international discussions in this area in recent years has been the question of the means for the reorganization of the current system of world economic links within capitalism and the most efficient organization of a system of universal economic relations. Whatever the neutral form the numerous theories and models for the development of such relations may assume, in the final account they express the class interests of the confronting forces and the real processes and contradictions of world development in the age of competition between the two systems and the conversion to socialism on a global scale.

Involved in this discussion are supporters of a great variety of schools and directions of economic thinking. The critical assessment of their views, the substantiated exposure of reformist illusions, and the development of a Marxist concept of a democratic reorganization of international economic relations are among the topical tasks of the ideological struggle today. The Soviet scientists are making a substantial contribution to their solution.

In this connection we must especially mention the monograph by E. Ye. Obminskiy¹ which criticizes non-Marxist theories related to the international economic order. The author is known for his works in the field of the international division of labor. He systematically analyzes the evolution in the views of bourgeois economists on the subject of the world's economy, the theory of the international division of labor, and the nature of the concept of a "new international economic order," formulated by the developing countries, with its different interpretations.

The principal merit of the book is that it leads into the very thick of the contemporary ideological struggle on the problem of the reorganization of international economic relations, describing the origin and evolution of the most significant currents of bourgeois economic thinking, from Ricardo to Tinbergen, on matters of trade and economic relations among nations. This broad historical approach gives the book scale and depth. Its emphasis on the present gives it a politically and scientifically topical nature.

The characteristic of Obminskiy's study is the twin, as though parallel, consideration of economic theories and the real development of the world economy, the study of ideological concepts and their deep material foundation: the growing internationalization of production and capital, and steadily expanding trade and economic relations between imperialist and developing

countries. This line of study which enables us to penetrate into the essence of the changes occurring in the world's economy, is of scientific value by itself.

Analyzing suggestions on the modernization and change of the present international capitalist division of labor, as formulated by the biggest bourgeois economists, E. Ye. Obminskiy leaves no doubt about their official purpose. "The objective purpose of a changed international division of labor (IDL) within the framework of the capitalist economic system," he writes, "represents, essentially, a preservation of the network of dependencies of the developing countries and a higher level of the involvement of their internal economic sectors in foreign economic relations. According to the Western ideologues, the new forms of cooperation among young countries and industrial companies of developed socialist countries covering the new sectors will contribute to retaining them within the orbit of the world's capitalist economy. Thus, the strategy of the new IDL will aim at the creation and expansion of new sources of exploitation of the developing countries on a higher level of development of production forces" (p 102). The bourgeois ideologues of various hues would like to see the new international economic order in precisely such a fashion.

What is the meaning of a new international economic order? What are the possibilities and limits of its implementation?

A great variety of answers to such questions may be found, some of which are conflicting or mutually exclusive. This is understandable, for such problems are not only of theoretical but of major practical significance, above all because they include within themselves a certain social prospect for the struggle waged by the young countries for economic equality. As Obminskiy justifiably emphasizes in his book, it would be radically wrong to depict the movement for a new international economic order as a conflict in the course of which the developing countries are fighting merely for "a place in the sun" within the capitalist world economic system. In terms of its socio-historical significance, the movement for a reorganization of international economic relations is not covered in the least by correcting the obvious anachronisms within the international capitalist sphere. Objectively, it exceeds the framework of achieving a certain new "balance of forces" between the industrially developed capitalist countries and the developing countries. Its true meaning is to insure conditions which would prevent continued exploitation on an international scale and limit exploitative relations in the international arena. That is precisely why this struggle is meeting with the total understanding and support of the socialist comity, the international communist movement, and all progressive and democratic forces, as was pointed out, in particular, at the 1976 Berlin conference of communist and workers' parties of Europe.

Due to the fact that many people in the West and in the developing countries consider the movement for a new international economic order a phenomenon which, allegedly, arose only in the 1970's, with no historical precedent, it would be proper to recall that it was born, strengthened, and developed under

the direct influence of the revolutionary theory and practice of world socialism, the unfading political slogans formulated in its time by the first state of workers and peasants, and the practical experience acquired in the development of equal economic relations among socialist countries within CEMA.

Characteristically, while preparations were being made for the 1922 Genoa conference, Lenin insisted on maximum democratization of the international economic order with a view to achieving what was maximally possible under the conditions of a peaceful coexistence between the two social systems (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 44, p 383). This requirement has become even more topical today, when world socialism, representing the future of our planet, could exercise and is indeed exercising a real influence on relations among all countries.

The conversion of socialism into a decisive factor of world development, the intensification of its political influence and economic power, its selfless aid to countries freed from colonial dependence, and its systematic struggle for the elimination of discrimination and all artificial barriers on the way to the development of mutually profitable and equal economic relations among countries noticeably changed the general global economic climate. "The contemporary global economy," N. P. Shmelev justifiably notes,² "is no longer the economy of the prewar times and even not the economy of the first postwar decade, when imperialist monopolies dominated virtually unchallenged all basic world commodity markets and all realms of foreign economic activities. Today the basic world economic processes are developing not only under the influence of capitalism but also of the socialist countries and the other progressive anti-imperialist forces of today" (p 204).

The capitalist ideologues are trying to belittle the factual influence of the USSR and the members of the socialist comity on economic relations among countries within the capitalist world economic sector and, particularly, between the developing and industrially developed countries. They deliberately speak of a kind of "self-removal of socialism" from the active reorganization of international economic relations, and of the position of "observers from the side" adopted by the CEMA-member countries. Firmly rejecting such assertions, N. P. Shmelev convincingly proves with numerous examples the active participation of the members of the socialist comity in the discussion of problems of the reorganization and implementation of measures aimed at changing the subordinate position of developing countries in the international capitalist division of labor.

The author firmly objects to the interpretation of the concept of a "new international economic order" as a system of relations between developing and industrially developed capitalist states. By its definition, this concept covers relations among all three groups of countries--socialist, capitalist, and developing. "If the new system," he writes, "is destined to be a durable part of international relations, one way or another it must satisfy all members of the world's commonwealth of nations" (p 239). This thought runs through the entire book, reflecting the principled stipulation of the socialist comity of insuring total equality among all countries in worldwide international economic relations.

The Soviet scientists do not idealize the movement for a new international economic order but bring to light its complex, multi-tiered nature, proving its general democratic and anti-imperialist content as well as its inconsistency and internal contradiction. The dialectical assessment of this movement may be traced particularly clearly in works discussing general problems of developing countries, and problems of the theory and practice of the contemporary national-liberation movement.

Such works include, specifically, the monograph by R. A. Ul'yanovskiy,³ and K. N. Brutents,⁴ authors who are actively participating in the elaboration of theoretical and practical problems of the struggle waged by the peoples for political and socioeconomic liberation.

Considering the results of the breakdown of the colonial system, Ul'yanovskiy justifiably emphasizes the depth and irreversibility of these changes. "At the same time," he writes, "long historical experience irrefutably proves that the imperialist exploitation of former colonial nations does not cease with the proclamation of their political independence and initial successes in the building of a national economy. Exploitation is in full swing, skillfully adapting itself to changing circumstances, acquiring new forms, and becoming more intensified. Hence the objective antagonistic contradiction between imperialism and the liberated countries retains its gravity, covering all aspects of life, regardless of a tendency to pursue a pro-Western policy displayed by the leading circles of some such countries" (p 212). This view is noteworthy above all because some researchers fail to see that the compromise between international monopoly capital and the exploiting leadership of some young countries does not eliminate the antagonistic nature of contradictions between imperialism and developing countries.

How deep are the real changes occurring in relations between developing and imperialist countries? Do they factually change the situation of the developing countries within the system of the capitalist world economy? Is imperialist strategy being factually revised? Raising these questions, Brutents convincingly proves that it is a question merely of yet another "modernizing" of neocolonialism. "In other words," he writes, "a large-scale operation has been planned and is beginning to be implemented, aimed at linking more strongly the young countries with the economic, trade, and monetary systems of the capitalist world and its technology. Within the framework of this course the imperialists do not exclude making certain concessions and looking for solutions more or less acceptable to the ruling groups of the developing countries" (p 85).

In this connection the study of the process of differentiation among Asian, African, and Latin American countries, determined, first of all, by differences in their social orientation and, secondly, the uneven development of capitalism within them, becomes very topical. The distinction which Brutents makes between national-capitalist development and the course of dependent capitalism makes it possible to refine one of the theoretical stipulations formulated in the first half of the 1970's:⁵ "The idea popular in literature, hinting at a certain inevitability according to which, whatever the case, the

dependence will inevitably become ever deeper, is not entirely accurate" (p 49). In particular, the revolution in Iran proves that this is far from being the case, and that the path of development dependent on capitalism could be terminated and replaced. As the author justifiably points out, "The events in Iran represent not only the overthrow of an anti-people's regime but, at the same time, essentially, the biggest defeat of neocolonialism. This involves not only the failure of its attempt to enslave Iran. It could be said that this is the failure of an entire model of development--quite clearly defined--which colonialism is trying to impose upon the liberated countries" (p 123).

The detailed study of the program for a new international economic order, found in the work by V. P. Kolesov and L. I. Komlev⁶ contributes a great deal to our understanding of the difference between this model and the other supported by the developing countries. The work systematically analyzes the basic concepts of the economic platform of the "group of 77" expressed in various United Nations documents and resolutions.

The thesis of the inseparability between internal and external economic changes, occasionally underestimated by some representatives of the developing countries, substantiated in the work, is of essential significance from the viewpoint of the critical analysis of this platform. Justifiably pointing out that the "interdependence between internal and external conditions in the struggle waged by the young countries for the elimination of inequality and social injustice is manifested both on the international level as well as within these countries" (p 221), the authors pay particular attention to the intensified role of the national state as the main lever of economic decolonization and as the most effective instrument in the building of a modern independent national economy.

This concept is directly aimed against the main thesis of the familiar work entitled "Reorganization of the International Order," written in 1975-1976 by a group of experts headed by J. Tinbergen, and currently prepared for publication in the Russian language by Izdatel'stvo Progress. This book, published in dozens of printings in a number of languages, represents the social democratic variant of the new international economic order which, as its authors assume, would enable the West to surmount the growing complex of social, economic, ecological, and other difficulties, without resorting to the destruction of the existing social system and its production relations.

We must give the authors of this work their due, as they present on a number of problems new and constructive considerations which could be subjects of serious discussions between Marxists and social democrats. Without anticipating such a discussion, let us nevertheless note that in one essential matter this plan takes a substantial step backward compared with the program formulated by the developing countries, specifically in terms of the national state. Whereas the young countries favor the all-round strengthening of national sovereignty, including ownership of natural resources, the authors of the report, conversely, call for its gradual elimination and suggest that the solution of the new problems arising in the global economy be resolved with the help of "supranational" organs.

Exposing the groundlessness of the key thesis in this report, which considers as the main contradiction of contemporary development the conflict between production forces and the national state, rather than production relations dominating the capitalist sector of the global economy, Obminskiy, Kolesov, Komlev and many other Marxist researchers in our country and abroad convincingly prove that any weakening of the role of the national state objectively opens possibilities for the activities of multinational corporations--the main tool for the neocolonial exploitation of developing countries today.

The new book by G. G. Chibrikov,⁷ a continuation of the familiar works by I. D. Ivanov,⁸ and E. P. Pletnev,⁹ positively reviewed by the Soviet press, considers the role of the transnational corporations in the process of internationalization of capital and production. G. G. Chibrikov formulates a number of fresh considerations applicable to the political economic nature of the contemporary international monopolies and their role in monopoly price setting on the world market, and "rejection" of market relations and undermining of the national systems of state-monopoly control. Separating himself from such views, the author analyzes the strategy of adaptation on the part of transnational corporations to the new circumstances in the developing countries and quite pertinently cites the statement by R. Prebish, the well-known progressive Latin American economist and one of the founders of UNCTAD, who believes that "the developing countries must be oriented toward the model of relations developing between international concerns and socialist countries" (p 149).

The question of the correlation between a structural reorganization in the distribution and production areas has been given priority of late in discussions on the reorganization of international economic relations (especially considered in the work by O. K. Dreyer and V. A. Los'¹⁰). Arguing against the representatives of bourgeois science in the West and in the developing countries who, in the study of this problem, proceed from the inviolability of capitalist relations, the authors justifiably point out that "with such an approach the new world economic order is considered not as a reorganization of relations in the production sphere but, essentially, in the sphere of redistribution" (p 62). The redistribution concept of the new international economic order objectively limits the reorganization of the old order to the existing social framework, whereas the radical change in the status of the developing countries calls for the broadening of such frameworks and going beyond the limits of capitalism.

From this viewpoint the position held by V. P. Fedorov¹¹ is unconvincing. He defends those who begin by raising questions of the distribution of the national product rather than problems of its production. He thus factually justifies one of the weaknesses of the program for a new international economic order formulated by the developing countries, i.e., emphasis on the distribution of the world gross product with an obviously insufficient attention paid to problems of its production. Such interpretations and formulations draw the attention of the readers away from the truly important and proper formulations of such questions, abundantly present in this work.

The study of the basic monographs totally or partially discussing the problem of reorganization of international economic relations proves that Soviet economic science is operatively analyzing new phenomena and processes of global development, thus effectively contributing to practical work.

FOOTNOTES

1. E. Ye. Obminskiy, "Kontseptsii Mezhdunarodnogo Ekonomicheskogo Poryadka" [The Concept of an International Economic Order], Mysl', Moscow, 1977, 206 pages.
2. N. P. Shmelev, "Sotsializm i Mezhdunarodnyye Ekonomicheskiye Otnosheniya" [Socialism and International Economic Relations], Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1979, 304 pages.
3. R. A. Ul'yanovskiy, "Sovremennyye Problemy Azii i Afriki" [Contemporary Problems of Asia and Africa], Nauka, Moscow, 1973, 295 pages.
4. K. N. Brutents, "Osvobodivshiesya Strany v 7-ye Gody" [The Liberated Countries in the 1970's], Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 159 pages.
5. "Razvivayushchiesya Strany: Zakonomernosti, Tendentsii, Perspektivy" [The Developing Countries: Patterns, Trends, Prospects], Mysl', Moscow, 1974, 462 pages.
6. V. P. Kolesov and L. I. Komlev, "Za Ravnopravnyye Ekonomicheskiye Otnosheniya" [For Equal Economic Relations], Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1978, 280 pages.
7. G. G. Chibrikov, "Rol' Sovremennykh Mezhdunarodnykh Monopoli v Protsesse Internatsionalizatsii Kapitala i Proizvodstva" [Role of Contemporary International Monopolies in the Process of Internationalization of Capital and Production], Izd-vo MGU, Moscow, 1979, 176 pages.
8. I. D. Ivanov, "Mezhdunarodnyye Koporatsii v Mirovoy Ekonomike" [International Corporations in World Economics], Mysl', Moscow, 1976, 215 pages.
9. E. P. Pletnev, "Kosmopolitizm Kapitala i Internatsionalizm Proletariata" [Capitalist Cosmopolitanism and Proletarian Internationalism], Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1974, 158 pages.
10. O. K. Dreyer and V. A. Los', "Ekologicheskiye Problemy Razvivayushchikhsya Stran" [Ecological Problems of Developing Countries], Znaniye, Moscow, 1979, 64 pages.
11. V. P. Fedorov, "Kapitalizm i Mezhdunarodnyye Ekonomicheskiye Otnosheniya" [Capitalism and International Economic Relations], Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1979, 176 pages.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1979

5003

CSO: 1802

- END -
148



END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

9 OCT 79

WB