

JPRS 75187

22 February 1980

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 18, December 1979

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

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

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

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

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

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

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

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

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

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

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 75187	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle USSR REPORT: TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No. 18, December 1979		5. Report Date 22 February 1980	
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 194
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 18, December 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
Toward New Achievements in Communist Construction	1
Course of Construction and Peace	13
Major Problem of Historical Materialism	26
Education of Talent (A. Kulakov, M. Samsonov, and A. Bichukov)	56
Art Addressed to the Masses (I. Vasil'yev)	72
First People's Revolution in the Epoch of Imperialism (A. Pedosov)	94
Comrade 'AVANTE!' (Gennadiy Petrov)	110
Year 1979: Survey of International Life (V. Nekrasov)	128
Developed Socialism--An Integral Social System (Yu. Vostrikov)	146
Born in the Struggle (V. Khlynov)	152

CONTENTS (Continued)	Page
In the Journalistic Shops (N. Plakhotny)	157
Brief Review of Books	163
Index of Articles and Materials Published in 'KOMMUNIST' in 1979	170

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No 18
Dec 1979

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : Dec 1979

Signed to press : 13 Dec 1979

Copies : 948,000

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

TOWARD NEW ACHIEVEMENTS IN COMMUNIST CONSTRUCTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 79 pp 3-13

[Text] The country is entering the final year of the 10th Five-Year Plan. The Soviet people know that the level reached in 1980 will become the reference point, the base which will define the assignments of the 11th Five-Year Plan for the economic and social development of our state.

Each labor victory and each success in the building of communism means the reaching of new levels in the future and opens ever broader possibilities for the creative and constructive activities of the people. Such is the reason for the great aspiration of the Soviet people to achieve high results in the final year of the five-year plan, and to increase their individual and collective contribution to the common project. The working people in the country welcomed with tremendous enthusiasm the results of the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum, the plenum speech of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, and the decisions of the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Awakening in the masses tremendous creative energy, the communist party channels it toward the solution of the most complex and most topical problems of mature socialism: Upgrading production effectiveness and work quality, accelerating scientific and technical progress, and making maximum use of intensive growth factors for insuring the harmonious and comprehensive development of all economic sectors and parts of the country.

The results of the first four years of the 10th Five-Year Plan strengthened the confidence of the Soviet people in the correctness of the course planned by the party. Within that time the country's national economy made substantial progress in all directions. Compared with the same period in the Ninth Five-Year Plan, industrial output rose by 600 million rubles. The average annual gross grain harvest reached 209 million tons, or nearly 27 tons more than in the Ninth Five-Year Plan. Even this year, most adverse in terms of weather conditions, 179 million tons grain were harvested. The economic potential of our society rose steadily: at the end of 1979 the productive capital of the national economy will total over one

trillion rubles; capital investments will exceed 500 billion rubles over four years. Compared with the corresponding years of the last five-year plan, the national income has risen by 323 billion rubles. The material and cultural needs of the working people are being satisfied ever more completely with the growth of the country's economic potential. In four years real per capita income has risen 13.3%, while social consumption funds will exceed 410 billion rubles.

The growth of our homeland's economic power and the steady rise of the prosperity of the people are the result of the selfless work of all Soviet people and the practical implementation of the socioeconomic program elaborated at the 24th CPSU Congress.

The year 1979 added new outstanding pages of labor glory to the chronicle of the five-year plan. The Nurekskaya GES was commissioned 15 months ahead of schedule; the second turbine of the Sayano-Shushenskaya GES--the biggest electric power plant in the world--was commissioned. Electric light illuminated the tayga along the BAM and workers' trains began rolling from the Davan to Baykal and from Urgal to Komsomol'sk-na-Amure. The five-millionth motor vehicle came off the main conveyor line of the Volga Automotive Vehicles Plant. Outstanding accomplishments were achieved by the builders of Atommash, the Kakhovskiy Canal, the Kama Automotive Vehicles Plant, and the steel smelters of Magnitogorsk. The Kazakhstan farmers harvested a record amount of grain--over 34 million tons. The grain growers of Altayskiy and Krasnodarskiy krays, and of Orenburgskaya, Omskaya, L'vovskaya, and many other oblasts made a substantial contribution to the country's grain resources. The country's cotton growers shipped to the reception centers over nine million tons of cotton.

Thousands of collectives in all economic sectors are successfully completing the fourth year of the five-year plan in an atmosphere of high labor activity. They are characterized by the type of atmosphere of constructive feeling, greater initiative, purposefulness, and adamancy which enables them systematically to resolve the most important problems of economic and social development, find profound reserves for economic growth, and struggle for upgrading the effectiveness of social production and work quality.

Many collectives fulfilled ahead of schedule this year's assignments and are already working for 1980. Thousands of leading production workers reported to the homeland the fulfillment of their individual five-year plans. They include Heroes of Socialist Labor Ivanovo textile workers V. Golubeva and A. Yerofeyeva, Azerbaijan excavator operator G. Guseynov, USSR Supreme Soviet deputy, Estonian tractor driver, E. Ryyrn, grinder at the Petropavlovsk Plant imeni Kirov, Yu. Drobot, and many others. Entire collectives are fulfilling their 10th Five-Year-Plan assignments, such as the miners' brigade of the Donbassantratsit Association, headed by Hero of Socialist Labor I. Naumov, the brigade of assembly men at Vostokmetallurgmontazh Administration in Novotroitsk, headed by

P. Babenyshev, the brigade of stonemasons in Kazakhstan, headed USSR State Prize Laureate G. Khayrullin, and hundreds of others. Over 500 workers and 70 brigades of the Leningrad Nevskiy Zavod Production Association pledged to fulfill ahead of schedule their individual five-year assignments. Over 200 Trekhgorka textile workers have already fulfilled their five-year plans and are working for the next one.

Socialist competition in honor of the 110th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birth is developing throughout the country. The party considers this mass movement which triggers outstanding examples of creative labor a tried means for increasing all our accomplishments. The patriotic aspiration to strengthen the power of the homeland through selfless toil is a characteristic feature of our society and one of the most essential accomplishments of socialism. Success does not come by itself. It is planned and organized by the communist party. It embodies the tremendous constructive toil of the Soviet people and the great purposeful work of the party members.

These results could have been greater had all plans and socialist obligations taken by production collectives been fulfilled without exception. However, as yet we have not accomplished this. A tense situation remains in some national economic sectors. "Far from everywhere have ministries and departments been able to surmount the force of inertia, firmly complete a turn in the work toward quality, higher labor productivity, and the reaching of best end-results," noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the plenum. Many cases remain of violations of labor, planning, and state discipline, and violations of the principle of unity between words and actions. This principle is the base of the high moral qualities of the Soviet person, revealed ever more completely in his attitude toward the work and social duty. In the course of their organizational and educational work the party organizations must see to it that this principle become the norm of behavior for every member of a collective, starting with the rank-and-file worker and ending with the economic manager. "Unity between words and actions and agitation through action," the All-Union Conference of Ideological Workers noted, "are of decisive importance in effectively influencing the minds and feelings of a person." We must see to it that all socialist pledges taken by the participants in the competition and the counterplans adopted by competing collectives are implemented.

This places great responsibility on the leading cadres. Always and everywhere they must take into consideration the educational consequences of their activities. They must have a feeling of high party responsibility for assignments. Breaking one's word, promising something while doing something else, and failing to fulfill an assignment, a plan, or an obligation are all incompatible with the moral principles of the Soviet economic manager. We must perfect the style and methods of work, based on the principled instructions of the party. We must strengthen the discipline and intensify control of the implementation of decisions. We must operatively and sharply react to cases of negligence and enhance the personal responsibility of economic managers for their assigned work sector.

The development of the socialist competition, the promotion of a communist attitude toward labor, and the development of a Marxist-Leninist outlook are prerequisites for further upgrading the creative activity of the masses. The scale of the economic changes taking place in our country and to be carried out in the course of the building of communism require the active and conscious participation of every working person in production and social affairs, and his high creative dedication. A conscientious attitude toward work as a creative process is becoming the most important prerequisite for upgrading production effectiveness. That is why the party considers purposeful ideological and mass-political work one of the most important factors for the successful implementation of all national economic plans.

The coming year the Soviet people must resolve major and responsible problems. "Next year," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized at the November Plenum, "will be not only the final year of this five-year plan, but the base on which the next five-year plan will be built. It will be a year of active preparations for the 26th party congress. It is precisely from such positions that we should approach the assessment of the work done and the 1980 tasks."

On the basis of a truly scientific and realistic assessment of the present stage in the development of the Soviet economy, and taking the exposed shortcomings into consideration, the plenum defined the assignments for the year based on future and long-term trends in the socioeconomic growth of our society. The plenum decree emphasizes the need "to insure the further dynamic and proportional development of public production and to systematically pursue a course of increased effectiveness and work quality in all economic units. Particular attention should be focused on the growth of labor productivity, accelerated production intensification based on scientific and technical progress, and improved economic planning and management."

The most important feature of the plenum's work is that it criticized shortcomings and brought to light the tremendous reserves existing within the national economy, whose utilization will insure a sharp upsurge in our country's economy.

One of the basic tasks in the country's economic development is the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. Successes in this area decisively affect the increased effectiveness of public production and the implementation of the party's economic and social program. Strengthening the ties between science and production, upgrading the quality and accelerating scientific developments, and rapidly applying their results in mass production, play an important role in the solution of this problem. In the 10th Five-Year Plan alone the production of about 18,000 new types of industrial commodities will be mastered. In 1980, 400,000 industrial workers will convert from manual to mechanized labor.

At the present stage the pace of production mechanization and automation acquires a topical significance because of the drastic expected reduction in the growth of manpower resources. However, this is only one aspect of the problem. The other is the tremendous social value of eliminating from the production process unskilled and heavy manual work and replacing it with machine labor. The solution of this problem calls for the creation and development of a machine system which would cover not only basic but auxiliary production. Currently, in machine building alone, for example, workers engaged in loading and unloading, freight transport, and warehousing operations account for 15% of the total and about 60% of them perform manual labor.

This five-year plan over 200 scientific and technical programs are being elaborated and applied, including the creation and mastering of machine systems for the comprehensive mechanization and automation of industrial processes in industry and agriculture, the application of automated control systems in most important technological processes and entire sectors, and so on.

Machine building plays a decisive role in raising the technical standard of the economy. As a whole, the 1980 machine-building and metal-processing output will be increased 6.5% compared with the expected 1979 level. Priority will be given to the production of machines and equipment for the fuel-energy sectors and agriculture, and the mechanization of heavy and labor intensive operations, and loading-unloading and transportation work. The machine-building potential developed in the country enables us to resolve major national economic problems. Speaking of successes in machine building, however, we must not fail to see the shortcomings in this sector: The low technical standard and quality of some types of machines, the lagging of the sector behind the needs of the national economy, explained by non-fulfillment of planned assignments for the production of goods in the necessary variety, and errors in intrasectorial planning and management. It was noted at the plenum that metal waste in metal processing has remained virtually on the same level. The metal intensiveness of many machines and equipment produced remains excessively high. As a result, the national economy is feeling a steady shortage of rolled steel. What makes the task of lowering metal intensiveness even more topical is the fact that increasing the production of metal requires substantial additional capital investments (500-600 rubles per ton per year). The more extensive use of low-alloy steel plays a major role in lowering metal intensiveness, along with improving designs of industrial goods. This would enable us to reduce the weight of many such items by 30 to 40% and to considerably upgrade their reliability.

The metallurgical workers themselves could do a great deal in the struggle for a thrifty and economical utilization of the metal: while increasing the production of metals they must insure their comprehensive conservation and most rational utilization by the consumer. The main ways for the solution of this problem are the radical improvement in the quality and

expansion in the variety of rolled metals, the production of economical shapes, the application of progressive equipment and technology in metallurgical production, upgrading the durability of metal goods, increasing the struggle against corrosion, and rapidly developing powder metallurgy.

At the present stage one of the key problems in the development of our economy is increasing the capacities of the fuel-energy complex and the improvement of its structure. The further electrification of the European part of the Soviet Union related to the development of nuclear power production is a practically inexhaustible source of energy and one of the most progressive sectors in modern industry. The capacity of nuclear reactors has already reached a million kilowatts and will grow even further in the future. Already now a number of nuclear power plants are producing electric energy at a cost lower than that of most thermoelectric power plants.

The proven fuel reserves in our country can meet the growing needs of the national economy for many years ahead. As the scale of the fuel-energy complex of the country expands, the efficient utilization of power resources is yielding ever greater economic results: reducing electric power and fuel outlays by 1% only saves about 17 to 18 million tons of conventional fuel per year and millions of rubles' worth of capital investments. Reserves in the economy and practical experience in the rational utilization of energy may be found everywhere. All that is necessary is to use them skillfully. A great deal is being done in this respect this five-year plan. Compared with 1975, for example, last year over 70 million tons of conventional fuel were saved. Concern for the economical utilization of energy resources must be the focal point of attention of each collective. A systematic implementation of a conservation regime is required, along with a reduction of all public production outlays and the rational utilization of all production reserves.

Transport, rail transport above all, plays a tremendous role in upgrading national economic effectiveness. Linking together all production processes, the transportation system directly influences labor end-results in all economic sectors, insuring the continuity of such processes. For this reason any delay in the delivery of freight lowers economic results. Conversely, reducing haulage time is the equivalent of additional output, i.e., to the better utilization of the production potential.

The number of intereconomic relations increases as the scale of output broadens. The volume of haulage rises considerably. This requires the fast development of transport facilities. In order to meet the full needs of the national economy a number of major technical, organizational, and economic problems must be resolved. The technical retooling of transport is necessary. Railroads must be modernized and their handling capacity expanded. Plans for construction and haulage must be balanced against material and financial resources, the capacities of construction and installation subunits, and the rational need of enterprises. The main attention

should be focused on upgrading the effectiveness of transport facilities and their reliability, the full automation of the management of the transport process, mechanization of loading and unloading operations, increased haulage in containers and packages, faster development of pipeline, riverine, and road transport, elimination of cross haulage and freight car idling by the fault of freight receivers and the more efficient planning of freight flows.

The decisions of the November CC CPSU Plenum ascribe an important role to problems of the further development of agriculture and its intensification. ". . . Insuring uninterrupted deliveries and adequate production of high-quality foodstuffs in a wide variety," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the plenum, "is one of the most important tasks based on the party's course toward upgrading the prosperity of the working people." Resolving this problem, the party implemented important measures aimed at strengthening the material and technical base of agriculture. In the past three five-year plans about 400 billion rubles were invested in agricultural production, over 173 billion of which in the 10th Five-Year Plan, including the 1980 plan. In 1980 alone industry will supply the countryside with 88 million tons of chemical fertilizers, 344,000 tractors, 270,000 trucks, and a large quantity of agricultural equipment.

All this creates favorable conditions for further agricultural upsurge. They must be fully utilized in order to raise the output of this important economic sector and, above all, to increase the production of meat and other animal-husbandry goods. Specific measures aimed at its development were considered at the July 1978 CC CPSU Plenum. The primary duty of agricultural workers is to apply all their effort to the strict implementation of the plenum's decisions.

Increasing the labor activity of the masses, improving the organization of kolkhoz-sovkhoz output, further scientific and technical progress, and upgrading the quality and sharply curtailing losses of agricultural commodities are the main factors for upgrading agricultural effectiveness. The party and public organizations must involve all farms and all rural workers in the competition for high effectiveness and work quality. They must extensively disseminate the experience of progressive collectives in raising yields and increasing livestock farm productivity. Organizing aid to the economically weak farms by the leading ones to eliminate straggling must play a major role in this connection. Many collectives have achieved a considerable increase in agricultural production thanks to the use of new production management methods based on specialization and the application of the progressive forms of cost accounting. On the basis of this experience it is necessary to insure closer ties between plan indicators and the material incentive system so that all workers and all subunits be interested in increasing output and improving production quality and conservation.

It is very important in agriculture not only to increase yields but to protect the goods and take them to the consumer. In this connection the

accelerated development of the rural infrastructure becomes an urgent task: A network of roads, transportation, communications, warehousing facilities, material and technical supplies, and the establishment of processing enterprises in the villages, insuring the preservation, transportation, and processing of finished products.

The development of many economic sectors and the growth rates of the socialist economy greatly depend on the successful work of the construction industry. In our country the scale of capital construction is tremendous. Next year alone state capital investments will total 119.1 billion rubles--6.6 billion more than was called for in the five-year plan for 1980. This makes it even more important to insure the economical spending of each ruble and to obtain quick returns. Many construction organizations have acquired great experience in upgrading production effectiveness. As a rule, they deliver on time or ahead of time finished projects with a high quality rating. They are saving substantial funds by lowering outlays of all types of resources. This increases capital returns in the country and results in additional output. However, far from all construction organizations are showing positive results. Completion deadlines of many important projects are being violated. Funds continue to be scattered among numerous construction projects. Overexpenditure of resources is tolerated and the volume of unfinished construction is rising. As a result, the national economy was deprived of a considerable amount of goods. Criticizing such practices, the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum indicated to the construction ministries the need to concentrate capital investments on the most important national economic projects, do everything possible to shorten completion time and reduce the volume of unfinished construction. The number of new projects will be reduced the next year. This will make it possible to concentrate forces and funds on priority projects in order to insure the fastest possible commissioning of capacities.

The November Plenum reemphasized the need to determine the economic areas in which minimum outlays would yield the biggest and quickest results. In the national economy this could be achieved if most of the capital investments are channeled into reconstruction and technical retooling of production facilities which insure the steady growth of capacities through the use of the latest scientific and technological achievements and the ever fuller utilization of intensive factors. Outlays for technical retooling of production facilities are the most advantageous and effective.

Currently a new system of plan indicators is being applied at all construction levels, aimed at increasing the interest of construction workers in delivering projects ready for use. Under these circumstances a decisive struggle must be launched against the obsolete methods of rating the work by "volume." The party organs must help the planning and economic workers to surmount the psychological barrier which hinders the application of progressive methods of planning and assessing activities of construction organizations based on finished projects.

A very important aspect of the 1980 State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR is noteworthy: in industry as a whole identical rates of the growth of output have been set for productive capital and consumer goods. This means that with an overall growth of industrial output the second subdivision sectors will accelerate their development and greatly increase the production of goods aimed at satisfying the growing needs of the population.

Systematically implementing the socioeconomic program adopted by the 25th congress, the communist party is doing everything possible for the Soviet people to live better. One of the big social measures of the 10th Five-Year Plan initiated in 1976 is nearing completion: the raising of wages and salaries of 31 million workers and employees in the non-production economic sectors. Additional benefits have been granted to some workers' categories in ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, the coal, shale, and textile industries, and agriculture. The wages of the field personnel in construction have been raised. A decision was passed to raise the wages of railroad workers in the eastern parts of the country and introduce one-time bonuses for length of service at enterprises of the Ministry of Railways.

The wages of agricultural workers in the Nonchernozem Zone of the RSFSR will be raised in 1980. Measures will be implemented to increase material incentives for employed pensioners and to improve kolkhoz pensions. The average monthly wage of workers and employees will be raised to 167.3 rubles and kolkhoz-member wages to 118 rubles. The fuller satisfaction of the growing solvent demand of the population will be insured: state and cooperative retail trade will be raised 5.1% during the year and will total 264.2 billion rubles. The plan calls for increasing the production of consumer goods, improving their quality, and enlarging their variety. Particular attention will be paid to the production of some goods enjoying greater demand.

In accordance with the annual plan an extensive program for housing construction has been drafted. This will make it possible to improve the housing conditions of over 10 million people. In 1980 social consumption funds used for the payment of pensions, aid, scholarships, the further development of public education, health care, and sociocultural services to the population, will be increased 5.5% and will total 116 billion rubles.

The increased level of prosperity of the Soviet people depends on the increased labor contribution and improved quality of the work of every participant in the production process and of each collective. This requires the profound awareness on the part of the individual of the social significance of his work and responsibility for common affairs. It requires the further strengthening of discipline at all levels and work sectors.

Our country has a powerful economic and scientific and technical potential. It has tremendous growth possibilities in literally every work sector.

Placing them in the service of the national economy and, on this basis, insuring the further upgrading of the prosperity of the Soviet people is a key task of our society at the present stage in its development. Bringing to light public production reserves, the November Plenum also defined the main prerequisite which insures their fullest possible utilization--the enhancement of the management level in the broadest meaning of the term. What makes this even more important is the fact that the dynamism and the expanded scale of the economy and increased complexity of economic relations require the steady improvement of the entire system of public production organization. ". . . Having understood," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 25th CPSU Congress, "that the framework of the existing economic mechanism has become too small for the steadily developing national economy, it must be decisively improved."

The significance of the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decrees passed on this matter is that they are aimed at the implementation of a most important national task, at the further development of the Leninist principle of democratic centralism in national economic management.

The tremendous scales of contemporary social production and the need to resolve a broad range of various problems facing society because of socio-economic progress call for strengthening centralized management along with its democratic foundations. For this reason, the intensified role of the State Plan and increased planning and state discipline must be organically combined with broadening the rights of enterprises and associations, the growth of the creative initiative of the working people, and their participation in production management. This is the main prerequisite for the dynamic and proportional development of the socialist economy and the fullest possible utilization of our technical and economic potential.

Elaborating national economic plans, we must insure the comprehensive solution of economic and social problems, the faster utilization of the achievements of scientific and technical progress which raise labor productivity and production quality, the rational utilization of all resources, the proper definition of priorities in the development of sectors and economic rayons, and the formation of material and financial reserves needed for the proportional and balanced development of the economy. The program-target method for the solution of major national economic problems assumes great importance in improving planning. Comprehensive target, scientific and technical, economic, and social programs, and programs for the development of territorial-production complexes and of individual areas become the most important component of the State Plan for the development of the country's national economy. The program-target method is a qualitatively new form of planning directed toward national economic end-results. Its extensive utilization will enable us to focus scientific forces and material and financial resources on the accelerated solution of major national problems in the main directions of scientific and technical progress.

Broadening the rights of sectorial ministries in the fields of planning and economic incentives, and enhancing the role of labor collectives are of essential importance to improving planning. The formulation of annual plans begins from below--on the level of production associations (enterprises) and organizations. The annual plans include the counterplans, supported by resources, adopted on the initiative of labor collectives. Their elaboration calls for the extensive utilization of economic and engineering computations, thus insuring an accurate determination of the collective's production possibilities.

The participation of union republics and local soviets of people's deputies in planning is broadened substantially. The combination of sectorial with territorial planning are thus improved.

Currently a number of industrial and construction sectors are making preparations to apply a system of plan indicators and economic norms, the conversion to which is based on the decrees on improving the economic mechanism. The essence of the system is that the assessment of activities of enterprises and association collectives and their material incentive will be precisely coordinated with the factual amount of their labor contribution.

There have been cases in economic practice in which the managers of some enterprises, in an effort to fulfill their sales plan (actually, their "gross output" plan), have refused to produce goods unsuitable from the "gross" viewpoint, even though needed by the national economy. In other cases, for the same reasons, preference has been given to expensive types of raw materials, semi-finished and ready-made goods and material-intensive types of output. Such methods have created artificial deficits and led to a totally unjustified increase in production outlays, adversely affecting economic effectiveness. The purpose of the new system of indicators is to put an end to such phenomena. Above all, the role of physical indicators has increased: the assessment of enterprise activities and, consequently, material incentive depend on the fulfillment of contractual deliveries on time and for the entire variety. Thus enterprise work will be built in such a way as to fully satisfy public requirements for various commodities, upgrade their quality, and to actively participate in the reaching of highest possible end results.

Another plan indicator--the net (normative) output--reflects the outlays for labor (socially necessary) at a given enterprise and characterizes the amount of the factual labor contribution of the collective. The use of this indicator in the course of the conduct of the economic experiment contributed to reducing material outlays and to the growth of labor productivity. Let us note that physical indicators can insure increased effectiveness and improved quality only when they are organically combined with cost indicators within a unified system.

The conversion to the new system of plan indicators and norms is, naturally, no simple matter. It requires extensive preparatory work. However,

this should not be a pretext for delaying it. The faster it is completed, the greater will the economic benefits to the entire economy become.

The need to control the implementation of the decrees on improving the economic mechanism was mentioned at the November Plenum. In this respect the party organizations at industry and transport enterprises must play a major role by profoundly interpreting the nature of the decrees and closely relating them to the specific tasks of the collectives.

The primary party organizations must make full use of the right to control economic activities of administrations. They must engage in a decisive struggle against parochialism and a narrow departmental approach, and for the observance of state interests. They must study the implementation of planned assignments and socialist pledges and find ever new possibilities for upgrading production effectiveness.

The fourth year of the five-year plan is passing the baton of the relay race to the fifth, final year. A number of important and responsible projects lie ahead. The wide range of problems on whose solution the energy and striving of the participants in the socialist competition must be channeled has been clearly defined. Our party's Central Committee considers that the prime task of the party, soviet, trade union, and Komsomol organizations and economic organs is to give the socialist competition in honor of V. I. Lenin's 110th birthday anniversary, and the forthcoming 26th party congress, a nationwide scope, involving in it all workers, kolkhoz members, and engineering and technical workers, so that every working person and collective may make a substantial contribution through selfless labor to the fulfillment and overfulfillment of production plans and socialist pledges.

The decisions of the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's plenum speech provide a specific battle program for work in all sectors of the building of communism. Today there is no more important and responsible task facing all Soviet people than the implementation of this program.

5003

CSO: 1802

COURSE OF CONSTRUCTION AND PEACE

Moscow Kommunist in Russian No 18, Dec 79 pp 14-24

[Review of vol 7 of "Leninskim Kursom" [The Leninist Course] by L. I. Brezhnev, on the occasion of its publication. Speeches, Readings, Articles, and Recollections. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 672 pages]

[Text] The seventh consecutive volume of the works of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, "Leninskim Kursom," covering the period from January 1978 to March 1979, has been published. Like the previous volumes, the new work is saturated with a profound ideological and theoretical content and imbued with faith in the inexhaustible forces and constructive possibilities of the socialist system and the Soviet person--patriot and internationalist and dedicated fighter for Lenin's cause. Its content offers answers to topical problems of CPSU theory and politics, party construction, and study and creative solution of problems of domestic and international life. The readers are exposed to the comprehensive activities of the party, its Leninist Central Committee and Central Committee Politburo in guiding all realms of society in the interest of creating in our country the material and technical base of communism, improving social relations, and shaping the new person.

Volume seven depicts with a new emphasis the importance and vitality of the decisions made at the 25th CPSU Congress. It shows the intensive work done by the party for their practical implementation. This is the main, the pivotal feature of the materials contained in the volume. The historical plans of the congress are developed in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's July 1978 speech and November 1978 address delivered to the CC CPSU Plenum, his speech at the electoral meeting in Moscow's Baumanskiy Rayon, his addresses in the course of his trip to Siberia and the Far East, and other publications.

The period covered here was marked by major and important events. In the course of the constructive activities of millions of people, complex problems must be resolved and tremendous experience has been acquired in this area. However, ascent to the peaks is sharp and hard. Some problems are

being resolved excessively slowly. Difficulties and shortcomings exist. The party sees them and takes the necessary measures. Loyal to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, it takes into consideration in its activities the changing circumstances and new phenomena and conditions. It creatively resolves ripe problems, providing the party members and all Soviet people with an efficient manual for action.

I

The volume opens with Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's memoirs "Malaya Zemlya," "Vozrozhdeniye" [Rebirth] and "Tselina" [Virgin Land]. These works, which were awarded the Lenin Prize, provide an example of political activity inspirational to the party members and all workers on the ideological front. They met with great response throughout the world and were published in a number of languages. This outstanding political leader of our time, who was a direct participant in the great events of the century, describes, truly and confidently, events related to important historical periods in the party's struggle for the establishment of the new system and for peace and social progress. The author describes the practice of developing the consciousness, organization, and activeness of the masses, and the development in the people of the readiness and ability to build and defend socialism. With outstanding facts borrowed from life itself, he describes the high moral qualities of our people and the sources for their heroism, self-sacrifice, and unparalleled military and labor exploits.

Such books-memoirs enrich the treasury of revolutionary experience and help millions of working people in a number of countries to define themselves socially. Their profound study is of great importance to instilling communist convictions and insuring the moral influence of the party on the broad masses. Reading the memoirs, the reader acquires an ideological and moral charge, and a lesson in high party-mindedness. He draws conclusions related to the great past and his own contribution to the common cause. This represents the unbreakable link between the periods of our revolution and the continuity of the history of the party and the entire people.

The profoundly scientific formulation by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev of the problem of mastering and utilizing historical experience is noteworthy. The pages in the history of the heroic struggle waged by the working people against oppressors and aggressors, and victories in the building of socialism are our national pride.

With every passing year the scope of our plans and the scale and complexity of the problems rise. Their solution must be achieved in largely new ways. Here we must take into consideration the very rich practical experience acquired in building socialism, the socially significant lessons drawn from it by the party and the people, and the economic and political consequences of one or another decision or event. According to Lenin, the essence of Marxism was "specific analysis of a specific situation." The entire collection is imbued with this Leninist approach. Here the depth of historical analysis is combined with focusing on the present and aspirations for the future.

It might have seemed that four years of war against the fascist aggressors, with all its trials and hardships, could have just about totally exhausted the forces of the people. However, the people gained a "second wind": the economic rebirth was accomplished within the shortest possible time despite the cold war unleashed by imperialism. Here again the energy of the masses and the feeling of ownership of their country and fate, acquired under the Soviet system, played an important role. In Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's words, under the most severe trials of wartime, intensive work to rebuild the national economy, and the development of the virgin and fallow lands, the Soviet people went on with the experience of the revolution, multiplied it accomplishments under the new historical circumstances, and engaged through their live experience in their victorious building of developed socialism.

The memoirs and other materials in the volume comprehensively describe the complexities and difficulties of political leadership, which was considered by Lenin as a science and an art which are not dropped from the sky or come by themselves. Simple desire here is insufficient. Extensive experience and profound understanding of theory and ability to convert it into practice are required. The author warmly describes the qualities needed by the leader. He emphasizes that the leader must approach matters scientifically, see in the distance, work intelligently and tactfully, without sliding over acute problems, shortcomings, and difficulties, with respect for the people, and using the method of explanation and persuasion.

Thanks to the tireless activities of the CPSU and its Central Committee, headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, a favorable atmosphere is strengthening in our society in which the respectful and concerned attitude toward the people and trust are combined with comradely exactingness toward oneself and others, and with strict responsibility for assignments. However, there also are people who would like to use such circumstances to conceal their own carelessness, unconscientiousness and, sometimes, even dishonesty. Such workers are well aware of their rights but forget their obligations, believing that the laws were not written for them. Subjected to just criticism, they either remain silent or do everything possible to reject it, referring to "undermining" of authority, and resorting to formal replies. On the other hand, relying on trust, here and there strictness and reciprocal exactingness are lowered, discipline violators are tolerated and shortcomings are accepted. Understandably, this is condemned by the labor collectives and party organizations. An even more systematic and irreconcilable struggle must be waged against anything which hinders our progress. This requirement is repeatedly expressed by the author and was clearly formulated at the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum.

II

The materials in the volume describe profoundly and comprehensively the tireless activities of the CPSU Central Committee to implement the instructions of the 25th party congress. They describe the process of elaboration

of political decisions in the spirit of the ideas of the congress and their implementation, and the concentration of the efforts of the party and the people on the fullest possible utilization of the advantages of mature socialism.

Economic construction is our common cause, the policy which interests us most. This Leninist approach has always been followed by the party in guiding the country's economic development. "Economics," as Lenin emphasized, "affects 'the deepest foundations of the lives of hundreds of millions of people,'" we read on page 436. "And, whenever it is a question of millions of people of their working and living conditions, the most serious policy begins for the party members. This is the main line of their organizational and ideological-political work."

A clear example of this is found in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's reports and speeches at CC CPSU plenums. They further substantiate the key task of the current five-year plan and the determining factor in the development of the country for many years ahead--increasing social production effectiveness and the quality of all our work. Reviewing the circumstances with a broad political outlook, and organically linking current with future tasks, the author analyzes the most important problems of economic and state construction and social development.

At the July 1978 CC Plenum Comrade L. I. Brezhnev described the scientific substantiation and vital force of CPSU agrarian policy at the present stage. He emphasized that the current strategy and tactic of agricultural development are based on the new conditions. They realistically take into consideration the possibilities and ripe needs of society. Directing the attention on problems requiring immediate solution, the speaker also indicated the main directions for the future development of the production process, considered of essential significance in converting agriculture into a highly developed economic sector. A vitally important problem such as the upsurge of animal husbandry is formulated particularly sharply. It must be urgently faced by the entire party, all our ministries and departments, kolkhoz and sovkhoz managers, and all rural workers.

"The main task we now set to agriculture," we read on page 401, "is to achieve the comprehensive and dynamic development of all its sectors and the reliable supply of the country with food and agricultural raw materials, in such a way that their increased output will insure a further considerable enhancement of the people's living standard. At the same time, we must increase our efforts to resolve the problem of bringing closer material and cultural living conditions of town and country to each other." It is a question, above all, of systematically increasing capital investments in agriculture, and more energetically increasing the capacity of all industrial sectors serving the countryside. The conversion of agriculture to an industrial base is one of the basic tasks. The production of chemical fertilizers and plant protection means and land reclamation will be developed further. All this will enable us to harvest higher and more stable grain and other crops.

Economic relations in agriculture and among sectors within the agro-industrial complex, and the development of interfarm cooperation were comprehensively discussed at the plenum. The profound changes occurring in countryside objectively require the further perfecting of the economic mechanism. This applies to planning, strengthening cost accounting, and further stimulating the production and sales of agricultural commodities. It was pointed out that not only production but relations among people, their way of life, culture, mentality, and conscientiousness are subjects of the party's continuing attention. "One of the most important tasks today is to combine agricultural production with standards, in the broadest possible meaning of the term, standards in labor, way of life, and human relations. . . . Today the question could be formulated only thus: Meeting the housing and living requirements and the increased cultural requirements of rural workers must be the subject of no lesser concern on the part of farm managers, and party committees and soviet and trade union organs than problems of production development" (p 434). The author indicates specifically and clearly the means for the solution of this truly historical problem of tremendous importance to the development of the country's entire economy, social progress, enhanced people's prosperity, and all-round and harmonious development of every individual.

What must the party members in the villages do today? This question was the focal point of the report submitted by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the plenum. We know that currently over 5.8 million party members are working in the countryside. Their duty is to use methods of party persuasion and communist upbringing to enable tens of millions of people to understand the tasks of the agrarian policy, to inspire them, and to focus their efforts on the implementation of the party's plans for the development of agriculture and the successful completion of the five-year plan. "Every party member," the speaker said, "must be a model of selfless toil. He must be a skillful organizer and disseminator of progressive experience. He must care for the common cause and for the development of an atmosphere of united, dedicated, and creative work within the collective. A party member cannot and should not ignore cases of careless attitude toward the work. He must be intolerant toward negligence, drunkenness, absenteeism, or any other action which defames the honor and the dignity of the Soviet person" (p 435).

A higher level of party leadership and more advanced methods of work among the masses must be consistent with the contemporary stage in the life of the party and the country. Rallying the efforts of the party members and acting as the political nucleus of labor collectives, the primary party organizations must purposefully, systematically, and effectively implement the CPSU's agrarian policy. Implementing their organizational and ideological work, the primary party organizations must be given more specific assistance by the rural party raykoms--the main political organs and authoritative units of the party's leadership of the economy and of socio-cultural life in the countryside, in whose activities a truly Leninist style is asserting itself to an ever greater extent.

However, we would not be self-critical, the speaker pointed out, had we said that the work of all party committees meets contemporary requirements. These words remain topical. Some party committees have not penetrated sufficiently profoundly into the economic and social processes taking place. They have failed to see all the new opportunities which have been provided for the faster growth of agricultural production. They do not always objectively assess the situation and occasionally exaggerate results. Any given year, regardless of whether it was good or bad, in each oblast, kray, and republic their are kolkhozes and sovkhoses which fail to fulfill their plans for sales to the state of one or another commodity. The main reason is the insufficiently developed feeling of responsibility and reduced exactingness toward cadres. Frequent references are made to difficulties and objective reasons. Yet, however difficult it might be, no one has the right to harm the common interests and violate state discipline. The struggle against such phenomena must be intensified and anything which triggers them must be decisively eliminated. All forms of control must be organized better.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev uses heartfelt words turning to the party organizations, the party members, and all Soviet working people: "It is no accident that our state seal displays the golden ears of wheat. Our grain is the result of the combined work of the peasant, the worker, and the intellectual. The further upsurge of agriculture is an inseparable part of the all-round economic progress of the entire country" (pp 435-436).

The following thought runs throughout the reports submitted to the July and November 1978 CC CPSU plenums and other documents in the collection: Formulating good plans is not enough. All efforts must be concentrated on their fulfillment and overfulfillment, and on the rational and effective utilization of allocated capital investments and resources.

The November 1978 Plenum summed up the initial results of the implementation of the socioeconomic program formulated at the 25th CPSU Congress. It drew the attention of the party and the people to the topical problems of national economic development. A great deal was accomplished in the first three-and-a-half years of the five-year plan. However, how to explain the fact that for quite some time we have been unable to eliminate the bottlenecks which prevent us from progressing at a higher pace and from achieving better economic and quality work indicators?

The main reason is that the central economic organs, ministries, and departments are slow in converting the entire economy to the tracks of intensive development. They have been unable to accelerate scientific and technical progress. They are poorly applying progressive practical experience. All this gives priority to problems of administrative and organizational nature and of further improvements in managing the national economy. Matters must be organized in such a way that all decisions be supported by efficient organizational measures. They should stipulate what to do, where, and within what time; who is specifically responsible for a

given work sector, and who is, at the same time, accurately and specifically controlling implementation. As was asserted also at the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum, one of the most important tasks today is to intensify control over the implementation of decisions and increase exactingness toward those responsible for such control.

Life adamantly demands an ever more profound study of the development of the national economy, aimed at the further enhancement of its effectiveness. A real turn toward effectiveness will be possible, above all, by raising planning to a qualitatively new level and making it consistent with the requirements of developed socialism. This means providing a profound interpretation of many vitally important problems and finding optimal approaches to their solution, combining high responsibility with initiative and creative daring.

At the November 1978 CC Plenum Comrade I. I. Brezhnev particularly emphasized that we must rely more on intensive factors of economic growth, for the other factors are being drastically narrowed. This applies, above all, to the possibility for recruiting new labor resources. This also applies to natural resources, whose reserves in our country are great but whose development requires greater capital investments. The conclusion is that we must make more rational use of everything at the disposal of our national economy and be directed toward production end results and find the most effective and economical means for attaining them.

As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out in his meeting with the voters on 2 March 1979, "Nothing is more important than the economical, the extremely efficient utilization of all our possibilities and resources. This calls for new approaches to the policy of capital investments and to many areas of technical policy, the flexible handling of available capacities and manpower resources, and surmounting departmental and parochial tendencies. This will also require a certain reorganization in planning and economic management methods, and in the system of indicators and material incentive. However complex such reorganization may turn out to be, we cannot do without it."

Today such a reorganization has assumed a specific shape following the adoption of decrees developing the decisions of the 25th party congress: CC CPSU decree on the further improvement of the economic mechanism and the tasks of party and state organs, and the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree on improving planning and intensifying the influence of the economic mechanism on upgrading production effectiveness and work quality. Their implementation has become the most important task of party organs and organizations, of all party members, of the entire Soviet people.

III

The warm greetings delivered by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev to leading collectives of enterprises and organizations, production innovators, and men of

science and culture, included in the volume, are imbued with a revolutionary creative spirit, and party concern for the purposeful and selfless work of all participants in the building of communism. They trigger extensive response in the country and inspire millions of people to work even better, more productively and creatively, and to dedicate all their forces and knowledge to the further blossoming of our homeland.

The author consistently raises the question of developing in all labor collectives the type of moral and psychological atmosphere in which everyone would consider it his natural duty to be maximally productive and work with the greatest dedication, an atmosphere in which public opinion would not tolerate loafers, idlers, waste makers, and plunderers of socialist property, and would contribute to the uprooting of anti-social phenomena.

The author considers thoroughly problems of ideological, moral, and labor upbringing. "The high level of education and information of the Soviet people including the young people, naturally," we read on page 292, "greatly increases the requirements regarding the style of educational work. Particularly intolerable here are manifestations of callousness and formalism. The time has come for all workers on the ideological front to put an end to the still occasional practice of the mechanical and thoughtless repetition of elementary truths and verbiage. The time has come to make it a rule to speak to the people in a simple and clear language, writing and investing in each sentence a living thought and feeling. This too is a problem of quality and effectiveness in a major sector in the building of communism such as the education of the new man."

These conclusions expressed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev on the tasks of communist education are fruitfully used by the party. They have become an organic part of the CC CPSU decree "On Improving Further Ideological and Political-Educational Work," which has become a manual for action for the party organizations and all party members in upgrading the conscientiousness and activeness of the masses.

The socialist competition, which has become truly nationwide in scope and depth, provides a great service to the development of the economy and the upbringing of millions of people. The author repeatedly goes back to the need for further improvements of the competition. "The management of the competition and the application of new and progressive features," we read on page 540, "is a live matter which tolerates no stagnation or conservatism. The practice of leading collectives and individual innovators show a factual sharp turn in the ways and means of work, technology, and organization of management. This calls for persistence, dedication and, if you wish, courage. Occasionally, here we must virtually restrain ourselves and demand this of others. Those who are afraid of the new hinder progress. This is the basis for the evaluation of cadres, both economic and party."

The author points out that there are differences in competitions. Competition requires neither noise nor chattering. We need the lively interest of

every working person, of each labor collective, in improving their work. Farfetched "initiatives" are unnecessary. What are needed are efficient initiatives, truly stemming from the masses, capable of firing and inspiring millions of people. It is precisely such initiatives that must be disseminated. The author repeatedly raises the question of the educational function of the competition.

An active life-stance, inherent in most Soviet people, high exactingness toward oneself and others, and criticism and self-criticism have always been and will remain the most important prerequisites for our successful work. "Most serious attention must be paid to the critical remarks of the working people. Nothing is more harmful to the interests of the party and the people than attempts to gloss over shortcomings, avoid just criticism and ignore it, not to speak of suppressing it and persecuting those who engage in it. . . . The suppression of criticism, comrades, is a violation of the norms of communist morality and of the Fundamental Law of the USSR. It is an evil which must not be left unpunished. We highly value the initiative of the people and no one will be allowed to undermine this source of our strength!" (pp 474-475).

The author deals extensively with problems of the further strengthening of the state of the whole people, the improvement of the political system of Soviet society, the development of socialist democracy, the fuller utilization of the tremendous opportunities inherent in our system, and Soviet democracy. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's speeches and articles show the party's concern for the need and further steady energizing of the work of all links within our political system, for encouraging and supporting the initiative of state and public organizations, and for involving all citizens in administration.

The speech to the electorate and addresses at USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium sessions contain a program for improving ways and means of activity of the soviets of people's deputies and, particularly, most important problems, such as strengthening relations between the soviets and the masses, developing their control functions, publicizing the work of the power organs, and implementing voters' instructions. The author emphasizes that such instructions are a vivid manifestation of our democracy, a democracy not in words but in actions, a true and real democracy. They express the concern of the working people for the affairs of their country and for the interests of society, for which reason it is very important to support such particles of the people's initiative and try to implement them more fully.

The party pays tireless attention to the implementation of the stipulations of the new USSR Constitution and through its subsequent legislative activities directs the efforts of party and state organs, public organizations, and all citizens toward the active and decisive struggle against anti-social phenomena, violations of legality, red tape, and bureaucracy. "A proper and planned system of laws, added to their strict implementation, is what legality is all about. It is also law and order without which the socialist way of life and socialist democracy would be inconceivable (p 616).

A tremendous vital force, the force of millions of people, lies in the soviets of people's deputies, in socialist democracy. It must be used even more fully to bring to light existing reserves, criticize shortcomings, compare opinions, and formulate substantiated decisions based on and checked by progressive science and popular experience. Soviet democracy can and must serve even better economic progress, which was and will remain the foundation, the material base for the ever fuller assurance of the rights and freedoms of the Soviet people.

The work includes materials which discuss ripe problems of development of science and socialist culture, the further strengthening of the friendship among the peoples, and the international education of the working people. Socialism has proved that the more intensive the growth and development of each Soviet republic becomes, the more clearly is the internationalization process manifested. Developing under the conditions of our multinational union, the culture of each republic encompasses the best features of the other national cultures. This is a very positive phenomenon. Turning to the working people--workers, kolkhoz members, and the intelligentsia--Comrade L. I. Brezhnev calls upon them to be always loyal to the outstanding internationalist traditions of the Russian and international workers movement and the Soviet people, and actively to implement the wise Leninist national policy of the CPSU, which is farsighted, principle-minded, tactful, and responsive. Our path requires giving all-round assistance to the development and spiritual enrichment of each of the nations forming the Soviet Union, while at the same time offering possibilities for the great historical process of strengthening their unity within the single socialist family and within the new social and international comity. This is the way along which the party is steadfastly leading the people forward, toward communism.

IV

Materials on the international position of the USSR and the gigantic activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state in the implementation of the program for the further struggle for peace and international cooperation and for the freedom and independence of the peoples, adopted at the 25th party congress, are treated extensively in the work. The party creatively combines revolutionary theory with specific practical activities in foreign policy and in the world's revolutionary movement. It displays a class-oriented, a truly scientific approach. It bases its decisions and actions on the interests of the working people, socialism, and the peace. We see with our own eyes that good changes are taking place on earth. The foundations of a new system of international relations are strengthening. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev is making a tremendous personal contribution to the development of a political climate favorable to detente and to insuring advantageous foreign conditions for the building of communism in our country and of socialism in the fraternal countries.

"Happy is the politician, happy is the state leader," he writes, "when he can always say what he truly thinks and do what he indeed considers

necessary, and promote something in which he truly believes. When we formulated the peace program, submitted at many international meetings initiatives aimed at eliminating the threat of war, I did this, strived for this, and spoke of this, since, as a communist, I believe in it profoundly and totally" (p 53). Such is the highly moral position of the revolutionary, the Marxist-Leninist to whom the interests of the working people, the interests of the nation, whose most basic right is the right to life, are above everything else.

Real socialism is an initiative-making factor of world development, and a bulwark of peace and social progress. The truth about it is the most important spiritual weapon in the struggle for the preservation and strengthening of the peace. This truth must be disseminated among all nations. This is the vocation of the communist and the sacred duty of the builders of the new world. The materials in the collection clearly prove the wealth and variety of ways and means for the socialist reorganization of society. The author emphasizes that the growing cooperation with the fraternal socialist countries firmly occupies a leading position in the foreign relations of our party and state. The Soviet Union comprehensively helps in the development of the socialist comity--the most dynamic, stable, and progressive economic force in the world. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's greetings to the participants in the 33d CEMA session emphasized that the socialist comity is distinguished by a harmonious combination of national with international interests, and respect for the views and national characteristics of each individual country. This is one of the reasons for CEMA's growing prestige. Guided by the principles of peaceful coexistence, in the international arena as well the CEMA-member countries decisively oppose discrimination in trade and promote economic and scientific and technical cooperation. This is not a course dictated by circumstances, but is based on the very nature of our system and the general direction of socialist foreign policy.

"The overall experience of built socialism (and, naturally, no one is imposing it on anyone else) is an outstanding gain of the entire international working class," noted the author's preface to the collection, entitled "The Socialist World Is the Triumph of Great Ideas," carried in the seventh volume. "This experience helps all revolutionary forces operating on national soil to find a reliable way to freedom from capitalist omnipotence and for the building of socialism" (p 544).

Thinking of the accomplishments and plans of the socialist world and its future, the author writes with conviction and optimism that, "We, the communists, seek this future in the joint movement of the socialist countries toward a communist organization of society, which alone can create all the necessary conditions for the harmonious development of the individual and the complete satisfaction of human requirements. . . . The victory of communism in a group of countries does not require the disappearance of the capitalist order throughout the world. This is not mandatory in the least. Speaking of external conditions, it requires

something else: the elimination of the threat of war and the conversion of military expenditures to constructive requirements; it requires peace today and tomorrow, and for all times. Communism and peace are the beacon along which, together with our friends and like-minded supporters, we are formulating our itinerary into the future" (p 545).

Together with the fraternal parties and countries, our party and Soviet state are dedicating maximum amounts of energy and persistence to promote cooperation with peace-loving and democratic forces, wreck the plans of aggressive imperialist circles, defend and intensify detente, and reliably insure the Soviet people and our friends and allies of the possibility to live and work under peaceful conditions. The reader will find in the volume a clear Leninist assessment of the situation today and of the essence of our peace initiatives.

The author convincingly formulates the most important problem affecting the destinies of every person on earth: The termination of the arms race, real disarmament, and elimination of the threat of a thermonuclear catastrophe. It is precisely along this direction, the author states, that we resolve the basic problem of how will the international circumstances develop further; it is precisely here that the most sharp struggle is currently being waged. In a number of speeches and articles included in the volume the author thoroughly narrates the constructive proposals submitted by our country aimed at improving the international atmosphere and expanding and intensifying cooperation between the USSR and the United States.

"We consider as the basic task of our foreign policy to do everything possible for a termination of the arms race and for strengthening the peace and security of the peoples" (p 477). This statement by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev is particularly topical and important today, following the signing of the Soviet-American SALT II treaty. Pointing out the great importance of the treaty, the parties noted that its implementation will be a major step toward restraining the arms race and reducing the danger of war. The signing of the treaty and its ratification are the most important steps in the prevention of a world war and restraining military preparations. As we know, in the course of the Vienna talks basic problems of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States were considered as well. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that the Soviet leadership and entire Soviet people wish for Soviet-American relations to be relations of peace and extensive cooperation operating on a long-term basis.

The author exposes the slanderous nature of assertions of the so-called "Soviet threat," and the allegedly militaristic intentions of our country. These are fabrications and a monstrous lie needed by the aggressive circles in the capitalist world who are concocting unrealistic and dangerous plans for achieving military superiority and "equip themselves with a longer and sharper sword," and pursue a "firm line" in order to impose their will on the members of the socialist comity. The supporters of this line live in an atmosphere of unattainable illusions.

In his time Lenin described disarmament as the ideal of socialism. Life has steadily confirmed this truth. No other country has submitted to mankind such an extensive, specific, and realistic program aimed at eliminating the threat of a new war. The problems of restraining the arms race are constantly in the focal point of attention of the CPSU Central Committee and Soviet Government. ". . . Any problem of intergovernmental relations can be resolved today if approached calmly and sensibly, with a willingness to understand the other side and avoid the heating up of passions and the aggravation of differences," we read on page 304. "Given goodwill on both sides we could look ahead with optimism."

For the first time in history the great Lenin combined the theory of scientific communism with the practice of conducting state foreign policy by a socialist country. Systematically and tirelessly implementing Lenin's peace-loving policy, our party and all Soviet people are actively and effectively supporting those who strengthen the cause of the peace, and promote friendship and reciprocal understanding among nations and freedom, democracy, and social progress.

History rushes forth. Tempestuous events broke out throughout the planet. The 20th century is already nearing its end. How will the planet welcome the new millennium? We are not seers. Today, however, we could repeat with particular emphasis and confidence Lenin's statement that our path is the right one and that the communists must know that the future belongs to them.

The party is confidently leading the people along Lenin's path. This is asserted with new strength by the works of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and his tireless activities for the good of the Soviet people and the bright future of all mankind.

5003

CSO: 1802

MAJOR PROBLEM OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 79 pp 25-46

[Text] The roots of the problem of the role of the people's masses and individuals in the historical process may be traced thousands of years back. Egyptians, Chinese, Greeks, and Romans considered this matter in ancient times. It occupied the philosophers of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, the prophets and ideologues of the French Revolution, realistically thinking historians in the Restoration period in France, the English economists, and the outstanding representatives of German classical philosophy--those who tried to explain and those who, like the great utopian socialists, made guesses, frequently brilliant, on how to change it. Both reactionaries, who tried to perpetuate the domination of their class, and the revolutionaries, who tried to abolish it, considered the matter as well.

Even though the question of the role of the people's masses and individuals in history stopped being a "thing in itself" ever since the appearance of the "Communist Party Manifesto" of K. Marx and F. Engels, with the direct or indirect support of all sorts of opportunists, the ideologues and politicians of the exploiting system have tried, day after day, to the best of their ability, to confuse it and, using all possible tricks, to disorient the working people. Naturally, this is underlined by definite class interests and entirely specific objectives.

What does the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist doctrine, this "summed-up experience illuminated by a profound philosophical world outlook, rich in historical knowledge" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 33, p 29) have to say on such an ancient and yet so topical problem? What is the peculiarity of its current formulation and contemporary meaning and significance?

I

The proper presentation of any complex philosophical-historical problem means, above all, to formulate it accurately, turning to its material sources, clearing it from subsequent ideological incrustations, and seeing

in it a reflection of factual social contradictions. To resolve such a problem means to bring to light the trends in the development of such contradictions, trace their historically characteristic forms and mutations, and make a specific study of their objective grounds and means for practical resolution.

The problem of the role of the people's masses and individuals in history had already appeared in the pre-class society. It assumed particular importance when, as a result of the appearance of private ownership, society was divided into hostile classes and social inequality became the permanent companion of its antagonistic development. The interrelationship between the people's masses and individuals was shaped and realized, from the very beginning, as a relationship between opposites, as a contradiction. Like all other social contradictions, it is rooted in social production relations. Private ownership is the common source of these contradictions.

The people's masses have always been the motive force of history, which naturally was made first of all not in the tents of military leaders, royal suites, offices of political alchemists, or halls of parliament. It was made in mines and stone quarries with the hands of the slaves, in the workshops and fields with the hands of craftsmen and peasants, and in factories and plants with the hands of the workers--the working people who created not only the material goods for life, but social life itself. It was precisely in the course of such material-practical activities that social relations among people were established and changed. It is precisely this constant mass building that is the main content of the historical process, while its laws are the laws of history. Nevertheless, for centuries people made history blindly, unable to influence the social consequences of their own actions or even predict them.

In a class-antagonistic society, based on private ownership and controlled by a handful of power holders, the laws governing its development are imagined by the people as being somehow alien, inaccessible, strange, and therefore fateful. This is not only due to the ignorance and cowering of the masses, which tend to mythologize and fetishize sociohistorical forces, as is claimed by the supporters of the concept of an "elite," fashionable among the educated bourgeois. Even the best educated and deepest minds of the past imagined, essentially, matters as being such. ". . . The infinite mass of wishes, interests, and activities," wrote Hegel, for example, "is a tool and a means for the world spirit. . . . Seeking and reaching their own the living individuals and nations are also the means and tools of something higher and more distant about which they know nothing and which they subconsciously obey . . ." (Hegel, "Soch." [Works], vol VIII, Moscow-Leningrad, 1935, pp 24-25).

"Higher and more distant." . . . The question is, precisely, that the division and alienation of the individuals, determined, above all, by their interrelationships in the realm of material production, resting on private

ownership, are invariably separated from the people and raise above them their own real social relations which become an "autonomous force ruling the individuals" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 46, pt I, p 141). These relations become materialized while, at the same time, restricting and lowering the meaning and significance of the "cause" of the toiling masses.

"The cause of the masses," turned into their "lot," is to transform through their toil the substance of nature, to feed and clothe scattered mankind--inevitably made the "person in the mass" anonymous, in the historical sense. The common conditions governing life and creativity--economic, political, and spiritual--were not the immediate subject of the activity of the masses. The social order was developed behind their back, only as the average average statistical end-result of their daily adamant efforts. For which reason their material activities appeared on the surface of things as non-historical.

It was only at times of the highest tension of the class struggle, when, abandoning their work, the people's masses emerged on the squares and, without abandoning the tools of their labor, which had become their weapons, undertook to change the obsolete social order, that their actions, in terms of nature, target, objectives, and scales acquired a direct meaning of historical activities. At such times the "human masses" both felt and acted as subjects of historical creativity, elevating from their midst outstanding leaders in the full meaning of the term. "Revolutions are the locomotives of history," Marx said. "Revolutions are the holiday of the oppressed and the exploited. The mass of the people can never be such an active maker of a new social order as in a revolutionary time. At such times the people are capable of performing miracles, considered from the viewpoint of the narrow and philistine measure of gradual progress" V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 11, p 103).

However, even in times of the highest upsurge of the struggle waged by the exploited against the slave owners and feudal advocates of serfdom, such actions, truly historical in terms of scale and significance, had neither a clear common objective or future, nor a planned program. They mostly did not exceed the framework of the social relations which triggered their protest. Attempts to take the reins of power away from the hands of the oppressors and take their future into their own hands ended, as a rule, in failure, for all that could be changed in a private-ownership society was the form of oppression, rather than its entire system. For this reason, after the defeat or decline of revolutionary action, slaves, peasants, and artisans returned "to their circles," and, once again, history became to them something "higher and more distant than daily labor."

This situation led to the fact that "abstractions began to rule" the individuals (Marx), while history could not fail to show the social fate of the working people themselves other than in a false light, as a mystical anonymous force--as ideas of God, fate, universal spirit, etc.

As material relations among people became impersonal, while the historical meaning and significance of the labor activities of the masses were belittled, there developed a personification of abstractions and an enhancement of the "accomplishments of the elect"--conquerers, military leaders, politicians, thinkers, i.e., of all those who held the power, and who controlled the affairs of society, the nation, and the state, always on behalf of the ruling class and in its interest.

Stemming from the objective analysis of the nature and dynamics of factual social human relations, the materialistic concept of history explains how and why there is a separation between the "accomplishments of the masses" and "accomplishments" of a specific historical individual, and how and why the "political sky" is separate from the "earth" of material relations, how and why the real makers of history--the people's masses--are depersonalized and their accomplishments are forgotten, and how and why history replaces the work robe with the mantle of a Caesar, the cloak of a military leader, the garb of the "prince of the church" or the white tie of the politician. Essentially, official "history" retained only the names of individuals to whom "historical creativity" was, so to speak, a profession. It is precisely this that determined the nature of the entire old, pre-Marxian formulation of the question of the role of the individual and the people's masses in history as essentially a question, precisely, of the role of the outstanding, the exceptional individual and the passive faceless mass. Understandably, it was resolved in favor of the individual, his awareness, will, and idea he served. The more passive and inert the mass remained in obscure periods of history, the more outstanding became the "historical personality" with its special historical mission.

Things became substantially different under the conditions of the last antagonistic formation--capitalism--when the tempestuous growth of production forces laid the material prerequisites for the extensive socialization of productive capital and the elimination of private property and the exploitation of man by man, along with social inequality and age-old social contradictions, and when the proletariat appeared--a physically and spiritually growing toiling class, which by virtue of its objective position within the system of social relations became the mass subject of the revolutionary reorganization of the world. At the same time, the very question of the role of the people's masses and individuals in history changed substantially.

The approach of historical materialism to this question was, and will remain, concrete-historical. Like the individual, the mass is judged, above all, by its accomplishments, social actions, and factual participation in the historical process.

As applied to social life the concept of "mass" is political. It is inconstant. At the dawn of the labor movement the term mass frequently meant several thousand revolutionary workers. Matters changed with the ripening of the revolution. Then, as Lenin noted, "the concept of mass

changes in the sense that it means the majority, and not simply the majority of the workers, but the majority of all the exploited; no other type of understanding is admissible for a revolutionary. Any other meaning of this term becomes alien" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 44, pp 31-32).

Today the recognition of the role of the masses in the historical process means, above all, the recognition of the need for a proletarian revolution as the highest form of historical creativity of the oppressed and the guidance of this creativity by the communist party; it means raising this recognition to a recognition of the need for the assumption of political power by the working class--the state power of the revolutionary majority of the people; it means a recognition of the ability of the people to create a new type of democracy--socialist rule by the people; it means to acknowledge the possibility and necessity of the growth of the state of the dictatorship of the working class to the socialist state of the whole people, whose supreme objective is the creation of a society in which the all-round development of each is a prerequisite for the all-round development of all and, consequently, in which every person, every working man, will be a maker of history in the fullest and most profound meaning of the term.

"Unable to understand the theory of the class struggle, and accustomed to seeing in the political arena a shallow mixture of various bourgeois circles and coteries," Lenin pointed out, "the bourgeois think that dictatorship means means the abrogation of all democratic freedoms and guarantees, all arbitrariness, and all misuse of power in the interest of the personality of the dictator" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 41, pp 373-374). In fact, this represents a total ignorance of the major distinction between the exploiting dictatorship exerted on the people, and the revolutionary dictatorship of the people. "The old regime systematically mistrusted the masses. It feared the light and was kept in power through fraud. The new regime, as the dictatorship of the tremendous majority, could and did remain in power exclusively with the help of the faith of the huge masses, exclusively by attracting most freely, extensively, and powerfully the entire mass to participate in the power" (ibid, p 381). In this light the regime's fear of the working people (naturally, bearing in mind the scientific meaning the term rather than its verbal expression) and the aspiration to denounce it, on one or another pretext, quite frequently means fear of the proletarian masses, and fear of the radicalizing of their interests, demands, and actions, and the desire to conceal all this behind the shield of bourgeois legality.

One way or another, all bourgeois and petit bourgeois theories, even those whose authors describe themselves as "leftists," the "new left," or "true revolutionaries," are aimed at debunking the revolutionary transforming mission of the working class in the capitalist world, "proving" its alleged inability to lead the non-proletarian toiling masses, and its "degeneration" and "integration" within the "consumer society."

Both the open defenders of capitalism and its petit bourgeois critics share the same social function, which they wittingly or unwittingly carry out by opposing in all possible ways the growth of proletarian organization: Dispersing and reducing the popular masses to an amorphous condition, striving to divide their organizations on the basis of national, age, religious, professional, and other labels, promoting their conviction of their own helplessness and need to adapt to the existing system, and inspire everyone with the desire to seek alone his "bluebird of happiness."

The preaching of extreme individualism, man's withdrawal within himself, alienation from sociopolitical life, reduction of the opposition to bourgeois vileness to extravagant "hippie" happenings, "counterculture" phenomena, and sexual and other "revolutions" other than (God forbid!) the social revolution, the preaching of the "reveler" who does not think but simply exists (or, more accurately, vegetates) "neglected" in a totally alien world, is most emphatically promoted with all ways and means of a powerful propaganda apparatus in the hands of the rich.

Despite all this, even the most extreme reactionaries are still trying to speak of human progress. Who will take care of it in this "atomized" world of individuals? The bourgeois sociologists' answer is as simple as it is traditional: "Strong personalities," "heroes," "the elite," managers, and "supermen" who rise above the crowd. . . . Here they are trying to present the snow of yesteryear as the latest scientific data. . . .

Twentieth century progressive social thinking and global revolutionary practice proved the accuracy of the Marxist-Leninist stipulation according to which the proletariat is the only social class capable of heading and leading the working people and the exploited masses. It is the only class which could take a revolutionary action to its end, and the radical and truly comprehensive, rather than local, transformation of the social order, for, indeed, it has nothing to lose other than its chains. It is the only social class whose purpose is not to rescue the small island of its own welfare, but to deal with the entire troubled ocean of poverty, exploitation, and rightlessness.

According to Marx, with the growth of the size of the masses, the substantiation of historical action will grow, being its product (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 2, p 90). That is precisely why the meaning of the question of the role of the people's masses and personalities in history changes together with the consolidation of the proletariat within a class, its emergence in the arena of the autonomous class struggle, the instilling within the proletarian mass of a scientific awareness of its historical mission, and the involvement of millions of people in the process of conscious social creativity and of the conversion of the concerns of history into their own concerns. It is posed theoretically and resolved practically as a matter of turning initially the majority and, subsequently, the entire toiling mass into historical activists, not only "within themselves," but "for themselves," into conscious and active

collective and individual makers of history, into historical personalities. Consequently, it becomes a question of the practical conversion of a faceless mass into a real collective of comprehensively developed individuals, into a mass within which everyone has a "free personality, based on the universal development of individuals and the conversion of their collective, their social productivity into their social possession . . ." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 46, pt I, p 101).

Also changing alongside of this are the criteria used in assessing the role of outstanding personalities in history, and the very concept of the unusual individual.

Marxist-Leninist theory approaches this matter as well from dialectical-materialistic, class positions. Naturally, the historical figure must possess outstanding qualities and talents. However, he becomes such an individual not by virtue of the qualities and talents themselves, but the social conditions and social environment, the social needs, and interests he serves, and the ripe historical assignment which precisely he objectively carries out.

The exclusivity of the historical figure of the old type was explained, above all, by the "uniqueness" of his social behavior, and the contradiction between his "historical deed" and "divine vocation" and the daily affairs of the masses. However, Marx himself wrote that the "essence of the 'special individual' consists not of his beard, blood, or abstract physical nature, but of his social quality" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 1, p 242), which should be considered in terms of the individual's social functions and class role. It is precisely this role that determines the attitude of the individual toward historical necessity and his ability to contribute or, conversely, hinder social progress. This ability would have been totally incomprehensible, mystical, and supernatural had the individual not been backed by classes interested or not interested in one or another social change, and had the individual not been a storage battery for their social energy, interests, and reason, but, conversely, the stupidity of the parties representing such interests.

The inordinate nature of the historical figure was measured over the centuries by the level of contrast between his activities and the activities of the "depths," the degree to which he was distinct from the "man of the masses," and the ability to see and accomplish that which millions of people neither saw nor could see or accomplish. The opposite side of the extolling of such a historical figure was, therefore, the abasement of the masses.

From the viewpoint of the revolutionary workers movement, the inordinateness of a historical figure is determined by his ability to see, think, feel, and desire that which the masses feel and desire, but see more, understand more profoundly, and look farther than they. The measure of the greatness of a historical personality is not his distinction from the

masses but the level of harmony and of convergence with the masses. The meaning of the actions of such an individual is not to pit himself against the mass and abase it, but to comprehensively enhance it, to turn the "man of the masses" into a historical figure, a historical personality, and in guiding the masses in the historical project whose total implementation will also mean in the future the disappearance, "deletion," and "withering away" of the problem itself of pitting the role of the people's masses against the role of the individual in history.

Lenin was precisely such a great historical personality. It was precisely this understanding of the question of the role of the people's masses and the individual in history that the party he created promoted and is promoting, adopting as its programmatic objective the universal prosperity and free and comprehensive development of all. It is precisely this type of understanding that has been established in the mature socialist society which does consider man the highest social value and the aim of social development, juridically codifying this principle in its Fundamental Law. By virtue of this fact the all-round development of the individual is, in our country, a practical task, not for the distant future, but for the present.

This task is being implemented in all realms of social life--economic, sociopolitical, and spiritual. Its implementation is considered not only a consequence of the creation of a powerful material and spiritual potential within the socialist society, but a prerequisite for its further growth. It is based on the only true, the truly scientific dialectical-materialistic foundation, fully consistent with the views of historical materialism that man is a sum total of all social relations and that the wealth of the spiritual world of the individual is determined by the wealth of his social relations. This wealth grows with the development of the labor, sociopolitical, and social activeness of the individual. The purpose of the political leadership of the communist party is the all-round support, encouragement, and stimulation of such activeness and of the social creativity of the masses.

That is what gives a new meaning and significance to the old question of social philosophy. That is what determines, above all, today the theoretical and practical interest in it.

II

In Russia, as throughout the world, the Marxist view on the role of the people's masses and individuals in history was formed and asserted in the struggle against the idealistic concepts of revolutionaries who considered that the "hero," the "critically thinking individual," the motive force of progress, pitted against the inert "crowd," as well as against the opportunistic theories of spontaneity and drifting, which in turn lower the role of the political vanguard, of the revolutionary party and its leaders, within the workers movement.

It was not even a question of philosophers who had turned to the extreme individualism of M. Stirner, who claimed that "to me there is nothing higher than me," or of L. Tallada, who scornfully snorted: "What does the death of vague people's masses matter if this strengthens the individual!" (cited from G. V. Plekhanov, "Soch." [Works], vol IV, Gosizdat, Moscow, 1925, pp 246, 244). No, the arguments developed also around ideas promoted by the leading lights of revolutionary-democratic thinking, the great galaxy of Narodnaya Volya members. For familiar historical reasons they too could not discern in the people their organizing revolutionary force--the working class--which they considered only as a faceless, suffering mass, incapable of individual creativity, a mass which could be led into active struggle only by the selfless rebel heroes "going to the people."

G. V. Plekhanov was the first in Russia to offer extensive criticism to the views of the populists on the role of the individual. He proved that the theory of "heroes" and "the crowd" is nothing new, and that it was merely a rehash of the subjective-idealistic views of utopian socialism, crushingly criticized by Marx and Engels, as well as the result of the influence of Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Stirner, and O. Bauer.

Popularizing the Marxist ideas, Plekhanov proved that the development of society is determined, in the final account, not by the wishes and ideas of outstanding individuals, but the development of the material conditions of its existence, and the class struggle. It is not ideas that determine the economic situation in society but, conversely, the economic situation determines the ideas, awareness, aspirations, and interests of the people.

However, this is not to say that ideas do not play a major role in history. In his early works Marx already claimed that a material force could be overthrown only by a material force, but that ideas as well become a material force when they capture the masses. In precisely the same manner outstanding individuals may become truly such only to the extent to which they are able properly to understand how to change for the better the material living conditions of society and the extent to which they accurately express the social interests and are supported by the masses.

The great Lenin continued and completed the struggle against the populist theory of "heroes" and "the crowd," wrecking it in its entirety. In his work "What Legacy Are We Rejecting?" he wrote: "The size of the population mass which is a conscious historical personality must grow with the expansion and intensification of human historical creativity. The populist always spoke of the population in general and of the toiling population in particular as the object of one or another more or less sensible measure, and as material to be directed along one or another way. He never looked at the different population classes as independent historical figures along this way. He never raised the question of the conditions along a given way which could develop (or, conversely, paralyze) the independent and conscious activity of such makers of history" ("Poln. Sbr. Soch.," vol 2, pp 539-540).

Opposing the idealistic exaggeration of the role of the individual and the abasement of the decisive role of the people's masses in history, Marxism does not reject in the least but, conversely, emphasizes the role of their leaders, their guides. Lenin considered the communist party an organization of organizers of the masses. "No single class in history has achieved domination," Lenin claimed in the first issue of ISKRA, "unless it promoted its political leaders and leading representatives who could organize and guide the movement. The Russian working class has already proved that it can promote such people . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 4, p 375).

Since today as well we hear occasionally the old anarcho-idealistic views of the uselessness of a single leadership in the struggle waged by the people's masses, and calls for debunking any and all authority (based on shameless or deliberate confusion between the concepts of "authority" and "authoritarianist"), let us recall a few lines taken from Lenin's polemics against the opportunists. "Authorities are needed by the working class engaged throughout the world in a difficult and adamant struggle for total liberation," he wrote. "Naturally, however, only in the sense that the experience of the old fighters against oppression and exploitation, veterans of many strikes, fighters who have taken sides in many revolutions, wisened by revolutionary traditions and possessing a broad political outlook" (ibid, vol 14, p 226).

Proving the total groundlessness of populist utopias, Lenin claimed that the individual could play a positive role only if he links his activities with the struggle of the progressive social class.

The role of the people's masses has always been great. However, it rises particularly in the imperialist epoch, in the age of democratic, socialist, and national-liberation revolutions, when they are headed by the most progressive, and the most organized revolutionary class--the proletariat--while its battle vanguard--the political party standing on Marxist-Leninist positions--unites and rallies the ranks of the working class and its allies among the non-proletarian toiling strata, leading them in the struggle for socialism. The party's leadership gives the people's movement organization and awareness. It increases its power immeasurably. Revolutions in which the majority of the working people participate and which are made in the interests of the working people are truly people's.

"Marxism," Lenin pointed out, "is distinct from all other socialist theories in its outstanding combination of total scientific sobriety in the study of the objective situation and the objective course of the revolution, with the most decisive acknowledgment of the significance of the revolutionary energy, revolutionary creativity, and revolutionary initiative of the masses and, naturally, of individuals, groups, organizations, and parties which are able to feel about for and establish ties with one or another class" (ibid, vol 16, p 23).

Lenin's great historical merit lies also in the fact that he created a consistently revolutionary party of the working class, arming it with a

Marxist understanding of the laws of social development and the theory of the means for achieving the victory of the proletariat in the struggle against capitalism, tempering it in the fire of revolutionary battles. In the course of this struggle the party consistently defended the interests of the people. It became its tested leader. It brought the working people to power and to the creation of the first socialist state in the world.

Proceeding from the basic interests of the working class and all working people whose most essential and main feature is the total elimination of the exploitation of man by man fully coincide, at all stages in the struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution the party created by Lenin engaged in the political education and organization not only of the proletariat, but of all social strata whose interests at a given time were close to or could, in the future, come close to its own interests. Constant work among the masses, reliance on the masses, and the strictest possible consideration of the mentality, moods, level of consciousness, and organization of the masses in the formulation of its tactical line is the most characteristic feature of the Marxist-Leninist party. This radically separates a truly revolutionary party from various types of sectarian and conspiratorial groups and reformist parties to whom fear of the masses and politicking are inherent. The history of our party is the most indicative example of the struggle for the masses, and for winning over millions of people on the side of the working class.

The victory of the socialist revolution which inaugurates the transitional period from capitalism to socialism is the first act in building an essentially new social system which arises not spontaneously but as a result of planned and conscious activities. In that period tens of millions of people, not divided, but collectively organized, aware of their objective and how to reach it, become involved in conscious historical creativity. Socialism is, precisely, the life, the conscious creativity of the toiling masses, united and headed by the party. This is precisely a time when, in Engels' words, "The unification of people within a society which so far opposed them as imposed above nature and history, now becomes their own free cause. Objective and alien forces which have dominated history until then fall under the control of the people themselves. It is only as of that moment that the people begin to make their own history quite consciously. It is only then that the social reasons they bring into motion will have the predominating and ever-growing consequences which they desire. This is a leap taken by mankind from the kingdom of necessity into the kingdom of freedom" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 20, p 295).

III

The bourgeois historians, like all social-reformist and revisionist authors, are still trying to explain how the socialist revolution in Russia could win so rapidly, decisively, and irreversibly. A number of speculations have been expressed, however along with glimmers of truth, such as,

for example, Lenin's theoretical, political, and organizational genius, the extremely high level of organization, discipline, ideological unity, and dedication of the Bolshevik party, its tactical flexibility and inflexible purposefulness, and the flabbiness and splintering of the forces of the White Guard reaction (or, as it is splendidly extolled, the "democracy"). All this is acknowledged by D. Kennan [sic] and L. Shapiro, along with others, more-or-less well-informed researchers, displaying a certain objectivity or attempting to present themselves as objective.

However, in the final account, all their views are reduced to proving the accidental and unique nature of the socialist revolution in Russia, depicting it as a certain product of the activities of an energetic group of conspirators, as a historical twist which, it is claimed, could have been avoided. . . .

Happily, the conditional mode is counterindicated in history. Historical materialism teaches us to seek the explanation of events in the specific circumstances which created them, in the reasons for the actions of the people's masses, in the behavior of the classes and their components and, naturally, in the activities of political parties and leaders, as expressing most fully and properly the aspirations of the confronting sides.

R. Luxemburg, the great revolutionary, immediately sensed the very essence of the event. Substantiating the political credo of the "Spartacus Alliance," she wrote that the proletarian revolution "is not the desperate attempt of a handful of revolutionaries to remake the world by force in their ideal, but the cause of a multimillion strong army of working people called upon to perform their historical mission and turn historical necessity into reality" (Rosa Luxemburg, "Gesammelte Werke" [Complete Works], vol 4, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1974, p 445).

She clearly indicated the force which organized and headed this army: "Lenin's party was the only one to realize the mission and duty of a truly revolutionary party and, through its slogan "All Power in the Hands of the Proletariat and the Peasantry!" insured the progress of the revolution.

"It was thus that the Bolsheviks were able to settle the famous question of the 'majority of the people.' . . . The road leads not through a 'majority' to a revolutionary tactic, but conversely, through a revolutionary tactic to a 'majority'" (ibid, p 341).

The decisive role of the masses and classes representing the progressive forces of a given society becomes particularly clear under the conditions of a revolutionary situation. However, it is precisely during such times of "non-gradual" development that political parties and their leaders must pass just as clearly their graduation tests.

In a single decade (1894-1903) Lenin was able to unite the revolutionary Marxist party which subsequently, in less than 15 years, developed into the

most influential social force in the country, which organized the entire working class in the struggle, and with slogans understood by even the most forgotten toiling strata, was able to involve them at the decisive time on the side of the proletariat and head the victorious socialist revolution. This irrefutably confirms both the entirely exceptional role played by Lenin personally, his theory, and his organizational work, as well as the role of the party he created in the gigantic acceleration of the historical process.

Here is an example of the opposite. Like all developed European capitalist countries, Germany had greater material prerequisites for a conversion to socialism compared with the Russia of 1917. The imperialist contradictions developed into the 1918-1919 revolutions in Germany and in Austria-Hungary. Soviet republics were founded in Bavaria, Hungary, Slovakia, and Finland. However, they were defeated by the united forces of the foreign and domestic counterrevolution, and the "birth pains" of the new society there produced abortions such as the Weimar Republic.

The reasons for this turn of events may be expressed in the words of one of the most noted proletarian leaders, K. Liebknecht, who justifiably noted that, "The ripening of society for socialism depends not only on the conditions of its economic development, but also on overall social development in the broadest meaning of the term, and above all on the extent of the consciousness, understanding, will, strength of resolve, and ability to act on the part of the proletariat, and the spiritual, moral, and mental level of development of the toiling masses . . ." (Karl Liebknecht, "Gesammelte Reden und Schriften" [Complete Speeches and Writings], vol IX, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1971, p 489).

One may object that, as a whole, the German working class was better educated and earlier took the way of autonomous political struggle compared with the Russian.

This, naturally, is true by comparing individual data. What was missing? An organization, an awareness of the topical nature of the revolution on the part of the broad masses, which could be given to the proletariat only by a Marxist-Leninist party headed by leaders, not only infinitely loyal, dedicated, and tirelessly thirsty for revolutionary action, but theoretically and politically mature, experienced, capable, even in the most complex and rapidly changing situations, to "consider strictly scientifically the objective content of the historical process at a given specific time and a given specific circumstance . . ." (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 26, p 139).

At that time there were no such parties in Europe other than in Russia. This was realized by Lenin, who even before receiving the news of the outbreak of a revolution in Germany, sadly noted, on 9 October 1918: "The greatest trouble and danger facing Europe is that it does not have a revolutionary party. There are parties of traitors, such as Scheideman,

Renaudel, Henderson, Webb and company, or lackeys, such as Kautsky. There is no revolutionary party.

"Naturally, a powerful revolutionary movement of the masses could correct this shortcoming. However, it remains a great trouble and a great threat" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 37, pp 109-110).

Indeed, the movement of the masses corrected this shortcoming. However, the Scheidemans and the Kautskys were able to hinder at length the revolutionary process by selling and betraying the working class and acting as factual accomplices of the bourgeoisie.

On the basis of not only the victorious experience of the October Revolution, but of the failed socialist revolutions in individual Western countries, Lenin drew the conclusion of the role and place of the working-class party in history, a conclusion which has remained just as topical today and applicable to any country in which a socialist revolution is still a matter for the future. "The communist party alone," he wrote, "if it is indeed the vanguard of the revolutionary class, if it includes all its best representatives, if it consists of fully conscientious and loyal communists, instructed and tempered by the experience of adamant revolutionary struggle, and if such a party has been able to link inseparably its entire life with its class and, through it, the entire mass of the exploited, and instill full confidence in this class and this mass, only such a party could head the proletariat in the most merciless, decisive, and final struggle against all the forces of capitalism. On the other hand, it is only under the leadership of such a party that the proletariat could deploy the entire power of its revolutionary pressure . . . a power which is immeasurably greater than its share of the population . . ." (ibid, vol 41, p 187).

The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia marked the beginning of the radical social reorganization of the country which took place in exceptionally complex and truly unique conditions.

To begin with, the proletarian revolution broke out in a single country presenting an inordinate variety of socioeconomic conditions and national and cultural traditions and ways of life, with a catastrophic status of the economy, a disastrous situation as to cadres, triggered by the general low cultural development (three-quarters of the population were illiterate), and the active sabotage of a considerable percentage of the technical intelligentsia and most specialists and white collar workers.

Furthermore, and this is extremely important, from the very first day of its existence the socialist state had to join in the fierce struggle against the internal counterrevolution and foreign intervention. Whereas in December 1920 Lenin was able to report to the Eighth Congress of Soviets that "we were able to wean from waging a war against us a number of great powers, but do not know for how long" (ibid, vol 42, p 136), one year

later, after Vrangel' had finally been defeated and peace with Poland made, at the next congress of soviets, he called upon, with full justification, "to remember that we are surrounded by people, classes, and governments who are openly expressing their greatest hatred for us," and "remember that we are always a hairbreadth away from an invasion" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 44, p 296).

Indeed, after five years of foreign intervention and civil war imposed upon the country by the imperialists who had organized and supplied the internal counterrevolution with everything necessary, the country had to experience the Kurzon and Chamberlain ultimatums, the banditry supported by the West (Bulak-Balakhovich and other atamans and "bat'kas"), the basmaks in Central Asia, guided by British instructors and operating with weapons and funds provided by British imperialists, the hunger blockade of the Soviet state, and the repeated direct attempts to test the strength of the new social system with bayonets. Finally, let us not forget the last and most dangerous attempt against socialism on the part of the shock forces of imperialism--fascist Germany and its satellites.

During virtually this entire period the Soviet people, carrying out under the leadership of the Leninist party its historical project, was forced most of the time, either arms in hand, to fight off the imperialists and their hirelings, or repair the terrible destruction they inflicted. It is also absolutely necessary to take into consideration that everything our party had worked for since October 1917 and it encountered in its daily activities represented, and still does, the opening of new, totally virgin roads.

What was the source of this inflexible belief in the final victory, this striking historical optimism which never abandoned Lenin, his students, and his party, even in most difficult and seemingly fatal situations? What was the source of the unusual tenacity and vitality of Leninism?

The theory and practice of scientific communism provide a simple answer to this: The fact that the Leninist always believed in the creative forces of the people's masses and relied on them; the fact that the Bolshevik ideas, appeals, and accomplishments were consistent with the thoughts and hopes of the overwhelming majority of working people and took into consideration the extent of their conscientiousness and readiness to accept the party's programs as their life's goal and fight unsparingly for their materialization; the fact that the Bolsheviks never trampled on one spot, turning to those who hesitated, to the stragglers and to those who fell on the side, yet never raising themselves above the class which had created them, above the mass of toiling people.

From the time of the "Petersburg Association for the Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class" to this day, the Leninists have been guided by the ideas of the founder of Bolshevism, who, while condemning tailism, gradualness, and opportunism, believed that the purpose of the

party was not to reflect the average condition of the masses, but to lead the masses and be their battle vanguard (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 35, p 94). Cautioning against any political adventurism and the desire of a revolutionary party to do everything itself and "do a great favor" to the masses, Lenin pointed out that "the vanguard can carry out its assignments as a vanguard only when it is able not to separate itself from the masses it leads, but factually to lead the entire mass" (ibid, vol 45, p 23).

Such is the chain of historical facts, rather than petty facts especially plucked out of history. To whom did the Leninist party address itself in the most difficult and complex times for the Soviet state?

To the working class, the toiling masses, to the people, and only to them.

Let us recall Lenin's famous appeals "To the Citizens of Russia!" and "To All Party Members and All Toiling Classes in Russia" (October-November 1917), his decrees on peace and land and Declaration of the Rights of the Toiling and Exploited People; the appeals "The Socialist Fatherland Is in Danger!" "To the Workers of Petersburg," "All in the Struggle Against Denikin!" "On Hunger," "To the Comrades Red Army Men!" "To the Struggle Against the Fuel Crisis," and "To the Aid of the Wounded Army Man!" The letters to the Petrograd workers on helping the Eastern Front, to the workers and peasants on the subject of the victory over Kolchak, to the comrade communists of Turkestan, comrade communists of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Armenia, Dagestan, and the Gori Republic, the appeal to the peasants of the Ukraine calling for victory on the civil war fronts, the struggle against the fuel and transport crises and for grain for the proletarian centers, and many others; and his addresses at the eighth party congress on work in the countryside and the 10th congress where the New Economic Policy was being substantiated, and its pamphlet on the food tax and speech at the Third Komsomol Congress. . . . All of them were aimed at involving in the building of socialism not merely the working class, but the multimillion-strong and socially heterogeneous mass of non-proletarian toiling strata!

Lenin's appeals invariably met with a response in the hearts and minds of the people, for they expressed their needs and requirements, and pointed out means for improving the working and living conditions acceptable to the different working population strata and groups, and means for the socialist reorganization of their entire way of life.

With all this, Lenin and Lenin's party never set themselves up as creators. They did not build paper "models" of the desired social system, as was typical of the old and contemporary utopians, not to speak of the political charlatans and turncoats. Unlike even the greatest minds of the past, who tried mentally to design a picture of the future in all its details, Lenin soberly pointed out that, "We do not claim that either Marx or the Marxists know the way to socialism in its entire specificity. This would be stupid. We know the direction followed on this way. We know the class forces which lead to it. However, in specific, in practical terms, this will be indicated only by the experience of the millions, when they take up this matter" (ibid, vol 34, p 116).

Lenin was not bothered whenever anything planned and resolved by the party turned out, in reality, not entirely so, or even not so at all. This cannot be avoided in any new project. Even the greatest and most brilliant prediction cannot encompass all the details of the future which is being created. Lenin tirelessly explained to those in a hurry, present at all times, that "no sensible socialist who describes the future has ever even conceived that with any given ukase we could organize and form in one fell swoop the type of organization of the new society." He added that, "Only collective experience, the experience of millions of people, could provide decisive instructions in this respect. . . . We are relying on joint experience, on the experience of the millions of working people" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 36, pp 379-380).

Formulating a scientific plan for the building of socialism in a stratified, multinational country, wrecked by imperialists and White Guards, Lenin and the Leninist party took into consideration that it will be built not by angels, but by people who had become not only physically but mentally degenerated after centuries of domination of private ownership, and that the victory of such people in building a new life should also be a victory over themselves, over the traditions and customs of the old, obsolete, yet not fully outlived social system which could contaminate the new one with the poison of mistrust, pessimism, cynicism, and individualistic morality.

This was a plan based on the selfless and intensive work of the entire Soviet people, for the sake of the great objective which also triggered great energy.

Seventeen months after the victory of the October Revolution Lenin noted the tremendous difficulties of managing a huge country with a miserably small number of people who had the proper skill and the required cultural standard to do so. "In Russia this stratum was thin and in the course of the struggle it became overstrained and overworked, having accomplished more than it could," he said (*ibid*, vol 38, p 145). This made it even more vital to go into the thick of the popular masses and seek among them talents which had been suppressed by the land-owning capitalist system before the revolution, but which now had to rise in their full stature, assuming personal responsibility for their destinies and the destinies of their fatherland. Lenin's conclusion was to ". . . involve in soviet work workers and peasants on the middle level and even below it" (*ibid*).

The transition from the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie to the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., from bourgeois to proletarian statehood, which meant true democracy for the working people, was marked by a tremendous growth of the social and political activity of the masses. The party directed this process, guided by Lenin's instructions on the development of socialist democracy, which should consist of the fact that "along with gradual and cautiously selected, but steadily implemented measures, the entire working population must be literally involved in independent

participation in the administration of the state" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 38, p 93), and his demand that "let every worker become imbued with the awareness that he is ruling the country" (ibid, vol 40, p 322). Lenin tirelessly reminded of the need to train workers and peasants as administrators and thrifty managers and political leaders on a broad scale. ". . . If it wishes to defeat the bourgeoisie," he wrote, "the proletariat must develop its own, proletarian, 'class politicians,' who would be as skillful as the bourgeois politicians" (ibid, vol 41, p 65).

The party honorably fulfilled Lenin's behests. After his death it not only preserved but strengthened its role as the guiding force of Soviet society capable of "leading the entire people to socialism, and directing and organizing the new system, and be the teacher, guide, and leader of all working people . . ." (ibid, vol 33, p 26). Lenin's idea of the growth of the role of the communist party in the building of socialism--a process which is consciously and purposefully implemented by millions of people--was fully confirmed.

Eliminating the resistance of renegades and capitulationists within its own ranks, which does not exhaust the ideological struggle by far, and frequently exceeds the framework of party mindedness and even Soviet legality (suffice it to point out the actions of opportunists who reflected the pressure of the petit bourgeois element and bourgeois ideology on the working class, the nationalists, and other renegades), the party relied on the creative forces awakened in the people by the revolution.

The faith of the masses in the Leninist party and the awareness of the accuracy and consistency of its policy with the interests of the working people, brought to life social phenomena which exceeded the understanding of philistine bourgeois ideologues and their occasionally unexpected allies. Specifically, these phenomena include:

The communist subbotniks, which Lenin described as the great initiative;

The victories of the workers-peasant Red Army in the intervention and Civil War over numerous enemies superior in training, experience, armaments, and supplies, which amazed the world;

The mass socialist competition, the movement of shock workers in the first five-year plans, the counterplans, the movement for mastering new equipment, and the Stakhanovite movement;

The industrial, political, and cultural linking of town with country, and the sponsorship of the country by the town;

Selfless aid by nations leading in their political, socioeconomic, and cultural development, and above all by the Russian people and Russian working class to the peoples of Central Asia, Kazakhstan, the Far East, and the Extreme North in the creation of a modern industry and scientific and

cultural centers, as a result of which all nations and nationalities in the Soviet Union, regardless of disparities in their initial starting points, computed not in terms of years and decades, but entire historical ages, were able to reach socialism simultaneously and have currently achieved factual equality in terms of all social and cultural parameters;

The mass exploit of the Soviet troops, which shook up the entire world in rising to defend the first state in human history without exploiters and without the oppression of man by man, built for themselves and for their children, and, perhaps less noticeable yet no less important to the fate of our land and of all nations in the world, the exploit of the fighters on the labor front in the Great Patriotic War.

Finally, the postwar rebirth and building of developed socialism in the USSR.

All of these are phenomena which cannot be rationally explained from the positions of the bourgeois philosopher or the authors of numerous homespun "models" of socialism, ranging from "democratic" and "with a human face," to the Maoist, the barracks socialism which Beijing's Pol Pot puppets imported and applied most disgracefully in Kampuchea.

IV

All this cannot be ignored. All this cannot be explained without strengthening the faith of the oppressed and exploited in the capitalist world in the possibility to make their own revolution in accordance with the national-historical characteristics and conditions of their country. All that is left to the supporters of capitalism is to conceal the truth from the masses, to slander real socialism and the people who were the first to build it, and our communist party--the organizer of this building.

Representatives of various bourgeois "scientific" schools and trends have long been involved in this dirty project, for as long as the Soviet state has existed, stealing from one another "arguments" and supporting them with the revelations of communist renegades imbued with helpless hatred.

Today, not unrelated to the powerful peaceful offensive of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist comity, once again we note a growth of anti-communist and anti-Soviet hysteria whose purpose is to distract the attention of the working people in the capitalist countries from the urgent problems of our time, from the new manifestations of the general crisis of capitalism and the dangerous military preparations conducted by imperialist reaction. The enemies of socialism do not look far for grounds for their ideological attacks aimed, above all, against our homeland, the Leninist party, and the Soviet state. Once again they have selected the occasion of the centennial of J. V. Stalin's birth. The anti-Soviet centers abroad and bourgeois mass-information media, in an effort to discredit the socialist system, are continuing to speculate on the factual

and fabricated errors and misuses of power which were committed by Stalin at a given time. Attempts are made to fabricate some kind of "Stalinism" as a particular system of theoretical views and sociopolitical practices. Slanderous fabrications are being piled up concerning the history of the building of socialism and "arguments" are being promoted aimed at belittling the decisive contribution of the Soviet Union to the victorious outcome of World War II; the victory of socialism and the successes of the building of communism in the USSR are being questioned, all under the pretext of criticizing Stalin and "Stalinism."

The desire to depict negative phenomena related to the cult of personality as, allegedly, organic features of Soviet society is characteristic of imperialist and revisionist propaganda. Some right-wing revisionists reach, in their slander, the open denial of the communist nature of our party and the socialist nature of the Soviet state. In their anti-Soviet propaganda the Maoists are steadily praising and "defending" Stalin, extensively using in this case the Trotskyite theses of the bourgeois degeneration of Soviet society. In the final account, all the efforts of bourgeois and revisionist propaganda serve the common objective of lowering and weakening the influence of Marxist-Leninist ideas and the achievements and experience of socialism in the USSR, and to promote confusion in the ranks of the international communist, workers, and entire liberation movements.

The positions of our party on this matter are principled and clear. A Marxist-Leninist and historically accurate assessment of Stalin's activities and their positive and negative sides may be found in an entire series of party documents--the decisions of the 20th congress, the CC CPSU decree "On Surmounting the Cult of Personality and Its Consequences," dated 30 June 1956, the Central Committee theses "50 Years of the Great October Socialist Revolution," the speeches by party leaders, and PRAVDA's editorial "On the Occasion of the 90th Anniversary of J.V. Stalin's Birth."

The CPSU firmly condemned violations of socialist legality, gross misuses of power and violations of the Leninist norms and principles of collective leadership, and all distortions caused by the cult of personality. Yet, as the CC CPSU theses on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution emphasized, such "distortions, regardless of how serious they were, did not change the nature of the socialist society or weaken the foundations of socialism. The party and the people deeply believed in the communist cause. They worked enthusiastically, implementing the Leninist ideals, surmounting difficulties and temporary failures and errors."

The extensive work done by our party to surmount the consequences of the cult of personality, the further development of socialist democracy, and the systematic Leninist line followed in ideological-political matters had a favorable influence on all sides of social life. "The party," pointed out Comrade L.I. Brezhnev at the 24th CPSU Congress, "ascribed great importance to the accurate and objective interpretation of the history of

our state. Individual attempts to assess from non-party and non-class positions the historical way of the Soviet people and to belittle the significance of their socialist gains were subjected to sharp and just criticism. At the same time, the party proved the groundlessness of dogmatic concepts which ignored the great positive changes which have taken place in the life of our society in recent years."

The conclusions contained in the party documents counter with equal effectiveness two extremes which distort the objective nature of the historical process: On the one hand, hostile attempts to discredit the Soviet system and make the party responsible for errors committed personally by Stalin; on the other, to ascribe it all successes and victories gained by the party and the people along the heroic way of the building of socialism and in the Great Patriotic War.

Guided by the party documents our science of history, political and fiction literature, and the party press, are extensively covering the revolutionary movement and the building of socialism and communism in the country. They are showing the decisive role which the people's masses play in it and the guiding and directing role of the Leninist party. They depict the activities of outstanding party and state leaders, military commanders, innovators and leading workers in socialist production, scientists, and masters of the arts. This literature also objectively shows Stalin's role in the period of the building of socialism and the Great Patriotic War and his activities as a big organizer, and his participation in the struggle against Trotskyism and right-wing opportunism. It depicts Stalin's complexity and contradictoriness as a leader and a man, perspicaciously characterized by Lenin in his familiar letters to the party.

Our party and people objectively assess both the positive and the negative sides of Stalin's activities. This is a Leninist approach consist with historical truth.

Today, one-quarter of a century later, there would be no need to go back to any aspect of this problem, for the documents we mentioned provide a thorough analysis of the objective reasons and subjective motives which triggered the cult of personality--a phenomenon alien to Marxism-Leninism--and define Stalin's true role in the process of the struggle for the socialist reorganization of society and the defense and consolidation of socialist gains. Yet, since it is raised again and again abroad, obviously not for unselfish reasons, let us, once again, recall the most essential aspects of the activities of this unquestionably important personality.

Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin (Dzhugashvili) (21 December 1879-5 March 1953) was a professional revolutionary of the Bolshevik school who became familiar from an early age with the difficulties and dangers of clandestine work and struggle, czarist jails, and exile. Party Central Committee member since 1912. In October 1917, became member of the Party Center for the

Leadership of the Armed Uprising; in the first Soviet government was people's commissar in charge of nationalities affairs. Central Committee Politburo member since its institution. Central Committee general secretary since 1922; from 1941 to the end of his life he combined this position with the position of chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and, subsequently, USSR Council of Ministers. During the Great Patriotic War was also people's commissar of defense, chairman of the State Committee for Defense and Supreme Commander in Chief of the country's Armed Forces. Elected to a high position in the RKP(b) during Lenin's lifetime and with his knowledge, following the death of the leader Stalin became the most noted leader of the party and Soviet state. Heading the Central Committee in the course of three decades, he expressed through his printed and oral addresses the collectively formulated Leninist domestic and foreign party policy, and summed up the experience in the building of socialism.

We must not fail to note that on three occasions at least Stalin differed with Lenin in his judgments: On the agrarian problem, at the Fourth Congress of RSWP (1906); on the question of the attitude toward the bourgeois Provisional Government, in the first days following the February Revolution of 1917; and on the problem of the national-governmental structure of the USSR (1922). However, first of all, he always adopted Lenin's viewpoint, the moment he clarified it for his own benefit, and secondly he never fought against Lenin, invariably considering himself his student and follower.

Stalin did not introduce in Marxist-Leninist theory anything which did not essentially agree with its basic conclusions. In the 30 June 1956 CC CPSU decree he is described as an outstanding theoretician and propagandist of Marxism-Leninism. Works of his, such as "Marxism and the National Problem" (1913), "On the Foundations of Leninism," and "The October Revolution and the Tactic of the Russian Communists" (1924); "On the Problems of Leninism" (1926), "On the Social Democratic Deviation in Our Party," and "Once Again on the Social Democratic Deviation in Our Party" (1926); and "On the Deviation to the Right in the VKP(b)" (1929), and the Central Committee accountability reports which he submitted at party congresses were a definite contribution to the revolutionary theory and the struggle waged by our party for the implementation of the Leninist plan for building socialism in the USSR, the consolidation and development of the international communist movement, and peace and universal security. This means that there could not even be a question of any kind of "Stalinism" as an ideological current within the Marxist-Leninist doctrine or outside it. The cult of Stalin's personality, which developed by virtue of familiar specific-historical circumstances and Stalin's individual qualities, could not be considered for this very reason as having naturally appeared, even though, to a certain extent, it was linked with communist ideology which invariably guided the party in the course of all its activities.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism not only theoretically substantiated the role of the people's masses in history but, through their long practical

work, promoted the unification of the forces of the working people and their involvement in the active class struggle. Marx, Engels, and Lenin nipped in the bud even the slightest attempts at their personal extolling. They did not tolerate doting. Throughout their lives they fought the cult of personality and strictly condemned all its manifestations. In his works and public addresses Stalin also always spoke out against any exaggeration of the role of any individual in general and of himself, in particular, pointing out that, "The time is past when the leaders were considered the only makers of history, while the workers and peasants were not taken into consideration. . . . Workers and peasants who build plants and factories, mines and railroad, and kolkhozes and sovkhoses without fuss and noise, who create all the goods of life, and who feed and clothe the entire world, are the true heroes and makers of the new life" ("Voprosy Leninizma" [Problems of Leninism], Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1952, pp 457-458). The contradiction within his activities is found, precisely, in the fact that, occasionally, he combined in practice his unquestionable loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and readiness to engage in an uncompromising struggle against any deviation whatever from revolutionary theory, with leadership methods rejected by Marxism-Leninism. While comprehensively fighting for the victory of socialism, at the same time, Stalin allowed himself and others to violate the theory of the inviolable principles of socialist democracy and the Leninist norms of party life and principles of party leadership.

Let us particularly note that, occasionally, Stalin did not make a major distinction between management methods objectively dictated by the characteristics of the class struggle and war times, and the methods of organizational work consistent with conditions of peaceful constructive work. ". . . The main task of the proletarian revolution," Lenin said, delivering the RKP(b) Central Committee Accountability Report to the eighth party congress, "is precisely an organizational task. It is not without reason that organizational problem here is assigned an outstanding role. In this area we must struggle with all possible means decisively, firmly, again and again. We shall accomplish nothing without long education and reeducation. This is an area in which revolutionary violence and dictatorship may be misused and I would like to caution you against such a misuse. Revolutionary violence and dictatorship are excellent things if applied when necessary and with those against whom it is necessary. In the field of organization, however, they cannot be applied" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 38, pp 148-149). It is precisely this Leninist behest that Stalin did not always honor. At the May 1977 CC CPSU Plenum, at which the draft of the new USSR Constitution was discussed, recalling cases of unjustified repressions and violations of socialist law which darkened several years, Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said: "This was done in violation of constitutional stipulations. The party firmly condemned this practice which must never be repeated."

It would be stupid and anti-historical to deny or belittle the harm which the cult of personality caused to our development. However, it would be no less stupid and anti-historical to assume that it changed the nature of the

socialist system and the direction of its progress, for, in the final account, both depend on the nature of the historical creativity of the masses. Because of its nature, the entire time following the October Revolution it remained truly revolutionary and socialist. Those were precisely the qualities which our party always developed in it.

The specific study of the various stages of the hard and complex period of the building of socialism in the USSR and of its contemporary universal-historical process provide no grounds whatever for hostile or naive-ignorant fabrications according to which Stalin's activities "deformed" social development and signified the party's deviation from Marxism-Leninism in the direction of a "Stalinism" which had never existed. Attempts to single out in the history of Soviet society a certain "period of the cult of personality" as a "special" step are aimed at slurring over the objective-scientific concept of the establishment of the new system. Equally groundless are the efforts of the Maoists who draw on Stalin to justify their hegemonistic and great-power chauvinistic policy and their own leftist-bureaucratic and social-militaristic work methods, which unquestionably are unsuitable under socialism and are rejected by our party.

It should be said most definitely that the excessive exaggeration of both Stalin's positive and negative qualities and to endow him with the supernatural features either of an angel or a demon come closer to mysticism and superstition than to science. It gives the authors of such elaborations either an idealistic approach or, most frequently, the desire to conceal behind a verbal cover their own rejection of real socialism. Also totally unfounded is the attempt to lead the assessment of Stalin's activities beyond the "framework of the materialistic concepts of history" under the farfetched pretext that "he was above this." This could be claimed only by those who are at odds with Marxism.

Even during the time of Stalin's activities, our party followed the Leninist course firmly and steadfastly in the main, the essential activities. It always turned to the people's masses and considered that the viability of its policies rested on their support. In its sociohistorical content this was not a "period of cult of personality," but a period of establishment of the new social system, initially in our country and subsequently in a number of other countries in Europe and Asia, and of the establishment of the world socialist system. The cult of personality did not change the general direction of the progress of society along the steps of the economic, sociopolitical, and ideological maturity of socialism; even though to a certain extent it slowed down the process of development of socialist democracy, it did not stop it, as proved by the adoption of the 1936 USSR Constitution, which for the first time in state-legal practice eliminated all political restrictions and established full juridical equality among all citizens regardless of their social, national, or religious affiliation, guaranteeing them rights and freedoms inaccessible to the masses in the bourgeois society. Also important during that

period was the strengthening of interparty democracy locally, with the introduction of the secret ballot in electing leading party organs at all levels and the banning of co-optation and of list voting.

Armed with hindsight the anti-Soviets write that under the party's influence the Soviet people carried out the accelerated industrialization of the country, which caused a number of difficulties and deprivations. Naturally the stress was exceptionally high and our country's population felt a great deal of shortages of frequently most basic items. This was comprehensively helped by the imperialist encirclement. However, the Soviet people consciously made sacrifices for the sake of freedom, independence, and socialism. The fact that such sacrifices were not made in vain was proved by the victory in the Great Patriotic War and the postwar restoration and development of the country.

We are accused of promoting the forced socialist reorganization of agriculture. However, the fact that the process of collectivization began from the very first days of the life of the Soviet state and that the "great turning point," the decisive turn of the peasantry toward kolkhozes, whose 50th anniversary is marked this year, was prepared by the long political and economic-organizational experience of the overwhelming majority of rural workers, who wished no longer to vegetate in poverty, ignorance, and capitalist slavery, is quite deliberately suppressed. This a movement of the masses themselves, for "never would millions of people listen to the party's advice unless such advice coincided with what they had learned through their own experience" (V.I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 32, p 178).

Errors were made as well. Thus, some excessively zealous persons would occasionally classify peasants of average means as kulaks, as capitalist elements in the villages. However, exposing this exaggeration, the party condemned such zealots as accomplices of the enemies of socialism. As to the fact that prior to the adoption of the 1936 USSR Constitution the former exploiters had been deprived of electoral rights, the Soviet people and the CPSU do not intend to apologize either to them or to anyone else. Under the specific conditions of a specific country such was the stern logic of the class struggle, which developed in the other socialist countries quite differently. It would be just as strange to apologize for the defeat of the interventionists and White Guards in the Civil War, the overcoming of sabotage and counterrevolution, and the deprivation of the landowners and capitalists of private ownership of productive capital, making it public ownership of the people's masses--its creators and real owners.

Stalin was arbitrary toward many former or imaginary members of various kinds of anti-party groups and deviations. In the 1950's the people who had been slandered or subjected to excessive punishment were rehabilitated, while those guilty of exceeding their power and violating socialist legality were chastised. However, this does not mean that a political amnesty was granted to deliberate Trotskyites, Zinovievites, right-wing

deviationists, and nationalists who had engaged in subversive struggle and had called for the overthrow of the Soviet system. Our party has always vigilantly protected and is protecting its ideological and organizational unity, and has neither admitted, nor will admit, any "ideological pluralism" in its ranks.

The novelty, unusual and unprecedented nature and totally incomparable scale of the building of socialism, the lack of any previous experience whatever, and the involvement in active social work of millions of working people who had lacked the opportunity to prove themselves under capitalism represented a tremendous source of difficulties and contradictions. The errors which may be made in the course of building a new society trigger the gloating of the enemies of socialism and is willingly depicted by them as social vices. Lenin always gave a worthy answer to such sallies. "We do not forget even for a minute, indeed, we had and have many failures and errors," he wrote on the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the October Revolution. "Were that we could avoid failures and errors in such a new undertaking in universal history as the creation of an as yet unseen type of governmental system!" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 44, p 148).

"We are not afraid of admitting our errors," Lenin said, "and we shall soberly look at them to learn how to correct them" (ibid, p 150). Our errors have nothing in common with the "errors" of the bourgeoisie, which are the manifestation of its antagonism toward the working people, inevitable under capitalism. "Antagonism and contradiction are quite different things. Under socialism, the first will disappear, while the second will remain" ("Leninskiy Sbornik XI" [Leninist Collection XI], Moscow-Leningrad, 1929, p 357). It is precisely the non-antagonistic nature of contradictions within the mass of the working people, united by a common class interest and inspired by the communist ideal, that explains the fact that despite their entire historical determination, our errors and shortcomings "are merely the growing-pains of the new socialist society" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 36, p 143).

It is possible to learn how to win, Lenin said, only by not fearing to admit defeats, by learning from the experience of failures, by not fearing "to tell even the most bitter and difficult truth bluntly . . ." (ibid, vol 44, p 210).

Another stipulation of Lenin's "science of winning" is always to bear in mind the "primacy" of socialism, its universal-historical rightness. To allow because of errors made by revolutionaries the censoring of all their activities, even though such errors do not characterize them in their entirety, and to instill in the members of the socialist society a kind of inferiority complex, even though such a complex, in our age, should afflict the obsolete class, the bourgeoisie, means to give moral aid to the class enemy. "Anyone who, in the struggle against the distortion of the new system, forgets its content, forgets that the working class created and is guiding a state of a soviet type, he simply does not know how to think and

is babbling away" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 44, p 106). The most important guarantees for the durability and viability of the socialist system are healthy scientific self-criticism within our society, the party's systematic self-investigation of its own decisions and practical steps, and their control through mass activities, as well as making occasional corrections in its tactical line while inviolably pursuing a Leninist strategy.

"From the height we have reached now," noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the report "50 Years of Great Victories of Socialism," "it is no longer so difficult to see the omissions and errors which occurred in the past. Unquestionably, something could have been done faster, better, or cheaper. However, in order to objectively assess the distance covered we must always remember that each step was to us a search. Each forward motion was accomplished in the course of an adamant struggle against enemies within the country and in the world arena."

Confident of the correctness of its political course and the justice of its cause, on its own initiative, without any outside coercion, at its 20th congress, boldly and decisively the Leninist party told the entire world of the harm which the cult of personality and related phenomena, alien to socialism, had caused Soviet society. As confirmed by the 30 June 1956 CC CPSU decree, this was accomplished efficiently, with a thorough analysis of the lessons of the past and with conclusions for the future.

At its October 1964 Plenum the party's Central Committee condemned just as firmly and uncompromisingly subjectivistic and voluntaristic improvisations, alien to the Leninist style of management. It fully restored the Leninist norms of party life. To the CPSU and the Soviet people all these are resolved problems. They are looking far into the future and marching forward. A moral-political atmosphere has been created in the party and the country in which it is easy to breathe, live in peace, and work well, an atmosphere of reciprocal exactingness and concerned attitude toward people.

The 23d, 24th, and 25th congresses confirmed the ever-growing theoretical, political, and organizational strength of our party, its unbreakable ties with the people, and its ability, as Lenin wrote, "to consider practical experience in order to reject what is harmful, put together everything valuable, and accurately formulate a number of immediate practical measures and implement them at all cost . . ." (ibid, vol 40, p 144).

While acknowledging the decisive role of the people's masses in social development and taking into consideration the factor of their growing consciousness, particularly in the course of the building of socialism and under the conditions of developed socialism, the materialistic understanding of history does not allow any belittling of the party's role as the political vanguard of a people building communism. On the contrary, the complexity, innovative nature, and greatness of the tasks facing society necessarily require the further growth of the influence of the communist party as its collective leader, organizer, and educator.

As early as the years of struggle against Menshevik opportunism, Lenin noted that the Mensheviks "belittled the materialistic understanding of history through their neglect of the factual leading and guiding role which parties which are aware of the material conditions for change and which have assumed the leadership of the progressive classes could and should play in history" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 11, p 31). The Leninist party proved the accuracy of this concept through facts. Under its leadership, for the first time in the world a developed socialist society has been created in which the strengthening of the material and technical base, advancement of all social relations, strengthening of sociopolitical and ideological-moral unity, rapprochement among classes and social groups of working people and nations and nationalities, and the growth of the culture, educational level, and communist awareness of the citizens are components of a single many-faceted process of its gradual growth into the higher phase of communism.

This process is manifested also in the ever more active participation of all citizens in the administration of social and governmental affairs, and the ever fuller exercise of their constitutional rights, secured and guaranteed by the 1977 Soviet Constitution--the constitution of developed socialism--including the right to elect and be elected to all state power organs, the right to work, recreation, education, health care, utilization of the benefits of culture, housing, insured old age, criticism of the actions of any official, and many others. By its very social nature socialism is democratic and no one can deny it this quality. The entire depth and breadth of the democratic changes which have taken place within Soviet society were described briefly and with maximum accuracy by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev: "For the first time the meaning of democracy has been revealed in the true meaning of the word, i.e., as the power of the people. For the first time real civic and political equality was acquired by those unfamiliar with it in any exploiting system--the working people. For the first time the principles of democracy were extended to all realms of social life, including its base--production relations."

True, one could agree with some "critics" of real socialism who say that some "freedoms" are indeed lacking in our country. Such as, for example, the right to exploit other people's labor, to own, for this purpose, productive capital, or the right of an entrepreneur to "rationalize" his enterprise by laying off another several hundred unemployed people. In our country laws ban the propaganda war, racism, nationalism, the dissemination of pornography, and drug addiction. Whatever the West may say, they must not exist in the socialist society. We have fought and will fight against anything which undermines the dignity and disturbs the tranquillity and safety of the Soviet person, and for strengthening morality and social discipline. "For," as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said, "without discipline and firm social order democracy is unobtainable. It is precisely the responsible approach of every citizen to his obligations and to the interests of the people that creates the only reliable base for the fullest possible embodiment of the principles of socialist democracy and for the true

freedom of the individual." Naturally, we neither grant nor will grant freedom to those whose actions harm the people's interests. We do not intend to question the long efforts of the CPSU and Soviet state aimed at molding socialist, truly collectivistic, social relations, internationalist awareness, and labor morality.

Resolving economic, sociopolitical, and moral problems, our party is guided by the Leninist behest that "there could not even be a question of any successful building of communism without an alliance with the non-communists in all possible fields of activities" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 45, p 23). Entirely consistent with this basic Leninist idea, the CPSU program stipulates that "the people are the decisive force in the building of communism. The party exists for the people and considers serving the people the meaning of its activities. The further expansion and intensification of the ties between party and people are a necessary prerequisite for success in the struggle for communism."

Closest possible relations with the people are an inexhaustible source for the vital energy of the Leninist party, while proper political leadership is a mandatory prerequisite for the fruitful application of the infinite talents and capabilities of the people. It is no accident that the recent CC CPSU decree "On Improving Further Ideological and Political-Educational Work" and the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Improving Planning and Intensifying the Effect of the Economic Mechanism on Upgrading Production Effectiveness and Work Quality," covering all major aspects of development of Soviet society, are addressed to the organizations of working people, labor collectives, and all citizens, for everything stipulated in these documents is and will continue to be accomplished with the hands and the minds of the people's masses and for the people's masses themselves.

The party dedicates to the people all its thoughts, initiatives, and accomplishments, focusing within itself the people's collective mind and invariably turning to their richest historical experience, and constantly arming the masses with the summed up lessons of this experience. The documents of the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum are a vivid example of this fact. The most important problems of the country's economic and social development were thoroughly and critically considered and the basic directions for the further implementation of the party's economic strategy, elaborated at its 25th congress, were defined in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's speech at the Plenum and in the Plenum's resolutions. Party members and working people welcomed with satisfaction the results of the Plenum and its call to make 1980 a year of shock work, of Leninist-style work. A nationwide socialist competition is spreading everywhere in honor of the 110th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birth and for the successful completion of the 10th Five-Year Plan.

"All of us realize that the socialist economy is inconceivable without the strengthening of the centralized principle," stressed Comrade

L. I. Brezhnev at the Plenum. "At the same time, in both politics and economics we need democratic centralism, which offers a broad scope to initiative from below--the initiative of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, enterprises, associations, and local organs. This stems not only from our outlook but from economic necessity. Initiative from below is our irreplaceable reserve for the acceleration of economic development."

Such an approach is inherent in the party in the solution of both domestic political and international problems. The implementation of the peace program formulated at the 24th and developed at the 25th CPSU Congress, the struggle for favorable external conditions for the building of communism, for peace and detente, for a termination of the arms race and disarmament, and the purposeful and persistent efforts to rally the fraternal socialist countries and the communist and workers parties on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and the unification of the anti-imperialist front as a whole, are all inseparable from the selfless efforts of the Soviet people and of every working person to strengthen the economic and defense power of the beloved fatherland and to increase its scientific and technical and cultural potential.

The Soviet people and progressive public opinion abroad consider the systematically Leninist course of our party, above all, as the merit of its collective leader--the Central Committee and its Politburo--and relate it to the work of the outstanding political leader of our time, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman. At the same time, it would be proper to recall here his words that "we would act properly by considering the achieved successes the result of collective work and of the joint efforts of both the leading party organs and all party committees and organizations."

The collective leadership of the Leninist party and Soviet state makes it possible to profoundly and comprehensively determine and analyze the new phenomena and trends of domestic and international development, formulate a scientific general line, and efficiently and realistically guide the working people to immediate accomplishments and long-term prospects. The Soviet people completely trust our party and its Leninist Central Committee and fully support its domestic and foreign policy. This trust of the whole people, the inexhaustible creative potential of the heroic working class, kolkhoz peasantry, people's intelligentsia, and working people of all nationalities in the country, and their socialist self-awareness and communist purposefulness are a reliable guarantee for the implementation of the programmatic ideas of Leninism.

5003

CSO: 1802

EDUCATION OF TALENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 79 pp 47-58

[Articles by A. Kulakov, head of the people's collective of the Graphics Studio of the ZIL Palace of Culture; M. Samsonov, art manager of the Studio imeni M. B. Grekov; and A. Bichukov, art manager, Painters' Studio of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs]

[Text] The CC CPSU decree "On Improving Further Ideological and Political-Educational Work" has become a manual for action for all ideological workers and the huge army of agitators and propagandists. The artistic intelligentsia is making a substantial contribution to the ideological and moral education of the Soviet people. The decree notes the need for developing high idea- and civic-mindedness and for promoting the creative activeness of writers, painters, composers, theater and movie workers, and journalists. The party calls upon the men of culture to create new major works of literature and the arts, talentedly depicting the heroic accomplishments of the Soviet people and the outstanding landmarks in the development of the socialist society, and works depicting the spiritual poverty of our ideological opponents.

This party appeal is addressed to every painter and to the creative union as a whole. Under developed socialist conditions art is a most important factor in the spiritual growth and perfecting of society and the development of a profound ideological conviction within its citizens. Artists--painters, sculptors, and graphic artists--are effectively participating in the molding of a communist morality. The size of the contribution made by Soviet graphic art to the building of communism depends on the ideological maturity and social activeness of the painter. For this reason the civic position of the painter as a representative of the people is very important. It takes more than noticing in the appearance of our contemporary

something characteristic and interesting in order to create a valuable portrait. One must be his ideological ally, understand his objectives, and share his thoughts. Works of graphic art must open to the viewers the essential aspects of our reality, social relations, and history of the fatherland. Art promotes respect for the working people and teaches to consider life creatively and dedicate it maximum efforts, rather than adopt a consumerist attitude.

The editors of KOMMUNIST asked the heads of some graphic arts studios to describe the new works of painters and the educational work and daily accomplishments in their collectives.

Scope for the Development of Capabilities, by A. Kulakov

Ours is a training studio. Workers, engineers, and employees attend it to study the foundations of graphic art--design--and to become familiar with the difficult and complex art of painting and learn the laws of composition. We want to develop creatively thinking individuals who can see the most significant phenomena in their surroundings.

Nevertheless, I would like to say that we are not trying in the least to take the place of art schools. Even though classes with our students are taught by experienced educators, it is not our task to train professional painters. Should a professional painter or sculptor come out of our little studio, fine; if not, we are not saddened in the least, for the purpose of the studio is far more important: to develop in a person the feeling for beauty and to see to it that every student become aware of the true beauty of the surrounding world. Our purpose is to teach him to be attentive and better in his attitude toward everything around him and, perhaps, to make him even stronger and spiritually richer.

A person involved in art does not spend his leisure time passively, such as, for example, watching television. He becomes spiritually enriched and uses all the opportunities offered by the socialist way of life. In this connection I would like to recall here the noteworthy stipulation in our constitution that in the USSR the development of professional art and people's artistic creativity are comprehensively encouraged.

True, there are many people who consider that only the elect have the gift for creative graphic work. Yet, everyone could learn how to draw. Let me cite the thought expressed by Aleksey Maksimovich Gor'kiy that man is an artist by nature. "The founders of art," he wrote, "were potters, smiths, and goldsmiths, weavers, stone masons, carpenters, wood and bone carvers, armorers, house painters, tailors, seamstresses, or, generally, speaking, artisans, people whose artistically made objects please our eyes and fill museums."

Think of these words: working people, creators of beauty. The artist is immortal in man. Beauty has always been his life companion. A person who can experience harmony is truly happy. I am profoundly convinced that anyone who can see and find beauty in the world around him is less predisposed to commit a bad action than anyone whose heart is blind to beauty. That is why our studio considers aesthetic education one of its most important tasks. This task is an organic part of the ideological-political activities of the party organization and of its educational work within the labor collective, in accordance with the April CC CPSU decree.

The life of the students is closely linked with that of the ZIL. For example, hereditary ZIL engineer-technologist Konstantin Molotilov has been attending our studio from just about the first day of its existence. He came to us in its childrens sector, long before the war. After the war, demobilized Soviet army officer K. Molotilov returned to his native plant where his father had worked. His most important work, "V. I. Lenin at the AMO Plant," now exhibited at the L'vov Paintings Gallery, is dedicated to the ZIL and its history. Another painting on the same topic was presented by him to the plant as a gift. His painting "Girl on a Fork-Lift Truck" proves, by its very title, that the amateur painter was excited by the topic of his plant. It shows a young, beautiful, and impassionate girl riding in the plant, and it seems as though her love of life has made the day brighter and lighter. K. Molotilov has participated in a number of exhibits in Moscow and abroad. His wife works at the plant, and so did his brother, who was a test engineer who died in testing a machine. Our students made a sculpture of the hero. . . .

Every person tells the plant's story. Our studio members are a united family. This is the first and main prerequisite for fruitful creative work. Thinking of the life of our studio I recall Marx' thought that in a future society wealth will be determined not by the working, but by the leisure time. There will be scope for the free activities and development of the individual.

It is self-evident that the spiritual development and the gaining of experience and knowledge among those who spend creatively not only their working but their leisure time is actively growing. Culture becomes part of the entire behavior of such a person. In turn, this makes him more exacting toward his work and leisure time. In a word, something like a "perpetual motion machine" is achieved. The leisure time influences the work and vice versa. The amateur art collectives play a very active role in this perpetual movement. In any case, it is precisely this that is the aspiration of our studio. It is pleasing to see the results of its creative influence on the personalities of its members.

Vladimir Zhuk, the chief painter at the ZIL, enjoys great prestige among his comrades. His biography is typical of a Soviet person. I recall him as a young boy when he came and shyly asked to join the studio. At that time he had just been hired at the plant. I was interested by his

drawings. The boy was accepted. He worked with enthusiasm, eagerly, and persistently. It soon became obvious that Volodya was a serious and very capable adolescent. As a talented painter, he happily combines his talent with amazing industriousness.

True, there was a period when V. Zhuk engaged in formalistic experimentation. Soon afterwards, however, through his own experience and not without the help of the instructors, he realized that formalism leads the painter into a dead-end street. . . . Therefore, in 1965 our collective deemed it possible to sponsor his first individual exhibit. It was thus that, in the final account, a liking for graphic art also determined his choice of profession, making it possible for him not to leave his plant. Today V. Zhuk is the ZIL chief painter.

Our task is to train amateur painters in the spirit of socialist realism. We want to give them solid theoretical knowledge and practical skills so that they may accurately and vividly depict our new world, the Soviet person. Actually, all classes in the studio, now attended by over 80 people, are subordinated to this task. Who are the students? Naturally, most of them are from our plant. However, it is also attended by people working in other organizations, school students, and pensioners. This is because we are located in a big rayon, yet there is only one studio. How to refuse a person when he is obviously talented and needs to be taught basic skills which will enable him to master the graphic art?

In a word, these are people of different ages and different training. For this reason we train the students on a group basis. Many of those who approach us are taking merely their first steps in the selected genre. Meanwhile, the most experienced could occasionally match even professional painters, particularly when the topic of a painting requires deep knowledge of the specific life of a progressive labor collective.

A routine approach to education in general and to the training of a painter, in particular, is inadmissible. In order to reveal to a maximum extent the talent of a student we must find the key to the individual, determine his inclinations in art and the direction of his talent. Naturally, this requires time. Fifteen years ago Aleksey Osinkin, a fireman, came to our studio. A passionate love for nature could be seen in the sketches he submitted. This short and frail man has a great capacity for work. As a painter he developed literally under our own eyes. Recently a Moscow motion picture theater sponsored an exhibit of paintings by A. Osinkin, with the Moscow area as his landscapes "Centennial Oaks," and "Sunlit Alley," which were also shown at the city and all-union exhibits of works by amateur painters. I can confidently state that he is a born landscape painter who can now depict anything in nature. In addition to landscapes he draws interesting sketches. He loves to draw the portraits of his comrades in ink. A. Osinkin is a permanent participant in the exhibits which the studio organizes in the Red Corners of the plant's shops.

The attention to the talent, tactfulness, and responsiveness displayed toward A. Osinkin from the very beginning made the studio his home. It was natural, therefore, that he brought to it his sisters. It was in our studio that they acquired their initial training, after which they entered a light-industry technical school, in the department training modeling artists. Every year 8 to 10 of our students are accepted by secondary or higher art schools even though, I repeat, this is not our objective, and do not consider in the least that the purpose of our studio is to offer preparatory courses for an arts institute.

The sooner one engages in art, the greater his chances are to love art forever. That is why it is precisely at a young age that our perception of beauty is the highest and, in my view, the best time to open the heart to art is precisely then. With every passing year the desire of the young people to acquire knowledge and art is becoming ever more noticeable. Implementing the CC CPSU decree on work with the creative youth, we are doing everything possible to assist this process. Over the past 12 years the composition of the students in the studio has changed strikingly. Whereas 10 to 15 years ago their average age was 36-38, today it is 20-22. At that time 65% of the students were with higher or secondary training, compared with 90% today.

One such young person is electric fitter Vyacheslav Sofonov. Slava has been working at the studio for the past four years. He had a personal exhibit at the press building where he works. His friends and fellow workers looked at his works with particular interest and critically. They included still lifes, landscapes, and portraits of his fellow workers. . . . The exhibit triggered a great deal of interest and its usefulness was obvious both to Vyacheslav and his colleagues. V. Sofonov's biography and his creative successes have definitely influenced him, his character, and even his appearance. This applies to others among our studio members as well.

Art develops in its own way in every individual. One is struck by a natural landscape which he would like to record on canvas; another is impressed by a visit to an art exhibit; another again reacts to joining a graphic arts circle or a studio. However, to all of us art invariably involves a secret. It is a silent secret, deeply imbued with the beauty within one's own heart, a secret of deep feelings and thoughts triggered by a painter in thousands of hearts to which he describes his own times, concerns, and people around him.

That is why aesthetic education in our studio is merely half the work. The organization of exhibits which expose ever new people to the graphic arts is no less important than the training process itself. With the help of the paintings painted by the studio members we try to open a road to the world of the beautiful for their comrades who are usually both the first audiences and the most objective and strict judges.

That is precisely why we organize in our palace of culture no less than five to six annual exhibits and display paintings in shops and Red corners of our ZIL. Here the works of studio members are welcome guests. Openings of exhibitions by amateur painters enjoy invariable popularity among the plant workers, bringing them the pleasure of exposure to beauty. Such was the case, for example, at Vyacheslav Sofonov's exhibit. Here everything interested the working people: the manner in which his fellow worker or shop neighbor saw a Moscow street, and the way he presented a landscape in the Moscow area. Particularly lively discussions are triggered by plant topics and portraits of leading workers and labor veterans. It is as though they present both the plant and the fellow workers in a new light.

I shall never tire of repeating that such exhibitions are beneficial to everyone. The studio painters can see the immediate reaction of the audience and listen to their immediate impressions. In turn, such exhibitions are best promoters of the graphic arts among the workers, increasing their interest in them.

The young people actively participate in exhibitions. The topics of their works are historical revolutionary events, sports competitions, or lyrical topics. Our students love to exhibit works based on their summer impressions, for most of them spend their leaves traveling around the country. On weekends we frequently tour the Moscow area and its kolkhozes and sovkhozes. This leads to lively sketches which invariably trigger the interest of audiences.

Exhibitions abroad were a major test for us. The studio has exhibited its works in France, Austria, and the GDR, representing amateur painters of our country.

A quite interesting festival of amateur art of three Soviet cities--Moscow, Gomel' and Penza was held in the GDR. An exhibition at Dresden City Hall presented 153 works by Soviet amateur painters--paintings, drawings, and sculptures. The authors of 143 of them were ZIL studio members. The exhibition lasted about one month. It was very successful. Needless to say that we felt a great sense of responsibility in exhibiting works in a city known the world over for its famous gallery in which masterpieces of world paintings are exhibited.

We were happy to see that many works by Soviet amateur painters drew the attention of the audience. Let me cite among them "Stors Received by V. I. Lenin," by V. Vasyukhin; "V. I. Lenin at the AMO Plant," by K. Molotilov; "Plant Suite," by V. Zhuk; "New Moscow," by G. Linina; and the series "Russian Landscapes" by Ye. Kulikov and Yu. Khudaleyev.

I think that the very names of the paintings eloquently describes their content. Naturally, the plant studio members wanted to describe their own plant, its history, and its present and, naturally, life in the country. We are happy that this made a good impression on our German friends.

Studio members have also exhibited their paintings at the All-Union Exhibition of Works by Amateur Painters. Works by V. Zhuk have been shown here. Ye. Pervov, another painter, presented the portrait of the initiator of the socialist competition and communist-labor shock worker V. N. Ozerov. A third-grade diploma was awarded at this exhibition to V. Dzin's work "Dokshanskoye Canyon."

To us all-union exhibitions at the Manege represent important training. The responsible attitude displayed toward them by our collective may be judged by the results of the all-union exhibit "Amateur Painters for the Homeland!" The right to participate in the exhibition was earned by five ZIL works, while V. Dzin, who was the author of "Curve Survey at the Baykal-Amur Main Line" and "Geodesists at the 72d Parallel," was awarded this time a first-class diploma.

The experience and skill of the studio members are growing and, together with the people, the studio itself is growing and developing. As one of the oldest in Moscow, over 10 years ago it was awarded the title of people's collective. Even though its students may leave it, it lives and strengthens because of ever new people replacing them--highly educated and passionately interested in the graphic arts.

Over 2,000 amateur painters have been trained by the studio. It seems to us, however, that this is very little in a country where art truly belongs to the people. Vladimir Il'ich Lenin's dreams are becoming reality. He spoke of a time when art will be understood by the toiling masses and loved by them, and will develop them as painters.

On Exploits, Valor, and Glory, by M. Samsonov

One of the main features of Soviet graphic art is its inseparability from the life of our country, and the responsiveness of the painter to the pulse beat of the times. The art of the Grekov Studio is closely linked with the life of the Soviet Army and Navy. Always in the front ranks, military artists have participated in the long marches of troop exercises and flown combat airplanes. They are trying to note and present in their works what is characteristic and unique in our army today. The topic of defending the homeland and the image of our contemporary soldier, safely protecting the gains of socialism, is the leading topic in the works of the Grekov military painters.

The Military Painters Studio imeni M. B. Grekov was organized in 1934 by order of the USSR People's Commissariat of Defense. The order read as follows: "As live witnesses of the fierce class struggle waged by the workers and peasants against the southern counterrevolution, in his splendid canvases Grekov recorded the unforgettable battles of the Civil War and justifiably assumed an outstanding position in Soviet battle paintings. He depicted with particular love the marches, life, and battles of the Red Cavalry. Exceptionally modest in his private life, the painter

Grekov was just as modest in his profession. He tried to depict exclusively the historical truth as he saw it and knew that this truth was so beautiful and so greatly saturated with the true heroism of the rebelling masses that it needed no artificial embellishment whatever. That is why Grekov's canvases, with their boundless southern steppes in the flames of the revolution, Red horsemen, and the smoke of bloody clashes, hurling themselves toward victory, facing death, will always remain the most valuable living documents of the heart and great epic of class battles."

Following the behests of their teacher, the Grekov students dedicate their works to the troops of the great Soviet Army.

Recently a major exhibition "In the Battle Line" opened at the Central Exhibit Hall in honor of the victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War. This represented the creative report of the studio painters. In their artistic characters the Grekov painters described the great exploit of the Soviet soldiers in the battles for the socialist fatherland, the battles of Moscow and Stalingrad, for the Caucasus, and at the Kursk Arc, the heroic defense of cities-heroes, and the storming of Berlin. The exhibition proved yet once again, convincingly, that the topic of the military exploit and defense of the fatherland is very close to the people. We saw the sincere respect and tremendous interest with which the audience reacted to posters and sketches of the front--works which were born in the flames of the war, on the leaves of sketch books. The moral purity of the heroic Soviet soldiers, recorded by the painters in the difficult war years have enabled many works to reach a high artistic level.

The exhibit "In the Battle Line" was visited by Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev and other party and government leaders. In a warm talk with the painters they pointed out that the works by Grekov Studio members on the topic of the Great Patriotic War resurrect in the memory of the Soviet people the path to the great victory, perpetuate the military exploit of the Armed Forces of the USSR, reveal the best qualities of our soldier, and contribute to patriotic education.

The exhibition enjoyed great popularity. In almost two months it was seen by over 200,000 people. In the course of the exhibition meetings were held between the painters and plant workers, intellectuals, party and Komsomol aktivs, students of military academies and personnel of the Moscow Garrison, school students, and foreign guests.

Expressing their tremendous sympathy for an art which has become the people's memory of a military exploit, the visitors wrote down their impressions by the hundreds. Despite their variety they coincided in the main. The people properly rated the works of the artists who exhibited over 1,000 paintings, drawings, sculptures, and diorama-panoramic works.

The approval of the people and of the party and government leaders has given us new creative energy and increased our responsibility. It has

called us to a more profound and serious interpretation of the nature of the reality around us. We deem it our duty always to be in the front line of the ideological front.

We are proud of the recognition of our work and believe that we owe the success of works on military-patriotic subjects, presented at the exhibition, is due to the very history of development of Soviet graphic art--the art of socialist realism which asserts the principles of party-mindedness, nationality, and humanism.

Working on military-patriotic subjects, the Grekov painters are developing the great traditions of Russian and Soviet realistic art and seeking new methods for the reflection of reality. Today the task of the studio painters is to depict the tense life of the Soviet Army and Navy.

The Grekov painters frequently visit the tank men, missile men, engineers, and submariners. The new features of soldiers and commanders who have mastered modern equipment, their high combat readiness and comradeship in arms are what attract today the attention of the painters. Life creates new topics. Army reality develops its specific approach to traditional topics.

Addressing ourselves to contemporary subjects, we depict the army of today as school for courage, patriotism, and high martial skills. Some of the most successful works which broaden the boundaries of the spiritual world of the Soviet person include the painting by A. Alekseyev, "Preparation for Flight," the canvas by V. Pereyaslavets, "Interceptor Fighters," and his portrait of honored test pilot V. F. Khapov; and the works of V. Dmitriyevskiy, "Crossing"; Yu. Ryazanov's "Army Days," P. Zhigimont's "Tank Men"; and N. Solomin's "Exercise."

Many interesting drawings have been made of Soviet troops. This includes, for example, Linotype engravings by S. Antonov, "Checking Communications," and "Panel Room," and V. Shcherbakov's series of Linotype engravings "Baltic" and "Army Alpine Troops."

Naturally, G. Postnikov is recalled on the subject of depicting through art our victories in outer space. He was the author of one of the first ornaments on the achievements of Soviet science, a work which had a certain influence on a number of other graphic interpretations of the topic. What makes his works interesting is that most frequently he has depicted the cosmonauts immediately after their landing on earth, when the feelings experienced during the flight were still immediate and had not lost their freshness.

The sculptor V. Sonin, author of compositions on historical events of the past and the present, has proved himself as a master of the psychological portrait. His portrait of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, was exhibited at the All-Union Art Exhibition "Following Lenin's Way."

The works of young studio member and Lenin Komsomol Prize laureate M. Pereyaslavets are very original, offering a fresh plastic interpretation. He has created deeply penetrating sculptures of a concentrating Polish military flier and a cheerful Russian head of construction brigade.

As our due to proletarian internationalism, we deem it our duty--the duty of Soviet artists--to reflect the life and struggle of the peoples of fraternal countries--heroic Vietnam, Cuba, and many others. Embodying in their works the ideas of internationalism, the Grekov Studio members, together with all Soviet painters and sculptors, are inaugurating a new chapter in graphic art.

In an effort always to be in the midst of events occurring abroad and at home, the studio painters were among the first to visit the BAM (Baykal-Amur Main Line). In their initial studies and sketches they showed the creative enthusiasm and labor exploits of the Komsomol members at the dawn of the building of this gigantic railroad, the way they had recorded the combat exploits of the Soviet people during the Great Patriotic War.

Themes for new works are created only by establishing contact with people and nature. Again and again I recall the trip to the BAM. The helicopter carried us over the tayga, richly blooming in the colors of autumn. The horizon was retreating further and further, presenting infinite chains of hills and the twisting bed of the small but treacherous Gilyuy River with its tributaries. Looking down, we found it difficult to believe that people were living in such a forest. Yet the helicopter landed on a log pad. The subunit commander and troops working nearby came to welcome the helicopter. They were quite pleased to learn that painters had flown here, to this small dot in the tayga. Such was our initial acquaintance with the builders of the BAM. The life of these modest and strong boys is truly heroic.

We were able to see at this great construction site of our century how powerful machines cut into the rocky mountains, how soldiers-Komsomol members were opening an auxiliary road, and how they laid the first kilometers of the tracks in rain and wind. Such events could not fail to touch us. We wanted to paint, to describe such courageous people and their struggle with the elements, for this is just as much a battle as a combat storming.

Based on my initial impressions, I chose topics which arose by themselves in my imagination. The BAM people became my favorites as much as the heroes of Sivash, the heroes of Sevastopol, and the heroes of 1941 whom I had painted earlier. I made a number of studies and drawings at the BAM and painted canvases, the first of which I named "Morning at the BAM." The morning of nature, the youth of man, faith in his victory, beginning of construction, and beginning of a great new life were topics which would be hard to come by inside a studio. They were brought to me by the lives of our contemporaries. I must emphasize this thought, for it reflects the

basic direction in the activities of all studio members. It imbues their creative thoughts and daily work. It is natural that the Grekov Studio painters, implementing their assignments, realize how necessary it is to continue to strengthen the ties between art and the life of the army and the people.

Along with the characters of our contemporaries who, today, have taken from the hands of their fathers and grandfathers the flag of victory, in our work we shall always turn to those who defended our homeland in the war. Of late nationwide attention is being paid to the memory of the heroic years. This has been expressed in monuments, monument complexes, paintings, and sculptures dealing with our heroic people and their great army.

The new Soviet rituals, the swearing of the military oath, acceptance in the Komsomol and the pioneers take place at monuments to military glory. . . .

Emphasizing the importance of recalling the heroes of the Great Patriotic War, inaugurating the monument-ensemble in Volgograd, Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev made the following noteworthy statement: "The years and decades will pass. New generations will replace us. However, the grandchildren and great grandchildren of the heroes will come here, to the foot of the great monument to victory. It is here that will bring flowers and take their children. Here, thinking of the past and dreaming of the future, the people will remember those who died in the defense of the eternal flame of life."

A striving to find new solutions and depiction methods may be noted along with the creation of monuments and sculpture-architectural compositions. In this connection, I believe that dioramas and panoramas are among the promising types of graphic art which impressively perpetuate important events in the history of our country and their unforgettable heroics. Practical experience in the development of this complex yet exceptionally interesting genre in our country has confirmed its tremendous power of attraction and popularity. In fact, "the people's path will not become overgrown" in F. Rubo's panoramic canvases "Battle of Borodino" and "The Defense of Sevastopol." In recent years dioramas and panoramas are becoming and an inseparable part of the works of Grekov Studio painters. The studio has already produced about 40 big dioramas, many of which have become quite popular and admired by the people: "A. V. Suvorov's Alpine Campaign in 1799" by A. Intezarov, P. Mal'tsev and F. Usypenko, "The Storming of Sapun'-Gory on 7 May 1944" by P. Mal'tsev, G. Marchenko, and N. Prisekin, "The Battle for the Dnepr" by N. But and N. Ovechkin, "Storming the Izmail Fortress by A. V. Suvorov's Forces in 1790" by Ye. Danilevskiy and V. Sibirskiy, and others.

Recently the panoramic work "Pleven Epic," created by the Grekov Studio painter N. Ovechkin with a group of Soviet and Bulgarian painters and architects, was completed in Bulgaria. The Grekov painters are turning

ever more frequently to panoramas or dioramas also as the most expressive treatment of the topic of the victorious completion of the Great Patriotic War.

The battle for Stalingrad stands out in the history of the war. In this battle the Soviet soldiers covered themselves with immortal glory. It is natural that the great exploit must be properly reflected in art. The Museum of the Defense of Tsaritsyn and the Defense of Stalingrad will be soon completed in Volgograd, the hero-city. The heroic time of the Red Fortress on the Volga will be depicted in a great variety of ways--documents, relics, and works of art. One of the main components of the museum will be a panoramic painting of the defeat of the German-fascist forces on the Volga.

The crushing blow at the enemy and the victorious offensive mounted by our 62d Army, which heroically stood its ground for several months on a narrow strip along the right bank of the Volga, will be depicted on a gigantic circular 120-by-16-meter canvas. The viewers will see the smoking city, shells exploding on the Volga, the wreckage of the tractor plant, and the exploits of the Soviet troops, all that took place in January of 1943. The building of the panoramic work in Volgograd is nearing completion and the painters from our studio will begin to work on their idea.

Following the artistic principles of the outstanding battle painters Vereshchagin, Rubo, and Grekov, the studio painters are thoroughly studying available experience and seeking new means for the development of panoramic art.

The days of the painters at the Studio imeni M. B. Grekov are filled with intensive work on new creations. Above all, we are attracted by the image of the contemporary soldier, firm and strong in spirit, loyal defender of our homeland. Creating paintings, drawings, and sculptures of the modern soldier, they are striving to depict the high communist ideal for the sake of which the characters in their works are standing on battle guard. The studio painters realize that a great deal remains to be done to recreate as completely as possible through their art the entire nobility of the military exploit of our troops and make a worthy contribution to the patriotic education of the Soviet youth and of all Soviet people.

Toward What Is Best in Man, by A. Bichukov

Three years following the creation of the Painters' Studio of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, Minister Nikolay Anisimovich Shchelokov was interviewed by a LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent. To us, the young painters, sculptors, and draftsmen who had joined the new "creative sub-unit," this interview was particularly important. It described the tasks involved in daily art practice. The minister spoke of the strategy of cultural sponsorship, and of the powerful force of art which promotes morality in the Soviet person. "Under today's conditions," he emphasized,

"the struggle against crime is largely a struggle against the results of lack of culture, spiritual narrowness, and a consumerist attitude toward life."

In our works we turn both to lyrical and publicistic topics. Landscapes, still life, and portraits are genres which may seem quiet, intimate, and heartwarming. Yet, in terms of their impact, they equal monumental paintings and sculptures and posters.

It would probably be unnecessary to mention how important it is for a painter to have a precise understanding of the viewer. The feeling of love for the world, for the people, for the homeland, could be the only possible starting ground for the creation of any work. The homeland may be big or small, may be a street, a settlement, a village, the home where one grew up, and the customs of the population. Love for people must shed its warmth on every one of the painters' days.

I frequently watch visitors to our exhibits, in the house near Taganka, where the studio is located. Naturally, the visitors do not consist solely of MVD personnel or their friends or members of their families. They are seen by our colleagues, painters, and by actors, musicians, and singers. Studio exhibits are visited by students, workers, and visitors of Moscow, in a word, all sorts of people. Nevertheless, most of our viewers are militia workers. It is pleasing to see the thoughtful and bright face of a person looking at paintings by studio fellow workers M. Kozel and R. Yaushev "Malaya Zemlya," "Meeting at Dneproges," "In the Virgin Land," and "The First." It is amazing how receptive this face becomes, and how lively it reacts to beauty. I have noticed the same play of feelings watching the people freeze in front of portraits painted by our talented painter M. Laktionova. Furthermore, naturally, visitors to our exhibits cannot remain indifferent to works on the difficult work of the Soviet militia, such as "Fire Practice" and "Practicing Unarmed Combat" by V. Dranishnikov, and "Life of the Causcasion Militia Division in Volgograd" and "Rural District Militiaman" by M. Kozel.

Inaugurating the annual exhibition in honor of the 62d anniversary of the Soviet militia, Yu. M. Churbanov, USSR deputy minister of internal affairs, said: "The interesting works by the studio painters play a major role in promoting among the people practicing our difficult profession the best human and civic qualities, their spiritual growth, and the broadening of their aesthetic outlook."

Aesthetic culture, intelligence, and depth of understanding of art are all inherent in the personnel of our contemporary militia. The struggle against delinquencies is, above all, moral, ideological. My studio fellow workers know this and our works are directed toward everything that is best in man, in his soul, and his life.

Our work is nurtured by constant meetings with our characters. Currently, there would be virtually no kray or oblast in the Soviet Union where firm

creative relations have not been established between painters and militia collectives. We offer consultations both in the studio and locally. Studio personnel assignments cover a vast territory: The Baykal-Amur Main Line, Siberia and the Far East, Central Asia, the Nonchernozem

All of us like this work. This is no accident, for all of us think alike. Furthermore, we are the students of the same school. The studio is attended by graduates of the Moscow State Artistic Institute imeni Surikov. Our outstanding teachers were the classics of Soviet graphic art. They did not teach us, the students, the craft alone. They did not merely develop our professional skills. They taught us how to set high goals in art, how to find the contemporary heroes, how to understand the social tasks of the age and the meaning of the link between the past and the future. We mastered the creations of classical geniuses, both domestic and universal, and studied folk art. Allow me to mention the splendid names of my favorite creative workers: Ivan Martos, author of the Minin and Pozharskiy sculpture on Red Square; Boris Orlovskiy--who is not familiar with his expressive monument of Kutuzov in Leningrad? Fedot Shubin, Lomonosov's fellow countryman and one of the founders of Russian head sculpture; Mark Antokol'skiy, who tried to interpret philosophically big historical personalities--let us recall his Peter the Great alone! Nikolay Andreyev, who, at the turn of the century, painted N. Gogol' and A. Ostrovskiy, and who linked the heroes of our culture with our Moscow, its cherished corners, and, after the revolution, was among the first to address himself to the topic of Lenin; and Vera Mukhina: there is no person in our country unfamiliar with her pathos-imbued monument-symbol "Worker and Kolkhoz Woman."

Why do I mention these great names when I am speaking of the modest work of a young art studio, and of the little that I have been able to accomplish myself, in the field of art? Because every artist needs guiding stars. Our time as well demands of the artist the creation of the big personality of a socially significant person who can lead and educate the others, resolve problems of the future, and score hourly accomplishments. Yet, this task of our time cannot be implemented without looking at the standards of realistic art.

For two years I worked on a topic which had taken a powerful hold on me and which demanded courage, one may say, not to consider it beyond my means. I wanted to create in the field of art the image of a person we had chosen as the leader of the communist party, whose name was linked with unforgettable fiery days of the Patriotic War and the years of postwar construction, and whose outstanding activities in consolidating the peace and good-neighborly relations among nations, and concern for the prosperity and happiness of every Soviet person, had earned him popularity and the love of the people of all countries and continents. I am speaking here of Leonid Il'ch Brezhnev, the commissar, as he was known by the soldiers of the 18th Army fighting at Malaya Zemlya, near Novorossiysk, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman.

Turning to such a topic, one knows that, regardless of whether he is a great painter or simply a daredevil, becoming imbued with the feeling of the people and sharing it warmly, the public will be particularly strict in judging your work. This largely determined my study. I wanted to present the features of Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, familiar to every Soviet person and perhaps to every person on earth, not merely by retaining the precise portrait similarity, but by expressing the summed-up concept of the Soviet leader, the outstanding Marxist-Leninist--the image which lives in the people.

In the course of these two years of work which, it seemed to me, I would never finish (for any variant I would accept in the evening I would reject in the morning as inaccurate, starting everything from scratch)--in the course of this daily work I realized the old dreams of my childhood and adolescence, memories of early childhood, and memories as a war orphan. I grew up in Donetsk. My father was a miner. I remember my father and his comrades--intelligent, strong, and confident people--I remember their optimism, pride, great honesty, goodness, and generosity. I remember those now distant days of quiet but strong sounds of their singing, laughter, warmth, and frank views. . . . I traveled to Donetsk, to see my mother. I walked the streets, looked at miners, looked at faces. . . . I felt that I was meeting my hero: it was all those people together, those whom I had remembered since childhood and those of the present, somehow becoming part of a plastic image.

I tried to paint the portrait of the outstanding communist Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, a person who has had an outstanding career and who has become part of the individual destinies of the Soviet people.

I was helped in my work by turning to the topic figure of F. E. Dzerzhinskiy, the knight of the revolution. I painted a big portrait of him, a composition; I made a small sculpture and a memorial medal with a bas relief. I was helped specifically by the fact that every time I sought in the image of the knight of the revolution I found new aspects of heroic pathos, aspiring toward strictness and even brevity of detail. I was also helped by lyrical topics I had already mastered: the portraits of Aleksandr Blok and Sergey Yesenin, and a monument of the Komsomol poet Boris Kornilov, in his his native area, in Semenov. . . . Without losing the strictness I had achieved to a certain extent in my work on Dzerzhinskiy, I wanted to invest in the portrait of Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev a lyricism as well, warmth, the voice with which the poet speaks for the people. . . .

Displayed in the entrance in the entrance hall of the Painter's House, on the Kuznetskiy Bridge, on the occasion of the "Always Vigilant" all-union art exhibition, the portrait of Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev seemed to me to be entirely different than at the studio. I was quite excited, not only during the exhibition. . . . The country was reading the books "Malaya Zemlya," "Vozrozhdeniye" [Rebirth], and "Tselina" [Virgin Land]--the

intimate talk between the commissar and party member and all of us. Had I expressed in the portrait the features of this outstanding person? Time alone is a test of art and gives it a rating. . . .

The many faces I see--young and old, familiar and unfamiliar--in the studio halls, on Volodarskiy Street, or at the opening of the all-union exhibition, are inspired by the thoughts and feelings which nourished the work of fellow studio workers and my own. I have been lucky to work in a collective of friends and like-minded people, together with whom every success becomes particularly precious and no trouble becomes frightening, in a collective of talented, warm, and industrious people. They are quite different from one another as are, for example, the head of the studio M. N. Tambovtsev, a person passionately dedicated to his work; our elder, V. Ya. Konovalov; our youngsters I. S. Araslanov and V. S. Izumrudov, and many others.

We are working, seeking, and loving. We love our work, our people, and our homeland. This is, probably, the main thing.

5003
CSO: 1802

ART ADDRESSED TO THE MASSES

Moscow KÖMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 79 pp 59-70

[Article by Honored Worker in the Arts of the RSFSR I. Vasil'yev]

[Text] On 12 April 1918 the Council of People's Commissars of revolutionary Russia passed the decree "On the Monuments of the Republic." This document, signed by V. I. Lenin, laid the beginning of an entire system of measures implemented by the Soviet system, known as monument propaganda.

In his memoirs A. V. Lunacharskiy describes the way Lenin summoned him as the then people's commissar for education, and formulated an idea which was overwhelming in terms of daring and novelty. Talking with Lunacharskiy, Vladimir Il'ich referred the work "City of the Sun," by T. Campanella, an Italian philosopher and representative of utopian socialism in the 17th century.

As we know, in this work the great utopian depicts the ideal city of the future, located on a high hill, on seven levels, surrounded by walls. The city is crowned by a spacious square in the midst of which rises a temple built "with amazing artistry." "By decree of Wisdom, the internal and external, lower and upper walls of the entire city are covered with beautiful paintings which depict the state of all sciences in an amazingly strict sequence. . . . All these paintings have their instructors and the children become acquainted with all sciences visually, effortlessly, like a game . . ." ("Utopicheskiy Roman XVI-XVII Vekov" [The 16th-17th Century Utopian Novel], Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, Moscow, 1971, pp 147-149). T. Campanella also presents in his book a picture of nationwide celebrations of noteworthy events and outstanding people praised by poets. His imagination looks at a city with a number of monuments with which society has honored the heroes after their death.

Recalling Campanella's idea, Vladimir Il'ich told Lunacharskiy: "It seems to me that this is not naive in the least and that, with some changes, could be adopted and implemented by us now. . . . I would name what I have in mind as monument propaganda. . . . Our climate would hardly allow the frescoes of which Campanella dreamed. That is why I am referring, mainly,

to sculptors and poets. In various public places, on suitable walls or any other special installations, short yet expressive slogans could be written, encompassing the longest reaching basic Marxist principles and slogans. . . . I consider monuments even more important: Busts or full figures, bas reliefs perhaps, or groups. A list must be drawn up of the predecessors of socialism or of its theoreticians and fighters, and of the luminaries of philosophical thought, science, art, and so on, who, even though not directly related to socialism, were true cultural heroes. On the basis of such a list commission sculptors to produce works which may even be temporary, made of plaster of paris or concrete. What is important is for them to be accessible to the masses, to be striking" (A. V. Lunacharskiy, "Chelovek Novogo Mira" [A Man of the New World], APN, Moscow, 1976, pp 121-122).

It was those Leninist instructions that were the base of the plan for monument propaganda.

The Leninist plan brought to life by the needs of the historical moment and consistent with the factual possibilities of the time, contained basic stipulations which remain topical to this day and acquire a new meaning at each stage in the development of the socialist society.

Above all, it is a direct manifestation of the principles of party mindedness and nationality of art, and the subordination of all political-educational work in the Soviet state, in the field of art in particular, to the cause of the struggle of the proletariat.

Starting with the Campanella idea, Lenin used it creatively, giving it another direction based on the principles of Marxist aesthetics and the traditions of the social purpose of art, promoted by Russian revolutionary-democratic ideas.

Lenin's plan was not a method for the dissemination of natural scientific knowledge, as was Campanella's. Nor did it represent a simple illustration of political slogans. Its purpose was to disseminate through aesthetic means the basic, the enduring communist ideals and Marxist ideas, and the great achievements of human culture.

Lenin's idea also contained an essentially new formulation of the question of the specifics and social functions of monument art.

Lenin saw in the murals, sculptures, and architectural monuments of the fictional city created by the imagination of the Italian philosopher a type of work of graphic art which, in real life, would be always among the masses, influencing them even subconsciously, and talking to the masses in the language of striking artistic forms.

We know that Vladimir Il'ich loved and knew painting. As confirmed by V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich, he "dreamed about organizing mobile exhibitions in

the provinces and printing photographs of paintings in color. Such publications should replace popular prints. The people will buy them quickly and willingly. The people love paintings and firmly collect everything they can, Vladimir Il'ich said" ("Lenin Vsegda s Nami. Vospominaniya Sovetskikh i Zarubezhnykh Pisateley" [Lenin Is Always with Us. Recollections of Soviet and Foreign Writers], Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, Moscow, 1969, p 25).

It is even more noteworthy that, while appreciating paintings and drawings in books and periodicals, and dreaming of the extensive dissemination of art reproductions, and the organization of mass visits to museums and art galleries, nevertheless, Lenin gave first place to monument art in the plans and concerns of the young proletarian state.

Naturally, Lenin's idea of monument propaganda is not precisely identical to the concept of "monument art." To a certain extent, it is broader, for it includes not only the creation of monuments but their combination with poetry and aphorisms, and the active use of memorial sites for speeches by party and state leaders, the holding of meetings, and so on. At that time, propaganda and agitation tasks were closely interwoven with the practice of educational work pursued in the Soviet state. In the same manner the various artistic means and genres interacted and combined. If materials were lacking temporary monuments made of non-durable materials were erected. Alongside, panels were painted--symbolic or on specific topics--hung on houses during holidays. The forms of monument art were combined with agitation posters or dramatic performances on streets and squares. The circumstances of the time were reflected in this merger of various arts. Thus, we see the use of and interaction among the various types of art combined in the pursuit of common ideological propaganda objectives.

Lenin did not pit one type of art against another. As confirmed by Lunacharskiy, he considered necessary the development of "all types of artistic works in streets, houses, and squares of all our cities" (A. V. Lunacharskiy, *Stat'i ob Iskusstve* [Articles on Art], *Iskusstvo*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1941, p 480). However, the nucleus of Lenin's plan was precisely the utilization of monument art with its specific feature of being "always visible," as was subsequently aptly expressed by the outstanding Soviet sculptress V. I. Mukhina. This quality of monument art was particularly important in the education and upbringing of the masses at that time. Lenin, however, looked far into the future. He clearly understood the tremendous power of the ideological and aesthetic impact of monument art, which grows immeasurably when appealing to people with a higher cultural standard, becoming a permanent element of their living environment. That is why he thought of monuments which would educate future generations. Lenin said that he had considered for quite some time the idea of monument propaganda, repeatedly asserting that Soviet art must produce monuments made of non-durable materials only for the time being, for, as he told painter G. Alekseyev, "There is no bronze. We cannot afford it now. Nor is there marble. All that is left is cement and plaster of

paris. . . . And we have very, very little money" ("Lenin i Kul'turnaya Revolyutsiya. Khronika Sobytiy (1917-1923 gg.)" (Lenin and the Cultural Revolution. Chronicle of Events, 1917-1923], Mysl', Moscow, 1972, p 108). However, even under those circumstances, the Soviet state found it possible to allocate funds which were substantial for the period for purposes of monument propaganda.

Interpreting Lenin's statements, instructions, and actions at the initial period of the implementation of the monument propaganda plan, we see that Lenin did not separate it from the other tasks related to the organization of a new way of life of the working people. Vladimir Il'ich also considered the nature of cities in the future and of harmony among the different elements within them. Soon after the transfer of the government from Petersburg to Moscow, Lenin met with architect I. Zholtovskiy to discuss the reconstruction of Moscow. He was concerned with the preservation and restoration of old architectural monuments, and gave advice on the landscaping of the city.

Addressing the voters of Baumanskiy Electoral District in Moscow, in 1971, L. I. Brezhnev recalled how "in the first years of the Soviet system, talking with architects, V. I. Lenin said that Moscow should be reorganized so that it could become an artistically planned and comfortable city."

Vladimir Il'ich also expressed his concepts concerning the overall artistic and emotional appearance of the city. As recalled by V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich, he said: "I would like it so much for our Moscow, as well as all other cities, to be happy, joyful, and sunny, for life to be bubbling everywhere. . . . The streets as well must educate the broad masses, exposing them to culture, for which reason the streets as well should be beautiful and elegant."

A comparison among Lenin's various facts and judgments leads to the conclusion that monument art, in his view, was not only a means for propaganda work, but a structural component of the aesthetic organization of the social environment, holding a leading position in such an artistically interpreted environment.

Vladimir Il'ich ascribed tremendous importance to the implementation of the plan for monument propaganda. He personally controlled the implementation of the decree and held strictly liable those who delayed matters. He considered the material to be used for one or another monument, met with painters and sculptors, and attended the inauguration of monuments. What is particularly striking is that all this occurred under the circumstances of the Civil War, hunger, intervention, and counterrevolutionary conspiracy against the Soviet system.

Following is a particularly noteworthy event: On 6 July 1918 the SR mutiny in Moscow reached its culmination, followed by its defeat. Yet, as early as 8 July, Lenin raised the question to and charged people's commissars

Lunacharskiy and Malinovskiy and the presidium of the Moscow City Soviet for their lack of activity in fulfilling the decree "On the Republic's Monuments."

Lenin's insistence in this matter amazed his contemporaries as well. On 12 July 1918 Vladimir Il'ich met with architect N. D. Vinogradov, who, at Lenin's request, had been chosen to provide "energetic supervision" over the implementation of the plan for monument propaganda, with the obligation to submit twice weekly a personal report to the Sovnarkom chairman. Vinogradov tells that in their very first talk he asked Vladimir Il'ich the following: "Only six days have passed since the 6 July SR action. Is this decree so important that the chairman of the Sovnarkom should deal with it on a priority basis?" Vladimir Il'ich looked at his collocutor. "I admit, I expected you to ask this question. The decree 'On the Republic's Monuments' is the most important," he answered and proceeded to explain the importance to the masses of monument propaganda which would enthuse them, and expose them to knowledge and culture (see A. Yusin, "It Began in 1905 . . ." PRAVDA, 16 Dec 1975).

The implementation of the monument propaganda plan began with the very first year of the Soviet system. As early as 1 May 1918 a number of monuments of royalty were removed from the squares, being of no historical or artistic interest. On 30 July the Sovnarkom approved a list of 69 names of revolutionaries and great men of culture of different nations for whom monuments were to be erected.

On 22 September 1918 the solemn inauguration of the first such monument took place in Petrograd--the bust of A. Radishchev, created by sculptor L. Shervud. In 1918 and 1919 monuments and busts of the following were inaugurated in Petrograd, Moscow, and other cities: Karl Marx, A. Radishchev, T. Shevchenko, H. Heine, A. Kol'tsov, M. Robespierre, N. Chernyshevskiy, and so on. In Moscow, an obelisk in honor of the First Soviet Constitution was erected on the spot of General Skobelev's statue (created by D. Osipov and N. Andreyev).

Many monuments, memorial plaques, and bas reliefs were inaugurated on the occasion of the first anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Lenin himself spoke on several occasions at monument inaugurations or the laying of cornerstones. Vladimir Il'ich also participated in the review of a number of monument designs.

In 1919-1920 this work was almost totally interrupted because of the difficult military and economic situation of the country. However, the moment the situation improved and the Soviet system was consolidated everywhere, Lenin's idea of monument propaganda was developed further. The best artists in the country participated in its implementation. The creative youth actively joined in this project with the old masters.

The greatness and novelty of the task, which had not previously been formulated on such a scale or resolved within such a short time, and the pathos

of the revolutionary age itself and the need to express its meaning triggered a tremendous upsurge among the artists.

The implementation of the plan for monument propaganda was not only striking in terms of scope, but contributed to the birth of a number of outstanding artistic ideas. Depending on the topic, place of the monument, creative individuality of the author, and his approach to the topic, a variety of graphic, plastic, composition, three-dimensional, and stylistic concepts were formulated.

The variety of searches and initial solutions had extremes, which in a number of cases proved to be erroneous and sterile. They included support of the old academic rules, which were inconsistent with the demands of the time, abstract symbolism, and the schematism of cubism, which was manifested, in particular, in the monuments of Bakunin and Sof'ya Perovskaya.

Lenin's attitude toward such types of futuristic monuments was unequivocal. At the same time, however, he was interested in works whose authors tried to express general concepts, the ideas of the times, and the pathos of revolutionary innovation, and in which the specifics of the subject made it possible to use the language of architecture.

Few monuments of that period have remained. Furthermore, not all designs were used. However, the majority of creative ideas, including those which were not carried out, have left their traces in the country's artistic development.

Soviet monument art began with Lenin's plan and stemmed from it. It has covered a long and complex distance from its first steps to the present. Our monument art has experienced periods of upsurge and relative declines, the focusing of attention on one or another genre, and more popularity of some genres compared with others. With all this, however, the Leninist principles of the social significance of the art and of its party mindedness and nationality, have always remained programmatic to the Soviet artists. They have based all their work on the positive creative example of the first post-October years.

This experience was used, above all, to perpetuate the memory of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. The Lenin Mausoleum, built from a design by architect A. Shchusev, has become a classic of Soviet monument art. Statues of the leader of the revolution at the Finland Station in Leningrad (created by S. Yevseyev, V. Shchuko, and V. Gel'freykh), the ZAGES [Zemo-Avchala Hydroelectric Power Plant] in Georgia (I. Shadr), and Ul'yanovsk (M. Manizer) have become an intrinsic part of part of Leniniana.

Between the end of the 1920's and beginning of the 1930's, in the period of the first five-year plans, a number of works perpetuating the characters of workers, peasants and soldiers were created, interpreted as symbols of the people. This includes I. Shadr's "The Cobblestone--Weapon of the

Proletariat," "Seasonal Worker," and "Sower," and L. Shervud's "Sentry." Many such works played a tremendous role in the development of new topics and in the artistic presentation of the characters of modern heroes shaped by Soviet reality.

V. Mukhina's sculpture group "Worker and Kolkhoz Woman," exhibited at the 1937 Paris World Exhibition, synthesized the searches of Soviet monument sculpture in this direction. The figures of a man and a woman holding in their raised hands a hammer and a sickle, expressed the thrust, the dynamics of the Soviet society, its strength, and the physical and spiritual power of free toilers--builders of socialism.

Addressing themselves to historical topics, the artists tried to express in their works the idea of the close link between heroes and people. This trend is particularly clear in the S. M. Kirov monument in Leningrad, created by N. Tomskiy. Narrative compositions with multiple figures were used for the same purposes.

Necessarily, the Great Patriotic War limited the scale of work in the field of monument art without, however, stopping its development.

The memorial ensemble in Kaliningrad was created immediately after the war, and subsequently a memorial ensemble was inaugurated in 1949 in Berlin, in Treptov Park. Symbolizing the liberation mission of the Soviet people in World War II, the grandiose ensemble in Berlin is one of the major accomplishments of Soviet art (created by sculptor Ye. Vuchetich, architect Ya. Belopol'skiy, and painter A. Gorpenko).

Soviet sculptors and architects actively participated in the erection of monuments to the heroes and victims of the struggle against fascism in many cities and settlements of the liberated countries in central and eastern Europe.

The decision of the government to have sculptures made of two- and three-time heroes of the Soviet Union and heroes of socialist labor gave a broader and more planned nature to the designing and making of busts. In the postwar years as well work on monuments to outstanding leaders of the past and of the present continued.

These works are both different in topic and style: they include strict lines and romantic pathos, lofty assertion and strong-willed challenges. The best of them show originality, and a search for new means of expression and a new content.

At the same time, however, many monuments followed standard patterns. A number of works of the end of the 1940's and beginning of the 1950's were influenced by a narrow-dogmatic understanding of realism as simple similarity. Excessive detail affected the plasticity. The specific problems of sculpture, such as dimension, space, and the structural integrity

of form, were underestimated. All this, along with the popular tendency to create theatrical and pompous compositions, led to an artificiality and to the loss of life in the characters.

A new stage in the development of Soviet monument art began with the 1960's. Its topics broadened and the arsenal of artistic means was renovated. Even though this 20-year period had its stages (the predominance of specific trends or genres at different times), monument art was distinguished by its unity of pathos and line of development.

Factual reality introduced changes in art. The shaping of a harmonious developed person, the pathos of creative toil, the development of the Virgin Lands, the struggle for peace, the international solidarity of the working people, the conquest of space, and the scientific and technical revolution were topics which awaited their artistic expression and were reflected in the works created in the 1960's and 1970's.

The preparations for the celebration of the anniversaries of the Great October Revolution, the founding of the USSR, the centennial of V. I. Lenin's birth, the anniversary of the founding of the Soviet Armed Forces, and the victory over Hitlerite Germany gave a new impetus to the artistic interpretation of the heroic past and present in the life of the Soviet state and people.

A monument to Karl Marx was unveiled in Moscow. Monuments to Lenin were unveiled in Moscow, Leningrad, Tashkent, Novosibirsk, Kaunas, Abakan, Donetsk, Kherson, and many other cities. Monument ensembles dedicated to the exploit of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War and monuments to the victims of fascism were given a new development.

The range of topics broadened. Monuments were dedicated to space heroes, discoverers of ore and petroleum deposits, the exploit of the working people in the rear during the war, the courage of the Tashkent population, and the fraternal aid it received during the earthquake, and many others were unveiled, reflecting various facets of the life of the Soviet people.

The geography of monument art was broadened. Monuments and ensembles were unveiled not only in historical but in new centers in all parts of the country, decorating small towns, and village and plant territories. Participating in this work is also a generation of artists who were trained and became masters of the art in the postwar years.

Thus, the capital of Kirgiziya was enriched with a monument to the fighters in the revolution (sculptor T. Sadykov); an interesting ensemble-memorial to Sadriddin Iyna was unveiled in Dushanbe. Fresh composition-plastic solutions were found for monuments to the victims in the Patriotic War in Marneuli (M. Berdzenishvili) and Poti (E. Amashukeli). The "Legendary Cart," created by a group of Leningrad artists, was unveiled on a steppe hill near Kakhovka. A monument to Soviet-Polish brotherhood in arms was erected on Belorussian soil, near the Lenino Settlement.

Along with statues of outstanding revolutionaries erected in various cities throughout the country, a number of statues of leading personalities in our multinational culture have been erected: Of the scientist Tsiolkovskiy and the first cosmonaut Gagarin, writers and poets Pushkin, Shevchenko, Mayakovskiy, Yesenin, Guramishvili, and Tammsaar, surgeon Pirogov, pediatrician Filatov, actor and composer Gulak-Artemovskiy, painter and composer Chyurlenis, and architect Tamanyan.

The best works oppose stereotyped, routine, inexpressive plasticity, and ordinariness. They provide ideological-artistic guidelines in the development of monument art. Many of them have been awarded the Lenin and USSR State prizes, and republic prizes.

Mosaics and murals on public buildings are becoming widespread along with sculptures. New types of works are appearing and a new concept of art synthesis is developing.

Noteworthy is the clearly expressed aspiration toward variety of forms and styles. In this respect the search was dictated by the need to bring out the richness of content, broaden the gamut of feelings, and achieve great depth and motion of the characters and show their new qualities.

The problem of the stylistic and formal variety in monument art reflects a more general understanding of the problem within the framework of the single system of the art of socialist realism. The party documents which summed up art practices and which opened new prospects for artistic work played a most important role in the proper interpretation of this problem.

The CPSU program called for extensive manifestation in art of individual creative initiative, high skill, and variety of forms, styles, and genres. In his CC CPSU accountability reports to the 24th party congress, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that, "We support an attentive attitude toward creative search, the fuller development of individual gifts and talents, and variety and wealth of forms and styles based on the method of socialist realism." Once again, at the 25th congress, the attention was drawn to the variety of forms and stylistic individualities. An ever deeper and truly dialectical understanding of the method of socialist realism was being asserted ever more profoundly in Soviet aesthetics.

True, there were also extremes in the course of the discussion of this problem. The theory of the single "contemporary style" with its absolutizing of conventionality, brevity, and expression arose under the banner of "anti-dogmatism."

The wealth of styles and forms, and the broadened range of means of expression are represented in the variety of methods used for the creation of a realistic character in which "the forms of life itself," along with conventional and metaphoric forms, providing that they express the vital content, proved to be artistically effective in specific creative problems.

The broad range of styles and ways and means of summation used by the Soviet artists may be seen, for example, by comparing the statue of Vl. Mayakovskiy, created by A. Kibal'nikov in his characteristic style, which combines specific depiction with colorful modeling, with the figure of the mother for the monument in Pirchyupis, sculpted by G. Yokubonis, whose characteristic style is the combined interpretation of big forms and a tendency toward artistic convention, and the statue of General Karbyshev, by V. Tsigal', in which the sculptor contrasts the harmonious proportions of the human body and the smooth modeling of the face with the unfinished form of a block of stone.

The variety of plastic solutions and stylistic individualities becomes particularly clear when a variety of artists turn to the same source. Let us compare the figure of Pushkin in the works of masters of sculpture such as M. Anikushin, Ye. Belashova, and O. Komov. In each case the character of the statue is defined in terms of differences in concept and the characteristic methods of the artists, each of whom, turning to the traditions of Russian art and to different stylistic trends, creatively refract them to offer a modern solution to the problem.

The free and extensive utilization of the entire variety of the graphic language enabled the Soviet artists to work more successfully on most complex and multidimensional characters such as Marx and Lenin. Particularly important here is the combination of portrait expressiveness with symbolism. This is attained in the best works. In their monument to the creators of scientific communism erected in Moscow and Berlin, and awarded the Lenin Prize, in order to achieve this objective L. Kerbel' and N. Tomskiy used a plastic metaphor which enriches the content of the monument and deepens the emotional impact of the realistically sculpted figure.

Stylistic variety was developed also by enhancing in monuments the role of the architectural presentation, particularly in monuments in honor of outstanding events or the exploits of many people.

In modern monuments architectural forms are acquiring great meaningfulness of figures, interacting with the sculpture itself and, occasionally, playing in this case an equal and, occasionally, even a dominant role. The basic ideological-artistic function which a round sculpture plays in statues frequently includes a symbolic architectural element. Let us recall here famous works, such as a monument celebrating the outstanding achievements of the Soviet people in the conquest of space, in Moscow, the memorial to the defenders of the Caucasian passes in the Karachayevo-Cherkesskaya Autonomous Oblast, the "Glory Burial Mound" near Minsk, or the monument "Broken Ring" outside Leningrad.

Wherever the authors have provided a profoundly felt and original solution to the topic and wherever the symbol was original and the finding meaningful, such a trend proves to be artistically fruitful, enriching the stylistic variety of monument art. However, a certain price has been paid for

the popularity of symbolism, however, expressed, above all, in the duplication of new means, turning them into stereotypes and, therefore, making them lose their emotional power. Along with new geometric forms traditional ones have become widespread, such as obelisks, pylons, etc. Frequently, however, they have been used only to organize space, remaining poor from the informative and emotional viewpoint, giving no spirit to the environment.

Countering the popularity of purely architectural forms, a tendency developed to express events not in symbols but in multiple-figure compositions. Here again we see a great variety of styles, forms, and individual solutions. This includes narrative details with a psychological description of the characters, big summed-up details, a realistic plot and the conventionality of metaphors growing out of the very composition.

Regardless of all differences in topics, styles, forms, and individual treatments, the imagistic concept of the best monuments shows a rejection of norms or of canonizing any specific stylistic or imagistic system.

The multinational nature of Soviet art is a major source for the variety of artistic solutions, and one of the means for the individualization of a character is national originality.

In the 1960's and 1970's monument art became extensively developed in the republics of the Soviet Union. During that time artistic cadres developed and a number of talented works were created. The national originality of monument figures was expressed differently and its development followed different ways and different channels, based on historical conditions and the artistic experience of one or another nation.

One can see the way individual features of national artistic tradition, even a new interpretation, yielded interesting and fruitful results. Thus, a romantic emphasis of the character and a metaphorical expression, typical of Ukrainian art, literature and cinematography, for example, are interpreted and contribute to the expressiveness of the character in a number of sculptures by V. Boroday, G. Kal'chenko, V. Borisenko, I. and V. Znob, M. Gritsyuk, and Yu. Sinkevich. The deep lyricism which characterizes Belorussian poetry, for example, is manifested in the monument to the Soviet mother-patriot in Zhodino, making the figure particularly human. The Latvian masters frequently include in their monument characters qualities of an entirely different nature--the monolithic singleness of a stone block, massive sizes, and smooth surfaces. The Lithuanian sculptors extensively use the style of laconic summation based on the experience of sculpture on wood.

Frequently, in order to achieve the greatest possible expressiveness, particularly in the case of historical characters, the sculptors turn to the national traditions of other types of art. Thus, creating the monument to David Sasunskiy--an Armenian epic hero--Ye. Kocher looked for a

combination of the modern realistic form with the forms of the national poetic awareness which in the course of centuries had developed its own style--epic power, hyperbole, and size of character. The statues of historical leaders created by Georgian sculptors E. Amashukeli and M. Berdzenishvili, encompass the principles of the architectonics of ancient Georgian architecture and medieval frescoes with their expressive decorativeness.

However, in artistic tradition national originality is a category which changes historically, which is in a state of dynamics. Today it is developing under conditions in which the nations and nationalities of the USSR have rallied within a single social collective, and when a new historical community--the Soviet people--has developed. Contributing to the enhancement of all Soviet culture, the ever greater rapprochement among nations and nationalities in our country also entails the aspiration to discover new values in national sources and traditions, and make them serve the common tasks of expressing a socialist content. "Today," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said, "we can say with full justification that our culture is socialist in content and in the main direction of its development, varied in terms of national forms, and internationalist in terms of spirit and nature. Thus, it is an organic alloy of the spiritual values created by all nations."

On the basis of the experience of other peoples, the republics of Central Asia and Azerbaijan where there was virtually no sculpture before the October Revolution developed under the Soviet system their own schools of contemporary monument art. A number of talented and original works appeared here in the 1960's and 1970's. We see in these republics, where important artistic traditions had developed, their fruitful utilization and further development, and their combination with the experience of the entire Soviet and worldwide progressive art. Thus, the famous composition by Yu. Mikenas, the father of Soviet Lithuanian monument sculpture, "First Swallows," dedicated to the conquest of space, clearly proves this approach to the creation of the image. We see in the allegorical thinking and scope of social summations a link with the international experience of Soviet art. It is important to emphasize that these features are not a mechanical collection of qualities, but the result of a profoundly felt idea refracted through the creative individuality of the author. In precisely the same manner, and in his own profoundly individual style, sculptor N. Nikogosyan, also relying on the traditions of Armenian culture and all-union experience (together with architect D. Torosyan) has sculpted writers M. Nalbandyan and A. Isaakyan.

Thus, undertaking new subjects, the artistic mastery of the new content of the national characteristics of art promotes the ideological and artistic expressiveness of the monument figure. In the course of this process the old forms are renovated, their possibilities become apparent, and new artistic solutions are born which may not show the external features of a simply interpreted "national specificity," but which reflect the new national reality and the influence of the collective artistic experience of other Soviet republics.

Within the generally fruitful direction followed in monument art over the past 20 years certain stages may be singled out in the development of national characteristics. Thus, in the 1950's and 1960's, enthusiasm for "national specificity" occasionally became self-seeking. It was reduced to the cultivation of means or motifs typical of one or another historical period of development of national art and frequently became stylized and archaic. In the 1970's an aspiration to surmount such narrowness and to intensify the contemporary understanding of topics, materials, forms, dialectics of tradition and contemporaneity, was clearly manifested. Greater attention was paid to the utilization of the experience of the entire Soviet art and to rate each work within the framework of this experience and its common problems.

Unquestionably, the further all-round rapprochement among the peoples of our multinational socialist homeland will lead to a new level of reciprocal enrichment among socialist national cultures, and new artistic accomplishments of our monument art, promoting the Soviet way of life and imbued with international pathos.

The aspiration toward a deeper artistic mastery of reality and of the expression of the great ideas of our time, and the desire of the authors to record historical events in large-scale monuments brought to life a specific type of work, such as the memorial ensemble with its complex system of figure in which the synthesis of the arts plays an important role.

In the memorial ensembles created in the past two decades the authors have tried to go from the specific fact to the great summation, to link the past with the present, and to relate them to the future. The novel approach to this topic lies precisely in this combination.

Among such ensembles are the one in Salspils in Latvia, Khatyn and Brest in Belorussia, and Sardarapat and Yegern in Armenia. The "Strip of Glory," built along the perimeter of the defense line of Leningrad in the period of its blockade is of a unique nature. It consists of a system of monuments and ensembles quite distant from each other, visually unrelated.

Such ensembles are distinguished by their artistic significance. The best among them are the pride of Soviet art. They possess a tremendous ideological-patriotic potential and trigger profound emotional experiences. Each of them has its own solution. At the same time, they express a certain common trend of our artistic development.

Memorials are usually built wherever major vestiges of the past have been preserved. The artist's creative thinking and feelings came in contact with the emotional atmosphere of the event and were inspired by live, strong, and direct feeling for the material. These memorial signs and memorial spaces were so eloquent that the desire to carefully protect them and to encompass them within the general ensemble was entirely natural and understandable. Such a preservation of documental originality is one of

the most important characteristics of the new memorials. The synthesis of the arts here is broadened by a combination with historical realities and the natural landscape. In turn, the immediacy of the perception of the documentary atmosphere of the site indicated, each time, a new approach to the spatial organization of memorial complexes. That is why the creative solution is distinguished by a particular freedom of composition and rejection of rigid rules.

The synthetic character of the ensemble includes not only the graphic art, but other arts as well: Words, music, and even stage action (various directed ceremonious acts and rituals). Lines of poetry and prose, the ringing of bells, the ticking of a metronome, and colors combined with architecture and sculpture create the powerful polyphony of the memorials.

The critics have also already noted that the ability to condense and express major social ideas can be compared in terms of depth of emotional impact and complexity of the system of figures in memorial ensembles with forms of other types of art such as the epic novel in literature and the symphony in music.

The most important place in the aesthetic organization of the urban environment are monuments which become the ideological-artistic and spatially dominant feature of the entire city or of an urban district. Usually, their topic is related to the history, events, or outstanding people who gave fame to that city. Creating a specific spiritual atmosphere, contributing to the expression of its unique individuality, and forming its artistic appearance, they become a characteristic emblem of the city.

In recent years significant urban memorial ensembles have been created. Let us name among them, above all, the Lenin Memorial in Ul'yanovsk (group of authors headed by B. Mezentsev).

In terms of purpose, the memorial is multifunctional: it is a museum, a center for mass social projects, and a center for historical relics. The overall composition includes the houses linked with Vladimir Il'ich's birth and first years of life. In this manner the memorial combines the memory of the greatest genius of mankind with the present life of the Soviet people--the builders of communism--and the immortality of the Leninist doctrine and its dynamics. The authors looked for and found the type of artistic solution which would express this complex and comprehensive content. Along with the other new buildings, the memorial is an ensemble visible from any part of the city and from the Kuybyshev water reservoir.

In Volgograd the great ensemble created by a group of authors headed by sculptor Ye. Vuchetich and architect Ya. Belopol'skiy, plays an extremely important urban-construction and ideological-artistic dominant role. This is a memorial complex dedicated to the historical victory in the Volga which had a decisive influence on the course of World War II. The legendary Mamayev Kurgan, along whose slope sculptural compositions are placed,

depicting various events in the historical battle, appears like a pedestal of a huge monument--the allegorical figure of the mother-homeland. Visible from all sides, crowning the burial mound, it dominates the surrounding buildings. Emphasizing the heroic nature of the city and reminding of its historical exploit, it is as though the statue brings together the numerous monuments in the city, subordinating them to the principal topic--victory.

The authors of the Leningrad memorial ensemble, dedicated to the great defenders of the city (sculptor M. Anikushin and architects S. Speranskiy and V. Kamenskiy) resolved a most complex problem: to create a grandiose monument which would show the importance of the heroic defense of Leningrad, making it the organizing center of the entire newly built area, and at the same time maintain unity with the spatial, stylistic, and imagistic structure of the city and its monuments and ensembles.

The monument-museum to the Red Latvian Infantrymen, in Riga, which perpetuates the exploit of the knights of the October Revolution, has a different nature of ties with the city and a different urban-shaping quality. Within the outline of the city this ensemble is not a noticeable spatial landmark. Here something else matters: as the spiritual symbol of the capital of Soviet Latvia, it draws within its orbit everything surrounding it. Thus, this old part of the city assumes a new ideological aspect. The Riga experience in transforming an ancient urban center through the erection of a new monument is fruitful and instructive.

Occasionally, not the entire ensemble but an individual monument may assume an ideological-artistic dominant role, performing an urban-shaping function. Such is the case, for example, with the monument in Izhevsk, in honor of the 400th anniversary of the voluntary unification of Udmurtiya with Russia and the 50 years of the founding of the USSR. With its help the authors (sculptor A. Burganov and architect R. Topuridze) have been able to bring together the different types of buildings of the new city center and subordinate them to a single image and composition idea. The pairs of high pylons are visible from various parts of the city and from the man-made lake. Their shape, which reminds of open windowpanes or sails swollen by the wind, is full of motion and aspiration upwards, expressing, as the authors planned, the progress of two united nations. The strong plasticity of the sculpted figures, located along three tiers on the face of the monument, is in contrast with the steel flatness of the pylons.

In this connection, let us also note the major trend (characteristic of other monuments as well) of broadening figure intonations customary in the field monument art. Usually there is a solemnity and a strictly static nature (and, in monuments to the fallen, a sorrowful greatness). Asserting today's life, optimism, and an aspiration toward the future, many authors introduce in their images a holiday spirit and joy, enhancing the decorative element. Broadening the content of the topic, the monument also shows more and dynamic shapes replacing traditional arches of triumph and obelisks.

There are cases in Soviet monument art in which someone's figure becomes the ideological-artistic and spatially dominant feature of the city. Such is the noteworthy sculpture of Salavat Yulayev in Ufa (sculptor S. Tavasiyev and architect I. Gaynutdinov). Its significance is determined not only by the fact that it vividly expresses the concept of the people of its legendary hero, Pugachev's comrade in arms, but also by the way this monument has been positioned.

The ten-meter-high cast-iron sculpture stands at the edge of a sharp turn on the very high bank of the Belaya River. It has become the organizing center of a natural-architectural ensemble which includes a mount, a river, and the space beyond the river. However, whereas both nature and urban construction have extensively become an organic part of the composition (here again it is important to carefully preserve established relations), the immediate space surrounding the sculpture should be improved.

Buildings representing particular types of monuments are appearing ever more frequently in our country. This includes not only the Ul'yanovsk memorial but the V. I. Lenin Museum in Tashkent, the Museum of the History of Cosmonautics in Kaluga, and the Museum of Komsomol Glory in Velikiye Luki. The interpretation of architectural constructions as monuments was reflected also in the competition designs for the Museum to the Revolution and the V. I. Lenin Museum in Moscow.

The overall process of intensification of meaning and broadening the range of expressive means and rich artistic language we see in sculpture and architecture has been represented in monument art as well.

At the time he formulated his plan, Lenin was considering the expressive possibilities of monument art and regretted that our climate was not suitable for painting murals on houses along streets and squares.

Today the development of technical facilities and the use for artistic purposes of materials immune to weather conditions have opened new possibilities for painters of monumental works. At the same time, the new structural style of non-ordered architecture, related to industrial construction, brought with it short compositions, simple dimensions, the domination of flat areas, and "clean" walls," which were put at the disposal of the painters. The great scope of public construction, such as palaces of culture and sports halls, scientific institutions, schools, theaters, and museums, led to the development of murals in the interiors--frescoes and works in other ancient media, such as tempera and encaustic.

Mosaics, murals, stained glass, and graffiti on the fronts and butt-ends of public and residential buildings and in their interiors, have become a mark of our time. However, the number of unquestionable successes is not so substantial, even though their number is growing and development trends are obvious.

Monument art experienced a period of growing-pains when, initially, qualities such as brevity and flatness of depiction and expression seemed absolutely necessary. At the same time, at the beginning of the 1960's, a number of works appeared in which the monumental figure was replaced by a schematic poster design or a symbol.

However, starting with mid-1960's, effective attempts were undertaken to surmount the narrow understanding of the problem of combining monument art with architecture based on the principle of stylistic similarity. Greater attempts were made to give a meaning to the figures and establish a more active emotional link between murals and viewers. The artists developed a variety of figure-composition solutions.

Thus, Yu. Korolev was able to successfully include as part of the Museum of the USSR Armed Forces, in Moscow, the complex mosaic composition "People and Army Are One," within the architecture of the main entrance hall.

Another monumentalist, B. Tal'berg, is also working on the epic depiction of the people's exploit, using different means. He structured his work on the epic of the 1812 Patriotic War, "Battle of Borodino," on the face of the Panorama Museum in Moscow on the basis of the principle of the "island" location on the wall of fragments of the historical narration; the mosaic "Liberated Man," in the Palace of Culture in Sverdlovsk, conversely, presents in a symbolical-allegorical form the release of the gigantic forces of mankind.

The biggest work of the 1960's in the field of monumental art was the frieze "The Gains of October" on the motion-picture theater on Kalinin Prospekt in Moscow (authors N. Andronov, A. Vasnetsov, and V. El'konin). The theme here is developed as a narrative which progresses in the consecutive alternation of events--the main stages in the country's history--expressed through symbolic summed-up characters. The structure of the mosaic is firm and strict, contrasting with the apotheosis expressed by the composition.

The principle of the mosaic frieze was subsequently developed in a characteristic monument in Tol'yatti. Here mosaics thickly cover all four sides of the pylon. Describing the history of the Soviet state, it is also of urban-construction significance (the work on this project is being completed by Yu. Koro'ev). The trend toward a more active participation of monument art in the shaping of urban areas is expressed in the mosaic covering the huge space of the library building of the Second Moscow Medical Institute. It is dedicated to the noble work of physicians (authors L. Polishchuk and S. Shcherbinina).

One of the significant monumental works of the 1960's, distinguished by profound development of the figures, is the mosaic by A. Vasnetsov "Conquerers of Outer Space" in the Museum of the History of Cosmonautics in Kaluga. Its figures have been individualized. Despite their external

static appearance, they show an inner stress. They are stern, yet poetical. The mosaic composition by N. Andronov and A. Vasnetsov in the building of the newspaper ISVESTIYA is distinguished by its elegance and beauty of colors, solemn structure, and correlation between man and architectural space.

A deeper content in monumental figures is characteristic of other types of murals as well. A number of noteworthy works were created in tempera. Noteworthy among them is the panel by M. Savitskiy "The Great Patriotic War. 1944" at the Belorussian State Museum of the Great Patriotic War.

The works of I. Bogdesko and O. Filatchev are noted by their originality and fruitful studies in the creation of the figures of our contemporaries. Among others, they make creative use of the experience of the great masters of the Italian Renaissance. These artists try to depict the entire characters of their subjects with the accuracy of today's real life. Their works reflect the new relations which developed at the end of the 60's between easel painting and monumental art.

Whereas by the end of the 1950's and the first half of the 1960's the presentation of people in easel paintings gravitated toward monumental poster types, while the elements of easel painting in monumental paintings were considered a shortcoming, today the monumental image is enriched, encompassing qualities which seemed inherent in easel paintings only.

In the mural "Belorussian Educators," painted on the walls of the Teacher's House in Minsk, in encaustic, G. Vashchenko provides an original solution to problems related to a deeper approach to portrait painting.

Works of note in tempera include wall paintings by the Georgian artist Nikolay Ignatov "Song of Georgia," in Pitsunda, and "The Dedication of Pirozman," in Tbilisi. The motherland and the land, art and people are the ideological content of Ignatov's murals. In "The Dedication of Pirozman" the author provides an original solution in which monumentality is combined with humor, which also enables him to include poetic fantasies in the mural.

The best monumental paintings of recent years offer data for raising the question of expanding the limits of monumental art and of enriching it, as well as of the reciprocal influence and interpenetration among its various types and genres. Unquestionably, this is a fruitful process.

To an ever greater extent the concept of decorativeness is related by the painters with the people's concept of the beauty of the real world, including it in their works. Since the mid-1960's, when the insufficiency, both in terms of meaning and emotion, of the principle of "brevity and expression" began to be felt, a trend began to develop seeking meaning and emotion by turning to the sources and motifs of folk creativity.

The Ukrainian painters V. Mel'nichenko and A. Rybachuk were among the first to follow this trend. In the Kiev Palace of Pioneers they created a number of mosaic compositions based on the motifs of M. Primachenko, the master of Ukrainian folk painting.

A turn to folk works was considered as the intention to create a counter-balance to the cold-straight line rhythms of the new architecture. On a broader level, it meant a creative polemic waged against the rational schematism of the figure, designed in a stylistic similarity of dry, geometric architecture.

Decorative artistic figures can be very meaningful. This is exemplified by the compositions of Georgian painter Z. Tsereteli. Typical of his works are the ornamental smalt mosaic at the Tbilisi Trade Union Palace, on the cupola on top of the building. It is here that people come to relax. Its topic is "man and labor are the meaning and beauty of life." The artist tries to depict the feeling of celebration and link the interpretation of the topic with people's symbols of sun and fertility.

In the resort town of Adler Z. Tsereteli has resolved complex space-organizing problems and has found original methods to accomplish this. Two big areas between the tall buildings of boarding houses contain a variety of sculptured groups and graphic compositions making them fabulous playgrounds for children.

In the ensemble of these two sites the artist uses new plastic forms which could be described either as sculptured paintings or three-dimensional mosaics.

I. Lavrova, I. Pchel'nikov, and other artists are successfully turning to such styles and providing their original solutions. This proves the existence of new and fruitful ways for the artistic enrichment of the environment and its saturation with poetic forms of great variety.

Decorativeness, understood as the beauty of the real world in its happy holiday manifestation, linked with the feelings of the people, is represented not only in paintings, but in sculptures decorating residential and public areas.

Indicative in this respect are the works of B. Svinin in Navoi--the new city of power workers and chemists rising in the midst of the desert in Uzbekistan. The sculptor glorifies water as the source of life, joy, and labor. Three sculptured compositions--fountains--express the various aspects of this topic.

The art of metal embossing, applied in the creation of wall panels, reappeared in the 1960's, as a cross between decorative and monumental art. It has been vividly expressed, for example, in the works of the Georgian painter I. Ochiauri. His works are also an example of combining sculpture with drawing and painting.

Whereas in I. Ochiauri's embossing sculpture is combined with painting, within a single monument-decorative figure, conversely, in the works of A. Stoshkus and K. Morkunas paintings become sculptured, thus broadening the means of expression of the ancient stained-glass technique. Many other examples of combinations of art genres could be cited. A similar process has been applied in tapestry making. In the works of a number of artists tapestries acquire a third, sculptured, dimension. What is most interesting here is that the makers of tapestries turn to serious topics using major summations and giving a depth to the content. The sizes of tapestries are being enlarged. Occasionally, they are the focal point of the interior of a public building, like works of monument art. Instead of their customary qualities of intimacy they bring oratorical intonations and are addressed to the masses. The monumentalizing of tapestries in recent years has resulted in a number of significant projects. Let us note the canvas by M. Savitskiy and A. Kishchenko "Leninism" for the administrative building in Minsk.

Going back to stained glass, let us point out that it has been developing in a variety of directions. Original and equally fruitful work in stained glass is being done by Russian Federation artists D. Merpert, Yu. Korolev, and B. Tal'berg. For example, B. Tal'berg's big composition "Protect the Peace" at the Komsomol Glory Museum in Velikiye Luki, proves the new possibilities of stained glass. Here the author originally combines painting with drawing. This work, fully consistent with the specific artistic task in terms of expressiveness, directs our thoughts yet once again to the fruitfulness of the interpenetration of the various art types and genres.

The successes achieved in the implementation of Lenin's idea have been unquestionable. The development of monumental art is continuing today at a tremendous scope. A number of major memorial ensembles are being created, such as the one perpetuating the great heroics of Malaya Zemlya in Novorossiysk. A three-dimensional complex entitled "Lines of Glory" is being developed with a series of monuments at places of former battlefields in the accesses to the capital, from Kalinin to Tula. A number of artists are participating in the contest for the creation of a monument in honor of the heroes of the international communist, labor, and national-liberation movements. The decision for this project was made by the 25th CPSU Congress on Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's suggestion. A number of monuments are being erected in the capitals of union republics and other cities. Wherever the ideas occur--in art workshops--and wherever they are carried out--on the walls of public buildings--work is under way on new mosaics, murals, stained glass, tapestries, graffiti, and bas reliefs.

Today Soviet monument art has entered a new stage of development related to the solution of the problems of the building of communism in the period of developed socialism and the assertion of the socialist way of life.

Present day conditions call for upgrading the effectiveness of all party ideological work. Addressing the 25th CPSU Congress, Comrade

L. I. Brezhnev discussed the way to achieve this: "It means the adoption of a comprehensive approach to the organization of all education, i.e., insuring close unity among the ideological-political, labor, and moral education in accordance with the characteristics of the various groups of working people." In this case ideological-moral upbringing through art, monumental art in particular, plays a major role.

We are witnessing a growing variety of links between monumental art and life and the public. This art fulfills the functions not only of creating spiritual values, but of shaping the material environment. Monumental works play an important urban-construction role. Memorial ensembles contribute to the birth and development of various forms of social rituals: Military oaths are taken, Komsomol and pioneer membership ceremonies, solemn meetings, and so on, are conducted at monuments. All this enriches monumental art, providing, naturally, that it resolves its main problem: the promotion of communist ideals and of exploits for the happiness of mankind. This demands of the artist, in addition to precise ideological concepts, talent and skill.

Here again we cannot ignore shortcomings in our practice and in the interpretation and solution of a number of problems. Let us note, above all, that the scope of the effort involved in the erection of monument works on the proper scale is far from always on the necessary quality level. Occasionally, monumental art is interpreted on a utilitarian basis, as some kind of universal means which would allegedly enable us easily to surmount the monotony of mass residential construction. Hence the creation of meaningless fillers. On the other hand, frequently a major historical or contemporary social topic will be suggested for the walls of a building, even though it would be out of place. Occasionally the artistic organization the urban environment is haphazard, without dominant ideological-aesthetic features.

To a certain extent such shortcomings may be explained by the fact that occasionally unsuitable people are given important assignments in the creation of monumental works. However, frequently the work of professionals as well suffers from immaturity of concept, haste, and approximation of the topic. Professionals are responsible also for the development of specific problems. For example, no one denies the possibility and suitability of big dimensions in monumental art. At the same time, however, the phenomenon of unjustified gigantomania is clearly visible, increasing the dimensions of a sculpture without adequate grounds, leading to the dehumanizing of the figure. This was justifiably discussed at one of the plenums of the USSR Union of Painters.

The scope of the work in the field of monumental art requires a considerable strengthening of its material facilities, which are still behind requirements. A number of problems must be resolved related to the organization and financing of monumental works, particularly in the area of the creative cooperation between artists and architects, from the very beginning of the designing of a project.

The further intensified study of the extremely rich creative experience in monumental art in the USSR is an adamant requirement. True, in recent years a great deal has been accomplished in this respect: A number of books and articles have been published; the unions of painters and architects have held interesting creative conferences and international meetings on problems of art synthesis. New exhibitions of Soviet monumental art were held or are being prepared as an inseparable part of the culture of developed socialism. Izdatel'stvo Sovetskiy Khudozhnik has organized the publication of collections, such as "Soviet Monumental Art," "Soviet Sculpture," and so on. Last year a fundamental work was published: the book-album "Monumental'noye Iskusstvo SSSR" [Monumental Art in the USSR] (author-compiler V. Tolstoy). Work is being done on scientific problems of monumental art in the research institutes of the USSR Academy of Fine Arts and the USSR Ministry of Culture. All this makes it possible to see quite completely the scope and variety of forms in which Lenin's idea of monumental propaganda is being implemented in our country.

However, our art science and critics face many urgent and unresolved problems of monumental art requiring further work in accordance with practical experience with all its strong and weak sides. This includes, for example, the question of the forms of interaction and synthesis among the various types of plastic art; the problem of the specifics of monumental art whose content and social purpose, even though developing with its time, remains always the same in its essentials: the aspiration to reflect the progressive trends of its age and to appeal to the human collective, to the masses. It is precisely this that develops the special language of artistic summations.

In the final account, all problems--both strictly professional and theoretical--must be subordinated to the prime task of enhancing the ideological-artistic level of monumental works which are part of our life and will be the most important spiritual guidelines of our descendants.

5003

CSO: 1802

FIRST PEOPLE'S REVOLUTION IN THE EPOCH OF IMPERIALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 79 pp 71-82

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences A. Pedosov, deputy director of the CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism]

[Text] Three-quarters of century has passed since the beginning of the 1905-1907 Revolution in Russia. For three years this huge country from Petersburg and Riga to Baku and Vladivostok was shaken up by tremendous class battle between the revolutionary masses and czarist autocracy.

The exploiting classes and their leaders in the governments of the various countries read with concern the texts of telegrams arriving from Russia. Autocratic monarchs and bourgeois presidents were united in the single aspiration to help the Russian czar to suppress the people's revolution. They did not withhold from Nicholas the Bloody loans in amounts of billions. They moved troops to the Russian borders and displayed feverish domestic political efforts, pouring floods of lies and slanders on the Russian workers and peasants.

Since that distant period the world has frequently been the witness and participant in events of universal-historical significance. However, they have been unable to overshadow the 1905-1907 Revolution, which had a deep impact on the course of global developments. Each significant step forward in the liberation of mankind from the oppression of the exploiters relied, one way or another, on the experience and the lessons of the first Russian revolution. Without the heroic struggle of the workers and peasants in 1905-1907, the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which inaugurated a new era in the history of mankind, would have been impossible. V. I. Lenin considered the 1905-1907 Revolution a general rehearsal, a prologue to the October victory.

I

In terms of objective historical content, this was the first people's revolution in the imperialist epoch. The people, i.e., the proletariat and the peasantry, were its motive force. The revolution pursued broad

liberation objectives, such as the overthrow of the hated autocracy and the establishment of a democratic republic, the abolition of landed estate ownership and thus the solution of the agrarian problem, the introduction of an eight-hour workday in industry and transportation, and so on.

A deep all-round revolutionary crisis had been ripening in Russia over a number of decades. Following the abolition of serfdom the development of capitalism was accelerated; production forces were gathering a high rate of growth. Yet, the political superstructure of society remained archaic. Even though it tried somehow to adapt to the new economic conditions in the country and, with a view to encouraging the development of capitalism, particularly in the interest of big capital, czarist autocracy was implementing some measures, it was unable to change its very nature--the dictatorship of the land-owning class. It was not resolving the old yet acute agrarian problem. Yet, this paralyzed the development of production forces and hindered social progress. Like a watchdog czarism was protecting the predatory anti-national and anti-people's policy of capitalists and land owners who had created inhuman living and working conditions for the workers and peasants--the main productive force of society.

The best people, whatever their social position, who were linked with the life of the people realized that great events were approaching. "Storm! A storm will break out soon!" wrote Maxim Gorky in 1901. For many years the Marxists most clearly indicated the inevitability of a people's revolution in Russia.

The revolution ripened under conditions in which the capitalist world was entering its new and final stage--imperialism. This process was taking place in Russia as well. Along with the further growth and development of capitalist relations in width and in depth, at the turn of the 20th century the process of monopolization of capital began. According to current estimates, in the first decade of the 20th century Russia had over 150 monopoly associations covering key industrial sectors. They were closely interwoven with foreign monopolies which rushed into Russia, considering it the arena for a more advantageous placement of capital and a market for less expensive manpower.

To the workers, to the working people, the monopolies brought, in addition to the old general capitalist oppression, their own, new anti-people's characteristics. These characteristics were manifested in the policy of monopoly prices, which restrained a number of outputs, in freezing wages, in the creation of artificial "metal" and "petroleum" hunger, which upset the economy, and, in the final account, hurt the workers and peasants, and all working people. Meanwhile, Russia remained a country with strong feudal-serfdom vestiges. All intensified socioeconomic contradictions and made the class struggle and relations among classes in general particularly acute.

Russia's entry into the epoch of imperialism meant that new socioeconomic contradictions were added to the old. Contradictions between the interests

of the people and of the monopolies, supported by the government, frictions among individual bourgeois groups, the aggravated inter-imperialist struggle, the upsurge of national-liberation movements in outlying areas, and so on, were added to the contradictions between peasants and land owners and between workers and capitalists, and to the struggle within the stratifying peasantry itself. The age of socialist revolutions was nearing.

All this meant that the historical role of the bourgeoisie as a once progressive force, holding the center of the age, had been played out. Henceforth the proletariat, grown quantitatively and qualitatively, was becoming the force which would determine the nature and direction of social progress. It was precisely the proletariat that was to head the movement of the people's masses in the growing revolution.

V. I. Lenin taught that in order to understand the revolution it is important to determine, above all, "its class nature and motive forces and means of struggle . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 30, p 325). As Lenin predicted as early as the 1890's, the main motive force of the Russian revolution became the proletariat, allied with the peasantry. Its position in society, working and living conditions, and organizational possibilities were all factors which were present with the existence of a political leader--the Bolshevik party, the only party in the country which had a program and an organization at the outbreak of the revolution.

At the beginning of the 20th century Russia had as many as 10 million hired workers. The industrial proletariat (including railroad workers and miners) totaled three million. Let us immediately point out that the revolution most clearly confirmed Lenin's thought that the strength of the organized proletariat is far greater than its relative share of the population.

The situation of enterprise workers was exceptionally difficult. It was equally difficult in the main economic sectors due to the overall process of economic development. The conversion of industry to the technical base of the steam engine, accelerated in the course of the process of production concentration, and the development of railroads and construction of electric power plants triggered a tempestuous increase in the consumption of coal and petroleum. The development of new coal mines and petroleum areas was accelerated. Hundreds of thousands of people became involved in exhaustive and dangerous work. For example, miners worked in great depths without adequate shoring, frequently on their knees or lying on their side, depending on the location of the coal seam. The air in the mines was raw, saturated with coal dust; coal cars were pulled literally on one's own knees, and frequently in water.

Inexpensive women's and children's labor was being used ever more extensively. A system of fines was practiced which occasionally took away up to

one-half of the earnings; the payment of wages was delayed and the cost of food bought at company stores was frequently higher, while the quality was worse. Characteristic of workers' housing conditions, in the textile industry, for example, was a system of barracks-type dormitories. In most cases Donbas miners lived in earthen huts; up to 20% of them had one or two square meters per person. Tuberculosis, typhoid fever, rheumatic fever, and other diseases shortened the workers' lives. The administration always had the right to dismiss anyone. Human dignity was violated with all possible means.

In the course of adamant class battles, at the end of the 1890's, described as the "Petersburg Industrial War," the proletariat was able to shorten the workday; factory control was introduced and wages were raised somewhat. However, the conscious segment of the workers realized that these gains were unstable. This was confirmed by the outbreak of the 1900-1903 economic crisis.

"Our breadwinner workers are being picked out by the hundreds, leaving them hungry and cold," ISKRA wrote in 1901. "Our unemployed comrades are walking the streets like shadows, coming from Volynka, where one shift was eliminated, from Pal, where half the night shift is unemployed, from Koenig, the Malaya Okhtenskaya Textile Mill, Shavo, Thornton, etc. . . ." "The European markets will balance themselves," says Mr Vitte soothingly. Meanwhile, the workers will also die by themselves! Do they have the right to live if their work is unable to bring profits to the capitalists?" (ISKRA, No 2, 1901).

Despite the legislatively codified workday of 11.5 hours, gained by the workers, at most enterprises the 13-14 hour day remained and only a few of the biggest and the state enterprises applied the 10 and 10.5 hour workday.

Russia was entering the revolution led by the proletariat, which had proved itself not only as a suffering class, but as a fighting class, as the vanguard force of all working and exploited people. This was helped by the circumstance that as in no other European country, the Russian working class was concentrated in production. Over 50% of it worked at enterprises employing over 500 workers and over 35% worked at plants and factories employing over 1,000 workers. Factories, gigantic plants, big mines, and other enterprises were rising in various parts of the country, promising to become the real bastions of the revolution, something which Lenin dreamed about and worked for. Such was the case in Petersburg, Moscow, the Baltic, Poland, the Central Industrial Area, the Donbas, along the Volga, the Urals, and the biggest railroads.

The political tradition among the progressive workers in Russia began to develop as early as the 1870's-1880's. The voice of weaver Petr Alekseyev in the czarist court was heard far and wide: "The muscular arms of millions of working people will rise and the yoke of despotism protected by

soldiers' bayonets will turn into dust!" Lenin described this speech as a "great prophecy by a Russian worker-revolutionary."

Since the beginning of Lenin's revolutionary activities, the creation of the Petersburg and, following its example, other "alliances of the struggle for the liberation of the working class," the publication of ISKRA and the spreading of a network of Lenin-ISKRA organizations, the propaganda, agitation, and organization of the proletariat acquired solid grounds and ended with the founding of the Bolshevik party in 1903. The party became the true leader and organizer of the working class and, on the basis of the revolutionary situation which developed in the country, charted a course leading to revolution.

II

In the course of the revolutionary struggle, rejecting the claims of the liberal bourgeoisie to assume a leading role in the revolution, the working class led the multimillion-strong peasantry masses. In the political sense, the peasantry in Russia had not "quieted down" even after the abolition of serfdom in 1861: here and there peasant troubles broke out. "The crux of the struggle," Lenin wrote, "is the serfdom landed estates, the most outstanding embodiment and the firmest support of the vestiges of serfdom in Russia" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 16, p 215).

The overwhelming mass of the peasantry had little or no land. The small class of owners owned a good half of the farmland. By the turn of the century 30,000 land owners in European Russia owned 70 million desyatinas, i.e., almost as much as the 10.5 million of the poorest peasants. The land owner's family averaged over 2,300 desyatinas, compared with 7 to 15 per peasant family. In the Nonchernozem Zone, i.e., in most of European Russia, the peasant was short of grain from the time he was born. ". . . There is not even enough to feed a chicken," complained one of L. N. Tolstoy's characters. Lenin, as we know, described the great writer as the "mirror of the Russian revolution."

Since it was impossible to live on the land, the peasants were forced to lease land, and borrow from the land owner and the kulak at usurious rates of interest.

The serfdom system of paying in kind for the land, unbearable taxes, both royal and local and direct and indirect, and payments for the land distributed after the 1861 reform undermined the peasant family. In the final account, the development of production forces was hindered and the old type of poverty, neglect, and backwardness of the Russian countryside, so familiar, extensively described and bemoaned by the great Russian writers of the 19th and 20th centuries, was strengthened.

The shameless plunder of the peasantry reached such an extent that as early as 1906, 45 years after the reform, it had already paid land owners for the

distributed land 1.9 billion rubles. This was more than triple the factual assessed market value of the land. Nevertheless, the countryside was still "indebted" to the land owners. Shortages grew with every passing year. The bureaucratic governmental machinery callously confiscated the pitiful property of the peasants because of "arrears," took away the cattle, and so on.

Adding to this the total political rightlessness of the peasantry, which worsened even further following the institution of the so-called "zemstvo chiefs," whose system virtually reduced to naught the role of the rural assembly elective organs, the entire tragedy of the situation becomes clear. It is not astounding that a revolution was ripening in the countryside as well. Between 1900 and 1904 there were 670 cases of peasant action in the country--triple the number over the preceding 10 years.

A profound objective base developed for the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry. It was pointed out by Lenin as early as his work "Who Are the 'Friends of the People' and How They Fight the Social Democrats?" (1894).

At that time the political position of the bourgeoisie was characterized by a certain dissemination of opposition feelings among a certain segment. However, fear of a popular revolution was even stronger. The unresolved agrarian problem, the existence of a huge land fund in the hands of land owners, the sluggishness of the czarist bureaucratic apparatus in meeting the growing needs of big capital, combined with the fact that the bourgeoisie was frankly blocked from assuming the political power, nurtured a certain dissatisfaction on its part with the existing order of things.

However, as Lenin pointed out, the bourgeoisie was the property-owning class which asked only for concessions on the part of the autocracy, not even conceiving of any change in the foundations of the economic system (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 9, p 133). This was explained by the fact that, on the one hand, the bourgeoisie was receiving from the government generous subsidies for big, military, in particular, industry, protective customs tariffs, government orders related to railroad construction, the opening of new foreign markets, and so on. On the other hand, it feared a radical breakdown of the economic system and mortally feared the fact that the struggle against one type of exploiting private ownership (landed estates) could extend to other types. Furthermore, here and there, the bourgeoisie itself had already managed to acquire land.

Unhindered, big capital squandered the country's human and material resources. The only powerful protection of the predatory and impudent behavior of the exploiters was a powerful autocratic-land owning state which offered the only reliable protection from the growing revolutionary wave.

Hence the dual behavior of bourgeois political organizations and leaders: occasionally they would go with the people, presenting matters as though

they sympathized with the revolution, while in fact engaging in open or concealed deals with the government. Meanwhile, the bourgeoisie tried to extract everything it could from the development of events. To this effect the liberal politicians tried to create the appearance that the bourgeoisie was acting on behalf of the entire people. It tried to assume the leadership of the movement of the masses in order to lead them, for example, into the struggle for a constitutional monarchy. The ideologues of bourgeois liberalism tried to prove that in the beginning revolution there were two fighting sides: autocracy, on the one hand, and the bourgeoisie, allegedly heading the entire democratic movement. As to proletarian democracy, which was promoting a social revolution, Struve, the leader of the liberals, for example, simply slighted it. "The concept of social revolution as a theoretical concept," he wrote, "is not only deprived of meaning or purpose but is false."

On the threshold of the arising revolution, czarism had its own view of the situation and the deployment of forces, maneuvering its own forces and direct and indirect reserves. Landed estates and the landed nobility remained the socioeconomic base of czarist autocracy. The system of state rule, from top to bottom--the general, civil, and military administration--was in the hands of a court camarilla, the reactionary officialdom, and other members of the landed nobility.

At the same time, however, under the conditions of the real economic and political development of society and complex class relations, the Russian autocratic government could not retain the political power or, in general, rule the country without an alliance with the bourgeoisie. Even though, being a super-conservative power, it was dragging its feet, fearing the loss of power, and constantly reminding the liberals that their "constitutional dreams were senseless," czarism was no longer able to avoid an alliance with the bourgeoisie, feeling the rising of the crest of a revolutionary, proletarian, popular wave. The czarist government, Lenin pointed out, was, nevertheless, "a government of a capitalist country linked with thousands of unbreakable ties with Europe, the international marketplace, and international capital" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 12, p 10).

Summing up the deployment of class forces within the revolution, Lenin wrote that "three main camps are fighting and will continue to fight: The government, the liberals, and the workers democracy as the center of attraction of everything democratic. . . . It is only by realizing the inevitable separation into three basic camps that the working class will promote its own ideas, rather than the liberal labor policy, using the conflicts between the first and second camps without being tricked, even for a minute, by the allegedly democratic phraseology of the liberals" (ibid, vol 21, p 172).

The democratic camp, headed by the proletariat, fought for the overthrow of czarism and the establishment of a democratic republic. The liberal-

bourgeois camp wanted a constitutional monarchy and the prevention of a popular revolution. The government camp (czarism, land owners, and other openly counterrevolutionary forces) tried to retain at all costs an inviolable monarchic governmental system and block a social coup d'etat.

However, the country mercilessly followed the path of the revolution. The entire course of socioeconomic development aggravated the revolutionary crisis. The fact which accelerated its outbreak was the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905. This was an imperialist war on both sides, even though its direct perpetrator was Japan, urged on by the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain, who were planning to impose their own rule on Southeast Asia. The czarist camarilla, encouraged by Germany, gripped by irresponsible optimism and rosy imperialist hopes, was confident that the atmosphere of military-patriotic enthusiasm, fanned by chauvinistic feelings, would help to abate the flame within the country and prevent the ripening of revolution. In the words of Prime Minister Vitte, the opinion of the ruling circles was that "in order to contain the revolution, we need a small victorious war." The czarist clique did not even conceive of the possibility of defeat.

From the very beginning of the Russo-Japanese War the Bolsheviks exposed its true objectives and pointed out its culprits. "The interests of the greedy bourgeoisie and of capitalism, ready to betray and ruin its homeland in the pursuit of profits, was what triggered this criminal war, which is bringing incalculable troubles to the working people," stated the appeal of the RSDWP Central Committee to the Russian proletariat in February 1904. As we know, after a number of big, lost battles, the war ended in Russia's defeat. However, the shameful failure was not that of the Russian people, Lenin wrote, but of the autocracy. He considered the fall of Port Arthur the prologue to the fall of czarism. Contrary to the hopes of the czarist politicians, the war only intensified the anti-monarchic, the revolutionary feelings of the people.

III

The revolution in Russia broke out on 9 (22) January 1905. That day, opening fire at a peaceful march of hundreds of thousands of patriarchally feeling workers who were marching to submit petitions to the czar, the autocratic government saw the capital covered with barricades. As the news of the "Bloody Sunday" and its victims spread throughout the country, the workers rose to political demonstrations, strikes, and armed actions. The authorities organized another bloody slaughter of the Riga workers on 13 (26) January. Here, four days after the Petersburg events, thousands of Latvian and Russian workers came out to demonstrate under the slogan of "Down with Autocracy!" Here again the wide bank of the Daugava river became blood colored.

"There still is no revolutionary people in Russia," wrote that same Struve in January 1905, two days before "Bloody Sunday." However, in January 1905

strikes spread over 66 cities, involving 440,000 strikers. The entire political picture changed in the months that followed. "The hundreds of revolutionary social democrats 'suddenly' jumped into the thousands, and the thousands became the leaders of two to three million proletarians," Lenin wrote. "The proletarian struggle triggered great ferment, along with the revolutionary movement, among the 50 to 100 million-strong peasant masses . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 30, pp 310-311). The movement of the peasantry was reflected in the army, where actions were mounted by soldiers and seamen, along with armed clashes among army units. Thus, this huge country with its 130-million-strong population entered the revolutionary struggle. The once "slumbering" Russia turned into a Russia of the revolutionary proletariat and revolutionary people.

The moment the revolutionary events began Lenin began to look for the chance to go to Russia. On 8 (21) November 1905 he returned home from exile and immediately plunged into active leadership of the central and Petersburg committees. He spoke at conferences and meetings in Petersburg and Moscow, met with party workers, and wrote articles for the Bolshevik press organs. Under his leadership the Bolsheviks began preparations for an armed uprising. On the day of his arrival in Petersburg the leader met with L. B. Krasin and other party workers at a secret Bolshevik meeting place. That same day Vladimir Il'ich visited the Preobrazhenskoye Cemetery and for a long time stood, his head bowed, in front of the common graves of the Petersburg proletarians killed on 9 January. The same evening he was addressing an expanded meeting of the Petersburg Bolshevik committee with a speech in which he explained the tasks of the party concerning the soviets. Soon afterwards permanent communications were established with the Moscow committee and Lenin issued directives to the Muscovites.

M. M. Essen, who then worked for the Petersburg committee, recalls that in his meeting with the Petersburg committee, Vladimir Il'ich "sternly admonished us for the fact that Mensheviks were at the head of the soviet of workers deputies (this applied to Petersburg--the author). Our fight for the soviets became more active following Lenin's arrival." The next day, on 9 November, Lenin held a meeting for the Bolshevik editors of NOVAYA ZHIZN', a legally published newspaper, attended by the party aktiv. He took over the management of the newspaper, which became the factual central organ of the RSDWP. Its daily circulation reached 80,000 copies. It was precisely in it that Lenin published 13 articles on basic problems of party policy and tactics in the revolution, in the course of slightly over one month, until the paper was closed down.

Subsequently, a legally published central organ, managed by Lenin, was printed under different names, through July 1906.

The role which Lenin, as the leader of the working class, and of the Bolshevik party, as the vanguard of the revolution, is clearly seen in the fact that at the very beginning of the struggle they formulated a

scientific concept of its development and defined the party's political line for its various stages. It was expressed in Lenin's and Krupskaya's letters to the homeland, the documents of the third and, subsequently, fourth and fifth party congresses, the book "Two Tactics of the Social Democrats in the Democratic Revolution," in numerous articles by Lenin in publications such as NOVAYA ZHIZN', VOLJA, VPERED, and EKHO, and in Vladimir Il'ich's addresses at meetings with party workers in the capital and other cities.

Lenin's concept of a democratic revolution in Russia was radically different from the concepts of the petit bourgeoisie, not to speak of the bourgeois parties. It was the latest word in Marxism and its further enrichment under new historical circumstances.

V. I. Lenin deemed it exceptionally important to properly define the class nature, motive forces, means of struggle, and characteristics of the revolution, and the means for the development of a mass movement.

The 1905-1907 Revolution was bourgeois-democratic in terms of social content, since the direct objective of the movement of the masses, which the masses could achieve through their own efforts, was the establishment of a democratic republic, the confiscation of landed estates, and the eight-hour workday. In its time these measures had been almost entirely achieved by the bourgeois revolution in France of the end of the 18th century.

At the same time, in a certain sense the Russia revolution was proletarian as well: it was precisely the proletariat that was its leading force and vanguard of its movement, and the proletariat alone could play this role. The strike--the specific proletarian means of struggle--was used as the principal means for "stirring up" the masses and was the most characteristic phenomenon of the growing revolutionary events.

Nowhere in the world, in no single capitalist country, including the most developed, had there been such tremendous strikes as in Russia in 1905. As a whole, the number of strikers at that time totaled 2.8 million, or double the number of factory and plant workers. Assessing this phenomenon, Lenin wrote: ". . . Until 1905 mankind did not as yet know how great, how gradiose, could a stressing of proletarian forces be and will be, if it is a question of fighting for truly great objectives, fighting in a truly revolutionary way!" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 30, p 312). The Bolshevik party headed by Lenin embodied the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution. The Bolsheviks were the only party in the country which, for a number of years, had made a scientific study of the objective development of society and by 1905 had already formulated a clear political program aimed at the victory of the democratic revolution and its further growth into a socialist revolution.

"Never could the popular masses," Lenin wrote, "be able to become such active creators of a new social order as during a revolution. . . ."

However, the leaders of the revolutionary parties as well had to formulate their tasks more broadly and boldly at that time, so that their slogans would always be ahead of the revolutionary activities of the masses, be their beacon, showing to them in its entire greatness and charm, our democratic and socialist ideal . . . ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 11, p 103).

The third party congress was held in London, under Lenin's chairmanship, in the midst of the revolutionary events. Its decisions were major contributions to the theory of Marxism-Leninism, particularly in the field of strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and all working people. The party provided clear theoretical and practical stipulations on the conditions for the victory of the democratic revolution. Whereas in the 19th century the democratic revolutions in the West inevitably led to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the problem now was posed differently. Since the proletariat had become an autonomous political force in the foreground of history, while the bourgeoisie had lost its revolutionism, the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution had to be crowned not by the power of the bourgeoisie, but by the power of the people--the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. It was to be represented by a provisional revolutionary government with the active participation of the social democrats. In a certain meaning of the term, Lenin emphasized, now the bourgeois revolution was of greater advantage to the proletariat and the peasantry than to the bourgeoisie.

Lenin's formulation of the matter radically rejected the Menshevik and Trotskyite ideas of the future of the revolution. Both the Mensheviks and their like-minded supporters in the Second International, like dogmatists and pedants, referring to the experience of the 19th century bourgeois revolutions, gave the leadership role to the bourgeoisie, and assigning to the working class the role of a "tail" and an appendage, the performer of "unskilled work." The Trotskyite theory of "permanent revolution," which meant avoiding the entire democratic stage of the revolution, in turn, led to the political isolation of the working class. Here the two opposite views on the further development of events became entirely clear. The Bolsheviks were relying on the full victory of the democratic revolution and the gradual growth of the bourgeois-democratic into a socialist revolution. Lenin clearly saw this possibility in the specific conditions of Russia. The Mensheviks believed that a lengthy development of the country lay ahead within the framework of the bourgeois system or, rather, the political framework of a constitutional monarchy, until certain conditions which, in their view, would be adequate for the victory of the proletarian revolution would mature, such as sufficiently high (by whose standard?) political, cultural, and numerical standards of the working class.

Here it is also important to compare the tactical line of the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks on the agrarian problem--the basic problem of the revolution. The Bolsheviks called for the confiscation of landed estates through revolutionary peasants' committees and the nationalization of all

the land. This was consistent with the expectations of the peasantry and gave impetus to the revolution. The Mensheviks raised the slogan of "Municipalization of the Land," which was damaging to the revolution. The essence of the program was that the confiscation of landed estates--a revolutionary measure which undermined the autocracy--was not planned. The land would be put at the disposal of the local self-administration or zemstvo from which the peasants would lease. This was a half-way, a reformist solution of the problem, similar to the Kadet program of the partial purchasing of landed estates. With this approach, the objective result was the making of a deal with the land owners and the Kadet bourgeoisie. "A peasant agrarian revolution without the overthrow of the autocracy is the most reactionary idea of the Mensheviks," Lenin said, emphasizing the very essence of the Menshevik formulation of the matter ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 16, p 313).

The political meaning of the two lines and two tactics--the Bolshevik and the Menshevik--in the 1905 Revolution was the following: The Bolsheviks and Lenin promoted the further development of the revolution and its victorious conclusion. The Mensheviks were trying to curtail the revolution and to limit it to constitutional reforms, i.e., in the final account, they were leading to the betrayal of the basic interests of workers and peasants.

The working class was the main hero of the revolution. It carried out the main revolutionary actions and suffered the heaviest casualties. Petersburg, Moscow, Riga, Ivanovo-Voznesensk, the Moscow-Kazan' Railroad, Donbas and the Urals, the Ukraine, Belorussia, the Volga area, the Transcaucasus, Siberia, and the Far East--this is only a partial list of sites of the combat actions of the proletariat. The All-Russian October Political Strike, this previously unheard-of form of struggle, covered virtually all of the country's political and cultural centers. The railroads stopped functioning and so did many communications arteries. The general strike forced czarism to engage in maneuvering, and to look for a compromise such as the 17 October Manifesto. However, Lenin perspicaciously guessed all the maneuvers of the counterrevolutionary and liberal-conciliationist elements. The revolution swept away the attempt of the autocracy to contain the movement of the masses. The December armed uprising in Moscow and in other cities was the peak of the revolution. Here the proletariat displayed models of self-sacrifice and heroism in the struggle for their revolutionary cause.

A mass peasant movement developed, but unfortunately after the peak of the proletarian movement had been reached. Nevertheless, the scope of the peasants' actions was tremendous. In the summer of 1905 they covered about one-fifth of all uyezds of the European part of Russia, while by the summer of 1906 they spread to already one-half. The peasantry of the outlying national areas was rising. An alliance was developing among workers, peasants, and oppressed peoples. At the very creation of their party, the Bolsheviks had called for organizing steady work within the armed forces as one of the mandatory party tasks.

For the second party congress Lenin drafted the famous resolution "On Work in the Armed Forces." Along with the clear examples of political demonstrations, workers' strikes, and peasants' disturbances, unquestionably this contributed to the fermentation among soldiers and seamen. The events aboard the Potemkin Battleship were its most outstanding occurrence. Given favorable conditions, it showed a promise of developing into the uprising of the Black Sea Fleet. Unfortunately, shortcomings in the leadership of the uprising, and weakening as a result of the arrests within the Odessa Bolshevik organization, prevented events from developing in the necessary direction.

Nevertheless, the uprising marked a major step in the course of the revolution. Lenin wrote that "the Battleship Potemkin remained the unconquered territory of the revolution, and whatever its fate we were faced with the unquestionable and noteworthy fact of an attempt to establish a nucleus of a revolutionary army" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 10, p 337). The Potemkin marked the beginning of an entire chain of uprisings in the army and navy.

The revolution offered examples of the constructive and creative energy of the masses. In a number of cases the strikers' committees developed into organs controlling the lives of entire enterprises and rayons. That is how new organs appeared--the soviets of workers' deputies and, subsequently, soviets of peasants' and soldiers' deputies. They acted in Ivanovo-Voznesensk, Petersburg, Moscow, Rostov, Saratov, Baku, Kiev, Yekaterinoslav, Sebastopol, Kostroma, Chita, Krasnoyarsk, Irkutsk, Smolensk, and many other cities and settlements, heading the strikes and armed uprisings.

As defined by Lenin, the soviets became the organs of revolutionary power. They exercised the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. Despite Trotskyite narrowness in the interpretation of the soviets as only organs of the strike movement, Lenin saw in them the prototype of the Soviet system, the future state form of dictatorship of the proletariat. This was confirmed by the experience of the Great October Revolution and the building of socialism. In 1905 the organized workers' trade-union movement was born as well.

IV

The 1905-1907 Revolution in Russia--the first popular revolution in the epoch of imperialism--left ineradicable mark in world history.

Despite its defeat, the revolution determined the entire subsequent development of the country. It forced czarism to make a number of substantial concessions. Even though for a short while, the proletariat gained freedom of speech, press, assembly, and union unparalleled in Russia. It gained concessions in the shortening of the working day, the easing of penalties system, and a certain increase in wages. Both the government and the land owners were forced to take a number of steps in favor of the peasantry:

abolish land purchase payments, and lower payments for leased land and the price of the land. Finally, czarism was forced to create representative institutions. This meant its further development toward a bourgeois monarchy.

Even though anti-national, the new agrarian laws objectively accelerated the development of capitalist relations in agriculture. In a country which suffered greatly from the insufficient development of capitalism and the vestiges of serfdom, this created favorable conditions for the development of the class struggle in the countryside.

The revolution forced all classes and main political forces in the country to show their political faces.

Once again czarist autocracy showed its political face as the worst enemy of the people. The bourgeoisie and its parties proved their half-way nature and the fact that the political maximum of their objectives was the establishment of a constitutional monarchy. The petit bourgeois parties revealed their inability to lead the revolution. Some of them were clinging to the old, obsolete concepts of revolutionism, while the others supported the interests of the rural bourgeoisie.

Headed by the Bolsheviks the Russian proletariat fulfilled its historical mission as leader of the revolution and did not surrender these positions through the victory of October 1917. Lenin--the leader of the party of the working class--was the leader of the 1905-1907 Revolution. Throughout the revolution he formulated the proper slogans of the movement, defined the main tasks at each one of its stages, and led the democratic strata of the population to selfless struggle against autocracy. The working class gave real examples of proletarian internationalism.

In the course of the revolution the Bolsheviks tirelessly protected the class independence of the proletariat and admitted no sectarianism. The firmness of their ideological principles enabled them to make compromises, promoting the cause of the revolution, and reach agreements on practical matters with the petit bourgeois parties and develop the tactic of "leftist blocs." "Throughout this time," Lenin wrote, "the revolution justified and proved all the basic theoretical stipulations of Marxism and all basic social democratic slogans. The revolution also justified our own social democratic work, our hopes, and our faith in the true revolutionary nature of the proletariat" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 12, pp 86-87).

The first Russian revolution had a strong impact on the status of the workers and national-liberation movements. The "peaceful period" of capitalist development ended. A period of political upheavals and revolutionary battles of the age of imperialism began.

Striking a blow at czarism, the revolution thus weakened the positions of international capital, enriched the proletariat of many countries with new,

varied experience in large-scale class battles, inspired the oppressed and the exploited to new adamant struggle for their liberation, and proved that the center of the world's revolutionary movement had shifted to Russia.

It was no accident that the international working class showed its fraternal solidarity with the heroic Russian workers. Karl Liebknecht openly called on the German workers "to stand under the banner of the Russian revolution." The Mexican revolutionary Romero Flores wrote: "We were inspired by the revolutionary thrust of Russia in 1905, suppressed by the czar. To us the struggle which was taking place in Russia at that time was a guiding star" However, already then other voices were heard which were trying to belittle the role of the first Russian revolution. Thus, as early as 1902, engaged in a lengthy discussion on the fact that the future revolution in Russia would allegedly help to break the ice of European reaction and bring a new spring to the peoples, in 1909 Kautsky began to talk differently, stating that the Russian revolution was of no essential significance to Western Europe (!).

However, reality did not agree either with Kautsky or with those like him. The influence of the revolution of the Russian workers and peasants spread, one way or another, throughout the world. Germany, Austria-Hungary, France and the Balkan countries experienced an upsurge in the political struggle. The entire struggle waged by the workers rose here to a new level. The same occurred in the United States where a mass proletarian organization, the Industrial Workers of the World, appeared in the summer of 1905. "World capitalism and the Russian movement of 1905," Lenin wrote, "made Asia wide awake. Hundreds of millions of neglected people, dulled in medieval stagnation, were awakened to a new life and struggle for elementary human rights and democracy" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 23, p 146). The revolutions in Iran, Turkey, and China which broke out soon afterwards, even though remaining unfinished, were major historical events in the history of the Orient.

The Soviet people--the builder of a communist society--highly honor the great exploit of the heroes of the first Russian revolution who 75 years ago rose to a decisive onslaught on the old world. The experience in the political leadership of the masses acquired in the course of that revolution, and the irreconcilable struggle against opportunism, revisionism, and pseudo-revolutionism, the experience of the struggle for the unity of the working class, the lessons gained in achieving the hegemony of the proletariat in the liberation movement, the unification between the proletariat and the peasantry and the other democratic strata, and combat proletarian internationalism--all these features of a truly popular revolution so widely manifested in the revolutionary history of our country--helped to insure the victory of the Great October. To this day these features are of exceptional significance.

The 1905-1907 Revolution gave a number of other lessons without which the victory of a democratic revolution would be impossible. They include the

firm leadership of the movement on the part of the proletariat or, under certain historical circumstances, the vanguard forces representing its ideology; the ability of the vanguard to rally around itself an adequate number of mass allies, seriously interested in the victory of the revolution and its completion; the fast and accurate determination of the time and features of the beginning of the political crisis and its development; the proper formulation of slogans and their theoretical and political accuracy and accessibility to the broad masses; the art of earning prestige among and the trust of various democratic population strata; the ability to anticipate the steps (obvious and secret) of the enemies of the revolution and to block them; and the ability not only properly to act under proper circumstances, but properly to retreat should events develop adversely, in the face of obvious superiority of enemy forces, in order to protect one's strength for the future struggle. . . .

The heroic revolutionary traditions of the Russian working class call upon the new generations of Soviet people to be worthy of the Red Banner of those who erected the barricades of 1905. Remembering the great and glorious revolutionary past, the Soviet people will dedicate their efforts to the solution of the new, great problems of strengthening through their selfless toil the economic and defense power of the developed socialist state and lead the socialist fatherland to the new peaks of social progress.

5003

CSO: 1802

COMRADE 'AVANTE!'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 79 pp 83-94

[Article by PRAVDA correspondent Gennadiy Petrov]

[Text] Anniversaries of the workers press--the French L' HUMANITE, the Italian UNITA, the West German UNSERE ZEIT, or the Austrian VOLKSSTIMME have become a tradition in the lives of the communist parties and a vivid proof of their inseparable links with the broad toiling masses. Only five years ago such a holiday would have been simply inconceivable in Portugal. This was made possible by the April 1974 revolution. This year the anniversary of the hero AVANTE! ("Forward!") was attended by a Soviet delegation which included PRAVDA correspondent Gennadiy Petrov. His essay is a lively story of our comrade and fellow worker--the newspaper of the Portuguese communists--and of its broad popularity and of the people who make this newspaper.

There were slogans everywhere--on residential buildings, sidewalks, side by side with street signs, and in underground passageways. . . . Some of them were extremely short: PCP. Their meaning was clear to everyone: the Portuguese Communist Party is acting, struggling, and calling to itself! Many such signs could be found even in resort cities where the villas of the rich stand.

Slogans are a chronicle of the Portuguese revolution. Some descriptions have aged and been half erased. Others are fresh, and shriek of the present: "Down with the Agrarian Reform!" Some are unusual and intriguing: "Poetry or Death!" Ask the people: What do they think? Here is something old and familiar: a black swastika painted on the glass door of a little store.

Slogans decorated for the sake of clarity with the electoral symbols of the parties adorn the streets and roads: Hammer and sickle--the communists; a fist--the socialists; a tree with three thick roots--the social democrats;

an arrow pointing upwards--the Christian democrats. . . . There are also real paintings with a number of figures and color compositions, expressive and artful. It would be regrettable for time to erase them.

At the beginning of September 1979 a particularly common description was "Festa do AVANTE!" ("AVANTE's Anniversary!"). Everywhere the people were invited to the ceremony through paper posters, wall writings, and banners strung across streets. This was not only in the capital and its suburbs, but in the peasant cooperatives in the south, the settlements in the north, throughout the country.

The bus brought us, the foreign guests, to the festival city. The city rises in the southern suburb of Lisbon, in the Alto-de-Ajuda district. It is surrounded by low, wooded hills and, in the valley between them, hundreds of exhibition and trade stands, several big lecture halls, tens of performing stages, and numerous open-air coffee shops. A variety of flags are crackling on high masts and huge panels project their colors.

Touring this city is no simple matter. It covers 19 hectares. We cross Peace Square, follow Lenin Street, turn on Popular Unity Avenue, cross Agrarian Reform Square, move along Republic Constitution Boulevard, and cross Freedom Square. . . .

We are guided by one of the thousands and thousands of Portuguese who have tied their lives to the struggle of the Portuguese Communist Party for the basic interests of the working people, and for freedom and social progress. His name is Antonio Dias Laurengo. The party has entrusted him with the position of editor in chief of the central newspaper of the Portuguese communists. The previous night, meeting the guests at the airport, he looked tired and concerned. Now he was cheerful, lively, happy: the holiday had begun successfully! The lightness of his movements, temperamental speech, youthful gleam in his eyes, and optimistic smile belied his 64 years of age, regardless of the silvery hair at his temples. Was he really 64? Listening to our doubts, he jokingly sighed:

"The trouble is that I feel like an adolescent while being an old man. . . ."

The Portuguese revolution is young and is not allowing "Papa Laurengo" as is warmly referred to by the young comrades, to age. He is the spiritual father of many people, and not only of his daughter Ivon, a party member with clandestine training and jail experience. As a metal worker, he was 17 when he joined the ranks of the PCP, in the memorable 1943, when the party took heart, after most severe repressions, gained a "second wind," and elected him as member of its central committee. In 1956 he became member of the central committee political commission. He has experienced everything that the party experienced under the difficult fascist conditions.

Speaking with us as we walked, Dias Laurenco looked into the stand close by, exchanged a few quick words with someone, and patted a child on the head. He is recognized, hugged, patted on the back, and joyfully greeted from afar.

This is the first day of the festival, 7 September, Friday. Yet, what a big crowd!

"What will it be tomorrow!" Laurenco exclaims ardently.

His troubles are behind him. There have been many of them! . . . The annual celebration of the newspaper must be held every year somewhere else. Reactionary officials are not greatly inclined to help communists. This time there was a great deal of red tape and all suggestions were rejected. Finally, a vacant plot was offered, since apparently nothing better could be found in a big, modern city.

The rocky hollow of Alto-de-Ajuda was thickly covered with rushes and tough grass. The plants had to be uprooted, the basalt had to be removed, trenches had to be dug for water and sewer pipes, electric cables brought in, along with gas and telephone lines. Then the city had to be built. This would be the task of a powerful construction organization! The party had no such enterprise. Throughout the summer, after work and on holidays, thousands of volunteers came here--both communists and those who believe and follow them. Many of them spent their leaves at work, in the thick dust and under the burning sun. They used hoes, shovels, and crow bars. However, construction needs more than earth removal. It needs engineers, electricians, health technicians, welders, masons, and carpenters. Artists and photographers are needed to erect the stands and landscape the territory. Masters of all skills were found.

The preparations for and holding of the celebration became a project for the entire party. Construction materials, tools, mechanisms, and trucks were procured. The AVANTE! personnel, and the editor in chief himself, worked at the site in their free time. Every Thursday they published a 12-page issue in which, among other things, they rebuffed the endless sallies of the bourgeois press.

The construction of the city was a steady target for the right-wing journalists.

"On what grounds and why have the communists leased a piece of abandoned land?"

"Why has the municipality given the communists construction materials?" hysterically shouted the enemies. You are indulging the Reds!"

"Why were you not indignant when the communist party helped the municipality celebrate the anniversary of the revolution?" sensibly objected the

mayor of Lisbon. "The other parties did not participate in this national project. . . ."

Even the socialist press joined the persecution. Their central organ POVO LIVRE accused the builders of allegedly "spoiling nature."

"We did not uproot a single tree! We did not waste city territory, but enhanced and improved totally useless land!" AVANTE! answered.

"As if they had not seen this for themselves!" added Dias Laurenco annoyed.

Next to Peace Square, the festival city has the International Solidarity Territory. Here are the stands of the fraternal newspapers: those of all socialist countries, the French L'HUMANITE, the Italian UNITA, the Japanese AKAHATA . . . along with newspapers from Angola, Ethiopia, and Guinea-Bissau

Crowds surround the PRAVDA pavilion, quickly buying out books, asking for badges and post cards, looking at length at the photographs decorating the walls. Such photographs, customary to the Soviet people, are here particularly eloquent.

The communists of all countries highly value the power of the press. It was not by accident that the great founders of Marxism-Leninism were also great journalists. It was not accidental that the Portuguese Communist Party considered, in its clandestine operations, the regular publication of AVANTE! a most important matter.

However, the enemies as well are aware of the force of the true word. That is why the most important task of PIDE, Salazar's political police, was the hunt for the editors, the press, and the distributors of AVANTE! On the mere suspicion based on the fact that a person had in his hand a bit of cigarette paper with the name of the newspaper and the slogan "Workers of the World, Unite!" he could be tortured, sent to jail, or killed. Any editor or press worker who would fall into the hands of the gendarmes had almost no chance of coming out of jail alive.

Comrade Antonio knows this from personal experience. He was in charge of the distribution of AVANTE! starting with 1942. Working with him were the firmest party fighters, who could voluntarily exile themselves and do without the simple pleasures of life. Equally difficult was the job of those who supplied to the printing press articles, paper, and dyes, who printed the paper, and who distributed its small thin sheets. The newspaper was distributed throughout the country, and the people could see that the communist party lives!

AVANTE! was published clandestinely from 15 February 1931 to 25 April 1974. Within that time 464 issues came out. There were failures and detentions as well. PIDE agents wrecked several presses and sent to jail hundreds of

people related to the publication and distribution of the newspaper. However, the voice of the Portuguese Communist Party was not silenced. There were two parallel editorial systems. Presses were located in various parts of the country. The moment one unit was eliminated, another replaced it immediately.

Antonio Dias Laurenc0 was arrested in December 1949. He spent five years in the Penise Fortress jail, in the north of the country. His escape was daring, incredible, working up the entire fascist ant hill. It was followed by eight years of clandestine work. Particularly strict conspiratorial rules had to be observed, for whereas previously he was unknown to the police, now they were actively looking for him. Portugal had thousands of paid PIDE agents and informants. It was possible for anyone to recognize the "dangerous political criminal" from the widespread photographs and detailed information: size, color of the eyes, particular marks Nevertheless, he spent eight years in freedom!

He was detained once again in August 1962 and sentenced to 23 years and 8 months in jail. This amounted to a life sentence. He did not intend to remain a prisoner of fascism for life. However, the guards in Penise watched the prisoner particularly closely.

Dias Laurenc0 succeeded in being moved to another jail in Caxias, near Lisbon. The jail was no better but had a hospital. It was from here that Comrade Antonio decided to escape on the 12th year of his imprisonment. He was liberated by the revolution.

"The central committee members immediately gathered to discuss the situation and act jointly," Dias Laurenc0 said. "This was the first time that we openly went to a meeting; some were coming out of jail and others emerging out clandestinity. There were embraces and tears. . . . The duties were quickly assigned. I was told: 'You, Joao (that was my party pseudonym), will be in charge of the newspaper.' That is how I became the editor in chief of AVANTE!"

The small leaflet had to be urgently converted into a big modern newspaper, regularly published in thousands of copies. This called for the creation of a strong group of editors, acquiring a powerful printing press, and have hundreds of new distributors. . . . This was quite difficult, for the editor in chief had spent 12 consecutive years in jail.

Nevertheless, the inmates learned of all most important international and foreign political events and the decisions of our party. They even read AVANTE! Dias Laurenc0 laughed, pleased with the impression he had made. How we managed it? Thanks to the concern of the central committee. In practical terms? Meaning no insult, this is still too early to write about. We are confident that the past will not return. However, many are those who would like once again to send the communists into clandestinity, to burn, to fire, to hang! . . .

Naturally, Comrade Antonio is right. Thousands of Portuguese fascists are active. Even agents of the former Portuguese security service PIDE, headed by their chief Pais, after a short term, are once again free. Ministry officials who served under the dictatorship are still in their offices. The virtually entire state apparatus has remained unchanged. Recently General de Arriaga organized a party officially known as the rightist party, which is rallying impudent extremists. What could be more to the right!

Yes, under such circumstances it is too early to reveal the entire experience of clandestine struggle.

But let us go back to April 1974. The just appointed editor in chief undertook to hire associates. Above all he chose those who had gone through a similar struggle. Ruben Carvalho, a professional journalist and central committee candidate member, became chief editor. He had been arrested seven times. He too had recently come out of jail. Also coming out of jail were long-term AVANTE! associates Doctor of Philosophy Fernando Correia, and Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Elena Neves. This was a drastic change, literally from deep darkness into blinding noon light. Once again they learned how to walk the streets, and for the first time to say out loud what was most strictly banned. . . .

The comrades who had remained free helped yesterday's prisoners to adjust. They included those who had continued to publish the clandestine newspaper through the 464th issue. Ivona Dias Laurencio was responsible secretary of the clandestine editorial group. She spent seven years in jail on mere suspicion. She was beaten and tortured. However, having failed to learn anything from her, the authorities released her quite unwillingly. Ivona immediately vanished from the eyes of the secret service. In a deep hideout, side by side with equally dedicated people, she produced the newspaper. She continues to work today as the responsible secretary of the editors. She is a small frail woman with big black, perennially sad eyes.

"Where is your daughter, Comrade Antonio?"

"I myself see her rarely. Ivona is in charge of the cultural program of the festival. She has spent quite some time preparing for it and it is only trouble! Sometimes she would spend the night sleeping at her desk, too weak to go home. Yet, the intellectual, the artistic standard of the holiday is quite high. The best Portuguese singers and artists are participating along with many foreign soloists and ensembles. The tradition of the AVANTE! biennial is being created. I believe that exhibits of works by popular craftsman and ancient musical instruments, and meetings with progressive writers and poets, will create a great deal of interest. This is worth working for!"

Darkness was falling. A fresh wind blowing from the Atlantic cooled the air. Comrade Antonio accompanied us to the bus. He gave his jacket to the interpreter and walked in his shirtsleeves.

"Are you not cold?"

"Not in the least. This is not your Siberian cold. Remember how cold it was then? Forty-six degrees!"

Together with Ivona he visited the Soviet Union in December 1976. The Portuguese communists spent several days in Novosibirsk. This was their first leave, their first trip abroad after the revolution. Before that, had Comrade Antonio ever rested? In his distant youth only, before the period underground. Then there were 18 years underground, 17 years in jail, and 2-and-1/2 years of continuous work. A country which had pulled out of the yoke of the dictatorship was seething, bubbling. It was seeking its channel, like a river emerging from the depth of the soil. Yet, the reaction was trying once again to push it underground.

Explosions thundered in the northeast part of Lisbon on the peaceful spring morning of 11 March 1975. Three helicopters armed with guns and three airplanes were bombing and strafing the location of the artillery regiment known for its support of the revolution. The regiment occupied defensive positions and repelled the attacks of parachutists. Another group of parachutists tried to seize the international airport. A third group was planning on capturing the radio station. In the center of the city reactionary officers seized the Carmo Fortress. The coup was organized by General Spínola.

Dias Laurencó learned the details several hours later. Then, as assigned by the party, he got into the thick of events. At that point, stopping the exchange of fire, the leaders of the attackers and the defenders met in no-man's land for a parley. This pause was sufficient for Comrade Antonio to open the eyes of the soldiers to what was happening. The paratroopers in their camouflage uniforms quickly realized that they had become the tool of the reaction and began to fraternize with the artillerymen. The putsch failed.

The troops of the airborne regiment garrisoned in the Tancoxa Training Base considered their participation in the counterrevolutionary mutiny a shame and tried to redeem it as soon as possible. The "right-wing" regiment turned "left wing." It turned so much to the left as to cause trouble. On 25 November of 1975 the paratroopers started from Tancoxa to Lisbon to make a "real revolution." This thoughtless campaign was used by the reaction as grounds for an offensive along the entire front of democratic gains. This affected the nationalization of industry, workers' control of enterprises and establishments, and the agrarian reform. . . .

The bourgeoisie led some private farmers in this "crusade." To trick them was relatively simple. One third of the adults and, in the north of the country, 45% of the population are illiterate. They have become accustomed to believe anything coming from the elder, the priest, or the landowner. Ninety-four percent of the population are believers. Yet, the church

taught that the communists are a Red Army unit which had invaded Portugal to destroy churches and send peasants behind barbed wire, where women, children, clothing, and utensils would all be commonly owned.

Gangs of landowners and priests set fire and wrecked PCP committees in a number of little towns, particularly in the north, killing communists. The distributors of AVANTE! found it dangerous to walk the streets. However, the newspaper was published and delivered to the readers. Dias Laurencó, like the other members of the central committee, traveled around the country, courageously facing threats, telling the truth to the people.

The party and all democrats needed a great deal of time to stabilize the situation. When it became entirely clear that the reaction would be unable to win, Comrade Antonio and his daughter decided to leave their posts for a few days.

Nevertheless, their trip to the Soviet Union was not for pleasure, but for work. In Novosibirsk there were planned meetings with party workers, scientists, and journalists. There were visits to the metallurgical plant and the electrical engineering institute. There were visits to theaters, museums, and monuments. This did not satisfy the guests. They packed their program to the limit. They were not stopped even by frosts considered severe by Siberians used to the cold.

"I would like to address a large public," Comrade Antonio said the very first day. "I would like to tell about our revolution, if possible. . . ."

Naturally! Everyone was eager to listen to such a speech. However, the CPSU Obkom decided that it would be most useful to organize a meeting at the Higher Party School, for its students would spread their impressions throughout Siberia.

The PCP Central Committee political commission member and editor in chief of AVANTE! and deputy in the republic's national assembly, came to the rostrum of the crowded hall of ceremonies with the text of a two-hour speech. Yet, he could have spoken freely even without such thorough preparations.

"We are always learning from the great Lenin and the CPSU," Dias Laurencó frequently repeated in Novosibirsk and Lisbon, in comradely talks, and in political addresses. "On the tactical level, our party is acting flexibly. It is engaged in a broad dialog and it is increasing its influence on the various strata of Portuguese society. However, it is doing this on a firm Marxist-Leninist basis. We are not trading our principles for additional votes, deputy seats, or ministry portfolios. Such an ideologically consistent policy is earning the respect and sympathy of the masses."

It is precisely this sympathy of the people for the Portuguese Communist Party and its central press organ that was manifested with tremendous power

the very first day of the AVANTE! celebration. It was displayed even more powerfully on the second day, a Saturday.

We are traveling to the festival city from the Beira Mar Hotel, in Lisbon's resort suburb. The bus follows a long stretch of beaches. The day was hot--up to 32 degrees. True, the ocean was always cold. Nevertheless, the people were splashing in the water, lying on the sand, and walking along the shore. There were thousands of people. . . . Who would go to the AVANTE! celebration? Naturally, the stifling and dusty Alto-de-Ajuda hollow could not compete with the attractiveness of the golden beaches of Carcavelos, Cascais, or Estoril. . . .

We reached the center of the city and passed by Commerce Square, surrounded by ministry buildings. A huge line was waiting for the bus near the statue of King Jose I. A banner was hanging with the familiar inscription, "Festa do AVANTE!" Big twin-deck buses were arriving but the line remained the same, patiently waiting under the sun.

The festival city was crowded. Gay crowds moved around. Revolutionary songs blasted from loudspeakers. Peasants in their black felt hats, boys in jeans and multicolored T shirts, workers, employees. . . . Many of them were wearing red cardboard sunvisors carrying the letters PCP.

Dias Laurenc0 welcomed the foreign guests, telling them that delegations from all districts had come and even from the islands of Madeira and the Azores. Bus stops planned to handle 270 buses were crowded. Yet, the people kept coming.

The district delegations provide the basis of the celebration. In their booths they display everything that their workers and peasants can create: Sheaves of wheat and rice, ears of corn, grapes, industrial goods, clothing, utensils, souvenirs. . . . Here one gets acquainted with the local cuisine and wines. Diagrams and photographs describe the life of the communist party organizations.

Comrade Antonio presented the Soviet guests to the Setubal party members. He is well known in that district, for once he worked there in clandestinity, heading the southern party zone. He has visited it a number of times after the revolution.

The district has 13 municipalities. We visited each, moving from one section of the pavilion to another, shaking dozens of hands, listening, asking, answering.

"These are the representatives of Grandola. The political standard of our population is quite high. In the past elections over 50% of the voters voted for the communists."

"Welcome to Palmela Municipality! We have a very strong party organization."

These grain growers, wine growers, weavers, and cork plantations were not exaggerating. Later on we visited Setubal District and saw Grandola and Alvalada and the peasant cooperatives and their associations. We saw many pleasing things. However, the people building the new Portugal have a hard life.

"We work hard and eat little," said Antonio Mario Gonsalves, chairman of the board of the Red Star Cooperative, one of the first in the country. "We may have to wait several months for our wages to be able to buy machines and fertilizer and strengthen the farm. However, we shall not give up, we shall not yield, no one will take away the land!"

Back in Lisbon we shared our impressions with the editor in chief of AVANTE! even though he knows the situation better than after a single, short trip. True, currently he is doing more work in the north. There, among the private farmers and tenants, until recently, there was little support for the communist party. The situation is now changing drastically.

"Recently I held a conference with our party activists in a small town," Dias Laurengo said. "The conference was held in new premises built on the site of those burned down in 1975. There were 70 people. When I emerged on the street I saw a crowd of curious people. They were hardly communists! I addressed them and began to explain what we wanted. A few of them frowned, but the majority smiled agreeably. Yet, only last year, this would have been impossible."

Comrade Antonio has special memories from the north.

"How long was it since you visited Penise?" I asked him.

"I have not been there for nearly a year. I addressed a meeting there last autumn. I shall be going there again soon. Yes, Penise"

This fishermen's settlement is slightly over 100 km from Lisbon. A gloomy medieval fortress stands over the port, next to the pier. Thick walls made of dark-grey cut stone, embrasures, towers at the corners, oak-wood gates nailed with iron

Such fortresses stand along the entire shore. Once they were used to protect the country from enemy raids. Many of them have been preserved and are used as hotels or restaurants. NATO feels at home in one of them (at least the one I saw). In Penise the fortress is inhabited by migrants from the former Portuguese colonies, temporarily, until they can find something better. No outsider was allowed in. Pity! I was unable to see the cells remembered by Alvaro Cunhal, Joaquim Gomes, Francisco Migela, and others among the best sons of the people. Here hundreds of anti-fascists were jailed for decades. How many of them also died here!

Antonio Dias Laurencio was brought here after his "investigation" at PIDE headquarters.

How quickly the mind forgets the bad! Before the revolution only a fascist or a mentally ill person could pass by this building in the old district of the capital. It stands on the narrow Antonio Maria Cardoso Street, which runs downhill. Today the people walk the street purposefully and without fear. At the very entrance two children are playing with a dog and laughing gaily. Is it only the impressionable foreigner who is reminded of the caked and unwashed blood looking at rusty spots?

Fernando Gouvelha, one of the master executioners, was assigned to deal with the detainee.

"Naturally, you will say nothing about the party," he determined. "This is understandable. But who wrote in this leaflet that I am a murderer?"

"I shall say neither much nor that little," Dias Laurencio answered, showing first the length of his arm, and then his finger.

"No, you will talk, otherwise that paper will be down your throat!"

Laurencio failed to understand the executioner. Immediately he was rushed and tortured for four days steadily. The moment he would pass out he would be brought back to consciousness and tortured again.

"Will you talk?"

He was too weak even to say "No!" Dias Laurencio pressed his lips tight, indicating that he would remain silent to the end. He was then pushed on the floor, his mouth was opened, a piece of paper was stuck in it, and his mouth was shut with tape. From 6 pm to 9 am he sat thus on a stool, hands tied behind his back. In the morning he was pushed off the stool and his nose was pinched. When he began to choke the tape was removed and water was poured down his throat. With it he swallowed the paper. After that he was sent to Penise.

Dias Laurencio was in solitary. He met with the other inmates only during exercise time, in the prison yard. Suddenly, someone decided to make a chess board. The "pieces" were put together--small stones and pieces of brick. A chess board was drawn on a slab. They enjoyed the game like children. This was not simply a game, but a small victory over their torturers.

To this day this old stone building rises on a steep slope by the fortress wall itself. Down below the ocean hits the rocks eroded by the salty water.

This was the only noise which the "unruly" Antonio could hear in the small windowless cell in which he was thrown. Occasionally he would hear the

steps of the guard. The guard would peek through the hole in the upper part of the thick oak door to see what the prisoner was doing. He would then walk away and there would be dead silence again. All he could hear were the regular splashes of the waves against the rocks on the shore. Twice daily the door would be cracked open. A hand would stretch in leaving on the floor a bowl with a spoonful of rice and a mug of water. No interrogations or walks. It was the torture of loneliness, the quiet of a grave, and the riveting cold.

Worse would happen should the guard walk inside the cell. He might then pay attention to the inner side of the door. With sharp eyes, he could focus on the lower right-side corner.

Dias Laurengo had been searched a number of times: At his detention, at PIDE, in Penise. . . . He had once again been carefully searched before being put in solitary. He had been stripped naked, his clothes and shoes were checked, they peered in his ears, his mouth, his nostrils. . . . Nevertheless, he was able to carry with him part of the blade of a pen-knife. Every night, painfully, he scratched on the oak door with this bit of steel. He dug at the lower right-side corner, away from the guard when he cracked the door open.

This work took an entire month. The saw cut was precise and sufficiently deep. Pushed hard, a bit of the door would break and a manhole would appear. . . . However, in order to be able to escape--something which, back in the main jail building, Dias Laurengo told his comrades of the prison's party organization at their first joint exercise--one had to find himself in solitary, in the same cell. When the cell was free, Dias Laurengo had the pleasure of insulting Rose, a guard. Once again the oak door with its four round openings on the top was closed behind him. No one noted the cut. Now a dark night was needed. Unfortunately, there was bright moonlight for two consecutive weeks. The prisoner was shivering from the cold, as it was December. The moist icy breath of the Atlantic settled in the cell. The stones cried while the man froze and waited.

Finally, clouds covered the sky. The evening check came: the guard, clinking his keys, approached the door, looked through the opening, and walked away.

Dias Laurengo tore the blanket into strips to make a rope. He tied his clothes in a package. The time had come! Cautiously, trying to make no noise, he pressed on the sawed-off part of the door. It fell off easily. He listened: The only noise was that of the surf. He crawled out.

The runaway knew that the guard from the tower would not see him because of a low stone wall stretching along the cells. From that wall he had to run to the outside wall. Yet, that part of the prison yard was brightly lit. He would be able to cross it only should the sentry look elsewhere at that moment. There was no way to know this, and the only solution was to rely on luck.

Dias Laurengo bent low, leaped through the open space and flattened himself in the shadow of the wall. . . . There was no shot nor alarm signal. He was lucky!

He slid across the wall and found himself at the edge of the precipice. Some 60 meters below him the ocean thundered. He tied his rope on an outcrop, and dropped down, clinging to the cold stones, unrolled more of the rope, and kept going. . . . Finally, the rope ended. How much was left? Fifteen, 20 meters? He did not know exactly. What difference did it make? There was no other way. He released the rope and plunged.

The icy water hit him and the pain he felt was such that he almost fainted. He had hit a rock and hurt his side and his leg. Almost choked. However, he regained control over himself and swam, fighting the waves. He did not want to freeze in this cold, salty water. . . .

He swam some two kilometers. He crawled ashore. For several minutes he passed out on the sand, at the very edge of the ocean. He forced himself to rise and moved along the side of the road in the bushes. He had lost his clothes. He was shivering uncontrollably. Walking did not warm him up. He walked with his teeth rattling, thinking of how to pass by the police post which guarded the exit from Penise round the clock. . . .

Behind him he heard an engine. Yellow lights pierced the fog. It was a truck. Police? No, fishermen returning with their night's catch. Should he risk it? The fugitive hurled himself in front of the truck.

The fishermen in the cab saw a blood-stained, barefoot man in wet, torn underwear.

"Give me a ride!"

"We shall and give you to the police. You escaped from the jail?"

"Yes. I am a communist."

"We do not know what the communists are."

In the mud, under the piercing wind, he described to them what his party was fighting for. He used clear and convincing words. The fishermen hid Dias Laurengo on the floor of the truck, covered him with a net, and moved the cases with their catch. They passed him through the police cordon and wished him a safe trip.

There was a secret meeting place along the road in the nearby village. The owner opened the door, but without letting the guest in, fearfully mumbling:

"No, no! I cannot have you here! They will start looking for you in the morning and will pass the entire district through a fine comb I have a family Go away! . . ."

He walked on, south, toward Lisbon.

"Have you seen that man ever again?" I interrupted him, unable to resist.

"No. I do not want to. I know that he is well. Naturally, as of then, since December 1954, he was dropped from our party. But the fishermen of Penise now are perfectly aware of who the communists are and support us firmly."

I could feel this in the course of my trip to the fortress. Next to it the wind was blowing a banner on a small square: "AVANTE! Holiday." It was the hour when the fishermen came back from the sea. One after another the vessels came to the pier. The fishermen unloaded their baskets loaded with all kinds of still-living and moving ocean fish, wide as a shovel, long as an oar, spotty as leopards. . . . The names of their boats sounded like good-luck wishes: "Calm Sea," "Good Catch," . . . There was also a boat with a name which could not exist in Portugal in 1954 or before or after that, until April 1974: "Road to Socialism."

Meanwhile, my collocutor was already describing his second detention.

At that time, in August 1962, he had been tortured twice as cruelly, with the entire hatred which had piled up in eight years of tireless pursuit: finally he had been caught! He was hit with fists, feet, rubber sticks, he was tortured with electric current. One torture they used was known as "the statue": he would face a wall, ordered to remain motionless; otherwise he would be shot. He stood like this one, two, three days . . . until he fainted. Then they tortured him with tape recordings of people crying, asking for help, voices begging him not to resist. He was tortured with heat, deafening noise, and sleeplessness. Toxic gas was fed into the room.

Dias Laurenc0 withstood everything. Once again the executioners found nothing.

"Did you escape from Penise before or after midnight?" a PIDE officer asked.

"Are you still hoping to get some information out of me?"

"This is in your interest. We would like to determine how many days you have left in solitary--14 or 15."

"Such questions are the peak of cynicism!"

He spent 90 days in solitary. First at the Caxias Jail in Lisbon, in the basement, in a tiny cell filled with stinking water up to the knees. He then "inaugurated" the improved Penise solitary. The first seven years he was kept in strict isolation and then transferred to a regular cell.

"It was not always so hard," said the editor in chief of AVANTE! as though apologizing for his amazing endurance. "In the final months preceding the revolution the Penice inmates were together and went to their cells only at night. Fascism was already feeling its weakness and maneuvering between repression and small allowances. Above all, however, we fought. We protested, we went on hunger strikes. Just imagine, in one single day the warden would receive complaints from all cells filled with communists. The text was absolutely identical, word for word. Or else, simultaneously, all inmates would refuse their food. The guards kept wondering how was it that we, isolated from one another, were in contact. This made an impression and proved our strength. The party, together with all democratic forces, supported us from the outside. That is why we gained certain concessions. . . . Thus, finally, they allowed us to read."

We were talking in the editor's office, a small, modest room. Comrade Antonio stepped to the shelf and picked up two thick volumes. According to the cover it was a Greek language textbook. In fact, it was a French-Russian and Russian-French dictionary! Waging a daily struggle, and pondering about victory, Dias Laurenco was studying Lenin's language. That is why, occasionally, he would begin to answer without waiting for the end of the translation!

Answering, he would be carried away, speaking emotionally, recalling details, describing entire scenes. However, he would begin unwillingly. For quite some time he avoided details about himself. I learned a great deal not from him but from his comrades--agronomist Louisa Campinos, physician Tito Siabra-Dinis, and from journalists. Was it difficult to recall the painful past? Was it modesty? Both. Yet, a principle was involved as well:

"We, the veterans of the underground, have agreed not to publicize our exploits. We do not wish to appear as heroes, in order not to humble the young people who have not experienced the horrors of jail. Today they must display equal self-sacrifice. At that time courage was needed to say 'No!' Now delicate work is needed. Some firm underground workers find it difficult to adapt to the new circumstances. Meanwhile, the young comrades are doing excellent work. Why to we have to boast in front of them of our former merits?"

Dias Laurenco likes to talk about the generation of communists who grew up after the overthrow of fascism. In five years the party raised almost 200,000 people, most of them young. Membership in the PCP offers no advantages. On the contrary, it promises privations and difficulties, constant dedication of efforts, and tirelessness and firmness in the struggle. This burden is not for everyone. Yet, young workers, peasants, and students join the red banner of communist party by the thousands.

"We have a splendid youth!" happily exclaimed the editor in chief of AVANTE! "Reliable support and most active force in all matters. Our

festival is an example. It was mainly the young people who built the city. It is still they who are running it now."

The AVANTE! holiday reached its height. It was Sunday, the third and last day. The square in front of the main stand was crowded. Those without seats were crowding the approaches to the square and the slope of the hill. They were sitting on the ground, on folding chairs, on cases.

The leaders of the Portuguese Communist Party entered and stood in line. Behind them were the foreign guests. When the greetings died down, Antonio Dias Laurenc0 stepped forth. He spoke of the work of the newspaper, the preparations for the celebration, and the course of the festival. As was his habit, the editor in chief spoke passionately and the huge audience tempestuously responded to his speech. Deafening whistles met his story on the reactionary intrigues. The speaker described the success of the festival and the people stood up, applauding, waving flags, chanting the name of their party, marking the beat with their fists:

"P-C-P! P-C-P! P-C-P! . . ."

They also chanted:

"Assim-se-ve-a-forca-do-Pe-ce!"

"What does it mean?" I asked, bending toward the interpreter.

Excitedly, her eyes shining, she interpreted the meaning but not the rhythm of the slogan: "This shows the strength of the PCP."

This chant was repeated many times by the members of the central committee political commission and the foreign guests, together the thousands of people, energetically waving raised arms.

Alv0 Cunhal stood up on the rostrum. The secretary general of the central committee explained to the assembly the electoral party program, described its immediate tasks, and assessed the political circumstances. He spoke at length on the significance of the AVANTE! holiday. It would be difficult to take notes standing up, and follow a speech not geared for simultaneous translation. All I recorded were isolated, yet meaningful statements:

"This holiday is an important form of our struggle, which influences the political atmosphere in the country. It proves the existence of the closest possible ties between communists and working people. . . . The AVANTE! holiday represents a tremendous concentration of our party's efforts and a clear manifestation of its organizational capabilities. . . . We shall be able to transform all of Portugal the way we did Alto-de-Ajuda hollow. . . . The way we have rallied here members of the various population strata, we shall accomplish this on the scale of the entire country. The AVANTE! festival has done more for democracy and culture than all previous governments."

We then sang the International. We sang Venceremos! With arms around shoulders, we sang the favorite song of the Portuguese communists "Avante Camarada!":

Forward, comrade, forward!
Join your voice to ours!
The sun will shine for us all. . . .

The meeting ended but the celebration went on.

"We planned to close the festival by midnight, but failed," Dias Laurenco said the next day. "The people did not want to leave. They did not let artists and lecturers go. They sang and danced, they spoke of their lives, and argued about the future. I left at about 3 am and there were still plenty of people."

When was he able to sleep? He was cheerful and energetic. He smiled gaily and slyly, as though working on a surprise. This was precisely what happened:

"Do you remember your question as to how many people were expected to attend our celebration? I thought that there would be no less than last year, 600,000. Yet, there were more. Far more. In three days the festival was visited by about one million people!"

This was indeed good news. One million is almost one-tenth of the Portuguese population. No other party in that country could have such a celebration.

That same time, hundreds of volunteers went to dismantle the city. They took away the exhibits and panels, slogans, and banners. The site had to be cleared within a week, to avoid paying more rent.

The plywood structures were easy to dismantle. However, the traces left by the festival in the hearts of the people could not be removed.

There are things difficult to name, so short a time they last. Yet, their durability is striking.

Such is the case, for example, of a newspaper printed on cigarette paper, the size of a handkerchief. These sheets were torn apart, trampled on, and burned. Yet, they lived and through their existence they prophesied the fall of Portugal's fascism, which proved to be the longest and most durable in Europe.

Or else a song. It would be sung quietly, in the close circle of clandestine workers. It was fired at, choked, drowned in the ocean, and tortured in jail. They could not kill it. Today it is sung by thousands of voices:

Avante, camarada, avante!

Thinking of the durability of the word, heard and printed, I think of the people, of those who gave strength to these words. I think of a person. Of Comrade Antonio Dias Laurencô da Silva. This is his full name.

5003

CSO: 1802

YEAR 1979: SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL LIFE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 79 pp 95-108

[Article by V. Nekrasov]

[Text] This was a year of a variety of frequently complex events, in the deep pulse of which the unique characteristics of our revolutionary age were manifested--the age of transition from capitalism to socialism on a global scale. This was a year in which important sociopolitical changes took place in the world, creating conditions for the further progress of the peoples toward peace and social progress. Yet, this was also a year of the energizing of imperialism and its allies, who intensified their counteraction to positive change. Taken together, the events of the year shed light on the immediate future of the peoples and offer the key to predictions of the further course of events in the great battle for the bright future of mankind.

In 1979 the life of the Soviet people was marked by adamant constructive toil for the good of the homeland and socialism. The scale of socialist production broadened. Its technical level rose and so did the people's prosperity. According to estimates, compared with the previous year, the national income rose by over eight billion rubles. In industry the volume of output rose 21 billion rubles in one year.

At the same time, however, this was a complex year. The stress remained in a number of areas of the national economy. In the course of the year, which may have been the most complex of the 10th Five-Year Plan, the Soviet economy encountered objective difficulties, including adverse weather conditions. At the same time, the main reason for bottlenecks and shortcomings in the economy was a certain stragglings compared with the plans for upgrading production effectiveness and work quality.

The severe winter, followed by the drought in a number of parts of the country required the adamant efforts of millions of agricultural workers. Despite the difficult weather conditions 179 million tons of grain were harvested. Record yields were obtained in the Kazakh SSR. A number of oblasts in Russia and the Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Moldavia fulfilled their

grain obligations. A good cotton crop was harvested. More potatoes and basic types of vegetables and other types of commodities were procured compared with the previous year. According to the plans for upgrading the prosperity of the people, real per capita income rose and so did social consumption funds. Retail trade rose 4.8%.

While properly assessing the great achievements, at the same time the CPSU pointed out the need to look ahead, to focus the attention on the difficulties and unresolved economic problems. It was considered necessary to insure the faster development of the power industry and urge on a number of vitally important units in industry and transportation, and continue the course of further agricultural upsurge. This orientation becomes particularly important while extensive work is being done drafting the 11th Five-Year Plan and the Basic Directions of the Economic Development of the USSR Through 1990.

The basic problems of the current economic, political, and social development of the country were considered at the April and November CC CPSU plenums. At the November Plenum Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, provided in speech a profound and comprehensive study of the condition of the Soviet economy, formulated the tasks for the immediate and more distant future, exposed shortcomings, and indicated means to surmount them and possibilities for resolving the problems facing the party and the people. The Central Committee plenums defined the foundations of the activities of all party, state, and economic organs and trade union and Komsomol organizations in matters of economic policy and directions leading to the further advancement of the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet and all soviets of people's deputies.

The July CC CPSU decree "On Improving Further the Economic Mechanism and the Tasks of Party and State Organs," and the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree on improving planning and intensifying the influence of the economic mechanism on upgrading production effectiveness and work quality were major steps toward improving the country's entire economic mechanism. Covering a broad set of management problems, these documents defined a system of measures aimed at insuring the dynamic growth of the Soviet economy in accordance with the requirements of mature socialism. The May CC CPSU decree "On Improving Further Ideological and Political-Educational Work" defined specific means for resolving the problems formulated at the 25th CPSU Congress of molding the communist awareness of the Soviet people and improving the ways and means of ideological education of the working people.

Soviet democracy, which will continue to serve even better economic and social progress, is acting as a powerful lever insuring the upsurge of the national economy. In turn, economic successes remain the base for the further blossoming of socialist democracy and of the political creativity of the masses. The elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet, 10th convocation, the first following the adoption of the new constitution, were the biggest

political event of the year in the country's life. They took place on 4 March in accordance with the new Law on Elections. The electoral campaign which preceded them took place under circumstances of great political and labor upsurge and was characterized by the efficiency and high level of activity of the Soviet people. According to tradition, the CPSU Central Committee addressed an appeal to all voters, citizens of the USSR, in which it reported on the results of the country's development since the last elections, and drew attention to the topical tasks of economic and cultural construction. The electoral campaign proved the close unity of the Soviet working people rallied around their communist party and the nationwide approval and warm support of its domestic and foreign policy. The elections resulted in a new major victory for the bloc of communists and non-party people. Once again they proved the unity among all classes, nations, and nationalities in our country, and the high civic maturity and political awareness of the Soviet people, and their resolve to continue to struggle selflessly for the implementation of the tasks set by the party.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev was reelected chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium at the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet (18-19 April). The USSR Council of Ministers was approved at the session. Comrade A. N. Kosygin, CC CPSU Politburo member, was elected chairman of the Council of Ministers. Laws dealing with the basic activities of the Supreme Soviet itself, people's control, and the further strengthening of law and order, consistent with the stipulations of the USSR Constitution, were passed at the first and second sessions of the supreme organ of state power. In the past year our party and its Central Committee attentively followed international developments, profoundly studied occurring changes, and, in the complex and conflicting foreign political circumstances, systematically implemented their principled course aimed at reliably securing for the Soviet people and their allies and friends the possibility to live and work in peace.

The Central Committee Politburo and, personally, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, who by the will of the party has headed its Central Committee for the past 15 years, are tirelessly engaged in tremendous work on the study of contemporary socioeconomic and political problems and trends of social development, and for defining and refining the domestic and foreign political course. Party solidarity and the monolithic unity between the party and the masses are the priceless political capital which makes it possible for the 262-million-strong Soviet people, entering the year of the 110th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birth, and marching toward the 26th CPSU Congress, to look optimistically at the future.

One of the noteworthy features of the global circumstances is the dynamic development of real socialism and the steady growth of its beneficial international influence. In 1979 the members of the socialist comity took a considerable step forward in all fields of economic and cultural construction. Their national incomes rose between three and eight percent.

All fraternal countries further increased their industrial and agricultural production and the material and cultural standards of their working people improved. Unlike the situation in the capitalist world, the social security of the people and their confidence in the future characterized living conditions in the socialist countries.

The now traditional Crimean meetings and talks held between Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and the leaders of the other socialist countries became a major step in the further strengthening of the interaction among fraternal parties in resolving domestic and international problems. Their attention was focused on long-term problems of determining importance to long-term reciprocal cooperation. The Crimean meetings, as the visits which USSR Party-Government delegations paid to Hungary (30 May-1 June) and the GDR (4-8 October) convincingly proved the high level of interaction among members of the socialist comity in resolving their problems, and their inviolable unity based on Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism. What makes this even more important is that the communist and workers parties of the socialist part of the world have entered their pre-congress period, when they will be earmarking the next major steps on the path of building a new society. The 12th Congress of the Romanian Communist Party was already held last November.

About 30 international economic organizations are important instruments of economic integration for the members of the socialist comity. Leading among them and rallying them are CEMA, which celebrated its 30th anniversary in 1979. Today CEMA consists of 10 socialist countries of Europe, Asia, and Latin America, with a population in excess of 430 million. In the course of CEMA's existence the volume of industrial output of its members rose by a factor of 12, while per capita income rose by a factor of 8. CEMA is enjoying growing prestige throughout the world.

The participants in the 33d CEMA session, held in June, in Moscow, summed up the experience of its activities over the past 30 years, and expressed their unanimous resolve to continue to expand and intensify the all-round cooperation among CEMA-member countries. Long-term target programs for cooperation were approved in the production of industrial consumer goods and the development of transportation. The implementation of previously passed long-term target programs and the question of coordinating the national economic plans of CEMA-member countries for 1981-1985 were considered.

Socialist integration and the coordination of plans and actions of CEMA-member countries substantially protect their economies from the adverse influence of crisis processes in the capitalist economy. Thus, the CEMA members were the only industrially developed part of the world which avoided the difficult consequences of the energy crisis. However, complications in the global economic circumstances are creating certain economic problems for the socialist countries as well.

Insuring the peace and security of the nations invariably remains the main concern and supreme objective of the international policies of the members of the socialist comity in 1979. The power and prestige of the foreign political actions of the socialist countries rose as a result of the fact that they acted in world arena jointly, coordinating their activities within the Warsaw Pact Organization and, particularly, Warsaw Pact organs, such as the Committee of Foreign Affairs Ministers and Committee of Defense Ministers, as well as on a bilateral basis. Supplying the joint armed forces of the Warsaw Pact members with everything necessary for defense is a major bulwark guaranteeing the security of the fraternal peoples and their constructive toil.

The historical accomplishments of the comity of socialist states in economic development and the profound social changes are vivid examples of the tremendous opportunities offered by socialism. The fraternal peoples and progressive public opinion throughout the world celebrated as a great and joyful holiday the 35th anniversary of people's Poland, socialist Romania, and people's Bulgaria, and the 30th anniversary of the German Democratic Republic.

Reports from China show another picture. They confirm the crisis difficulties which the country experienced in 1979, and the difficult material situation of the working people. The PRC had 20 million unemployed, a number which threatens to increase in the forthcoming years. In agriculture the grain harvest per capita remained on the 1957 level. As admitted by the country's leaders themselves, about 100 million Chinese are undernourished. The Maoist orientation toward turning China into a country with a high military-industrial potential imposes burdens on the toiling population and is triggering widespread protest. Repeatedly last year the Chinese capital and other cities in the PRC witnessed actions by the working people demanding that their needs and wishes be listened to. The Beijing authorities answered this with repressive measures.

The aggression in Vietnam, which exposed once and for all the anti-socialist degeneracy of Maoism, raised even more sharply the important problem of the destructive role played by Beijing in contemporary world circumstances. From a reserve and accomplice of imperialism, the Maoists have essentially become its direct allies; everywhere they gave political, ideological, and military support to the most aggressive imperialist circles in the hope of earning the blessings of the United States and NATO on the implementation of their hegemonistic plans.

Beijing's military-political considerations were focused on the idea of establishing in the future a broad anti-Soviet military alliance involving the participation of China, the United States, the NATO countries, and Japan, and, at a given stage, a political rapprochement among these countries and an accelerated continuation of the arms race. Beijing considered the establishment of full diplomatic relations between the United States and the PRC, as of 1 January 1979, a major step along this way.

To encourage Beijing in its hegemonistic aspirations, and to contribute to China's militarization, as the Soviet Union emphasized, means to complicate the solution of international problems and erect additional obstacles in the path to peaceful relations among countries. As to relations with the PRC, the USSR sees no objective obstacles to resuming with it friendly relations based on the principles of peaceful coexistence, should China's position become more sensible and peaceful. While continuing firmly to oppose Maoist theory and practice, the Soviet Union proceeds from the fact that there are no objective reasons for the alienation, and even less for the confrontation between the peoples of the two countries.

The Chinese Government's refusal to extend the 1950 Friendship, Alliance, and Mutual Aid Treaty between the USSR and the PRC, in the light of the statements accompanying the refusal, cannot be considered other than hostile toward the Soviet Union. However, as a result of Soviet constructive efforts, on mutual agreement, talks were initiated in Moscow on 28 September between the two countries with a view to improving bilateral relations, on the level of government delegations of the Soviet Union and the PRC. In the course of the talks the Soviet delegation submitted a draft "Declaration on Principles Governing Relations Between the USSR and the PRC," based on the principles of peaceful coexistence.

In our day the problem of war and peace has become the all-embracing central problem of world politics, unbreakably linked with all basic socioeconomic problems of our time. A struggle of historical importance is continuing to be waged throughout the world for the strengthening and developing of detente and organizing peaceful coexistence among nations and states. While remaining the dominating trend of international life, in 1979 the detente process experienced substantial hindrances. Two conflicting trends became clearly apparent: On the one hand, a constructive dialog continued among countries with different social systems and detente acquired new material content; on the other, conflict situations remained and the arms race was encouraged. Attacks against detente on the part of right-wing conservative circles in the imperialist countries, the United States above all, intensified. Beijing's propaganda actively participated in this campaign.

Under those circumstances the Soviet Union dedicated maximum effort to develop cooperation with the forces of peace and progress. Together with the fraternal countries it firmly and systematically defended the cause of the peace and security of the peoples, struggled for the prevention of the threat of a new world war, promoted the restriction of the arms race and disarmament, and attentively watched the intrigues of the enemies of the peace.

In his speech at the electoral meeting in Baumanskiy Electoral District, in Moscow, on 2 March, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev presented a broad constructive program for the termination of the arms race. Important proposals aimed at intensifying the political and insuring the military detente in Europe were

contained in the communique of the meeting of the Committee of Foreign Affairs Ministers of Warsaw Pact members, held in May and December. In the interests of strengthening political and legal guarantees for peace, at the 34th United Nations General Assembly the Soviet Union submitted the item "On the Inadmissibility of the Policy of Hegemonism in International Relations," i.e., of aspiration toward the domination of other countries and peoples. The proposal that hegemonism be unconditionally condemned was supported by the majority of UN members.

The suggestions on strengthening the peace in Europe, raised in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's speech in Berlin, on 6 October, substantially expanded in his answer to the question asked by PRAVDA's correspondent, on 6 November, were, as universally acknowledged, a historical initiative. The Soviet Union suggested an effective means for reducing the quantities of nuclear weapons on European soil and the immediate initiation of corresponding talks. It also decided, unilaterally, to reduce its forces in Central Europe and formulated proposals aimed at strengthening the trust on the European Continent. As the Western press noted the Soviet proposals created more favorable circumstances for military detente.

In 1979 positive processes continued to develop as a whole in Europe, triggered by the policy of detente. Contacts and consultations among governments and reciprocal visits by leaders of socialist and capitalist countries became more frequent. Economic relations became more stable. The Franco-Soviet summit meeting, held last April in Moscow, brought very important results. Specific means for intensifying the policy of detente were included in the initialed program for the further development of cooperation between the Soviet Union and France aimed at lowering international tension and promoting the peace.

Yet, toward the end of the year, it became obvious that the imperialist forces, interested in a different development of the circumstances, were increasing their efforts to turn Europe to the path of intensified arms race and the heating up of tension. The question of the further development of intergovernmental relations on the European Continent and of strengthening European security became particularly urgent once again.

The meeting between Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and U.S. President J. Carter in Vienna, on 15-18 June, and the signing of the Soviet-American SALT II treaty, was a major and serious step of most important significance to restraining the arms race and strengthening international peace. The path leading to the new Soviet-American treaty was not easy. However, in the final account, the objective situation led the leaders of the United States to the conclusion of the need to cooperate with the USSR with a view to limiting the danger of a thermonuclear catastrophe as a result of an American-Soviet conflict.

The Soviet side considered the SALT II treaty a realistic document, equitably balancing the interests of the parties. The implementation of

the treaty, in its view, would offer good prerequisites for the intensification of the processes of political detente and favorably influence the overall international climate. It would also enable Soviet-American relations to develop more evenly.

However, despite the fact that the SALT II treaty was welcomed by the governments of virtually all countries on earth, with the exception of the Chinese, and that it met with the support of the overwhelming majority of Americans, influential circles in the United States launched fierce attempts to block the enactment of the treaty. These circles launched against it a powerful, carefully planned, and generously financed campaign. A sharp struggle developed in the United States between those standing on the positions of political realism and those favoring the further growth of deadly arsenals. Debate on the treaty was deliberately delayed in the Senate. The U.S. Administration made concessions to a coalition of the opponents of peaceful coexistence and met the demands of circles demanding a new increase in military expenditures as the price for supporting the treaty.

As the struggle waged in the United States on the ratification of the SALT II treaty clearly proved, the most aggressive imperialist circles are responsible for the retention of international tension and for the arms race. They are unwilling to accept the changed ratio of forces in the world arena and are trying to gain military superiority over world socialism. As a result of the imperialist policy, in 1978 political campaigns mounted against the socialist countries and against the other anti-imperialist forces of our time assumed an unrestrained nature in the capitalist world. The concentrated anti-communist campaign was based, above all, on the lie of the "Soviet military threat," and on nonsensical attempts to present the struggle waged by the peoples for freedom, independence, and social progress as "Moscow's intrigues and machinations."

The tendency to return somehow to the infamous policy "from the position of strength" has become clearer in U.S. foreign policy in recent years, in 1979 in particular. The United States actively broadened its military presence in Europe, while NATO as a whole spent last year \$218 billion for military purposes. Steps were taken aimed at extending the activities of the North Atlantic Bloc to other parts of the world.

In accordance with the concepts resurrecting the idea that the NATO groups should be the first to make a nuclear strike, the armed forces of the United States and its allies were reorganized. The suggestion of deploying on the territories of some Western European countries--NATO members--new systems of American nuclear missile weapons of intermediate range, to carry out strategic assignments--Cruise missiles and Pershing-II ballistic missiles--were intensively promoted for approval by the U.S. allies. The plans of the American military, leading to an aggravation of the circumstances in Europe and capable of largely spoiling the international atmosphere as a whole, were actively supported by London and Bonn, who thus

charted a course toward increasing the arms race. A respective decision was passed at the December meeting of the NATO Council regardless of the warnings of the Soviet Union that this would wreck the foundations for talks on limiting nuclear weapons of intermediate range on European soil.

One of the main lessons from the events of 1979 is that the peace-loving forces must apply many more efforts to surmount the resistance of the opponents of peaceful development. Many more complex and difficult problems must be resolved along the path of the forces of peace, requiring tremendous energy and great efforts.

In 1979 the economic situation in the capitalist world remained quite tense. Instability factors were manifested in the low growth rates of productivity, galloping inflation, unabated levels of unemployment, deficit balances of payments, fluctuations in the exchange rates of currencies, and a general deep disturbance within the entire system of international capitalist economic relations. It became ever clearer that the 1974-1975 crisis had started a very lengthy period of considerable worsening of capitalist reproduction conditions compared with the preceding 20 years. The multinational corporations inserting themselves in the economies of tens of countries, and already controlling nearly three-fifths of the world's capitalist trade, are playing a disorganizing role in the functioning of state-monopoly capitalism. To an ever greater extent the capitalist economy is experiencing the adverse consequences of the continuing arms race. The U.S. military machine, noted in this connection THE NEW YORK TIMES MAGAZINE, "is leading the civilian economy up to a precipice."

The growth rates of entrepreneurial activities in all capitalist countries, already slowed down in 1978, continued to decline in 1979. According to preliminary estimates, as a whole, they were under two percent. Starting with the spring, the United States entered a period of tangible production decline. Experts are predicting a decline in the immediate future in Western Europe and Japan as well. The hope has been voiced that the time disparities between the beginning of the decline in the United States and in the other leading capitalist countries would make it less intensive compared with the crisis of the first half of the 1970's.

Inflation became the most urgent economic and sociopolitical problem of capitalism. As a whole in the developed capitalist countries, in the course of the year, prices rose 8.5% and, in the United States, nearly 14%. Unemployment rose with inflation. By the end of the summer the overall number of registered unemployed exceeded 16 million people, including nearly 10 million in the Common Market countries. Unemployment rose even further in the autumn and the winter.

Social contradictions and political instability rose in the capitalist countries. The economy, weakened by crisis phenomena, limited to an ever greater extent the ability of the ruling circles to engage in social maneuvering. The class struggle became aggravated. Meanwhile, processes

of restrictions of democratic freedoms and increased repressions of the working class and the other detachments of working people were noted. Chauvinism and racism intensified and neo-fascist actions became more frequent.

Political instability dominated the majority of Western European countries, affecting Japan and Canada as well. The domestic political situation in the United States was aggravated, as confirmed by the unprecedented re-shuffling, last summer, of the members of the Washington Administration and of presidential advisers and special assistants. J. Carter described the circumstances in the country as a "crisis of faith."

In a number of capitalist countries 1979 was a parliamentary election year. Attempting to interpret their results in their class interests, bourgeois propaganda claimed that, allegedly, they were confirming a shift to the right in the mood of the public. However, a study of the facts fails to back such conclusions. Whereas as a result of the elections in Great Britain, Luxembourg and, partially, Finland, the right indeed strengthened its positions, in the course of the parliamentary elections in Spain and Austria and elections for the local administrative organs in France and Spain, the increased influence of the left flank in political life was noted. In Canada, Italy, Sweden, Japan, and Portugal a situation of unstable equilibrium was either preserved or developed. The fact that shifts to the right indeed took place within the bourgeois parties themselves is a different matter. Here the right-wing forces spoke ever more loudly, displaying ever greater activity and aggressiveness. The right-wing maneuverings were helped by the political activities and inclination to granting concessions to the bourgeoisie on the part of the reformist leadership of the socialist and social democratic parties.

The increased threat to the social gains of the working people and the worsening of the living conditions of the bulk of the population resulted in the fact that class contradictions developed into acute sociopolitical conflicts on basic problems. The process of further politicizing of all social life continued.

In 1979 the economic positions of U.S. imperialism in the world arena continued to weaken. Contradictions among the three centers of contemporary imperialism--the United States, the European Economic Community, and Japan--were aggravated even further. The positions of the FRG strengthened in the capitalist part of Europe. The FRG is trying to assume a dominating economic and political position within the EEC and become more independent from the United States. By the end of the year economic contradictions among Common Market countries and, particularly between Britain, on the one hand, and France and the FRG, on the other, became substantially aggravated.

Since the general crisis of capitalism is international, capitalism is seeking a way out of it on an international level, trying to elaborate a

common strategy and tactic for action. Imperialism is reacting to the aspiration of the people for social and national liberation by unifying its forces both politically and economically. Priority is given to military power, which leads to ascribing prime importance to military coalitions in which the United States would like to retain its "right to leadership." In fact, the conference of heads of states and governments of the United States, the FRG, France, and Great Britain, held in Gualeloupe on 5-6 January, was dedicated to the specific elaboration of imperialist global political and military strategy.

The regular annual conference on economic problems of the political leaders of the seven biggest capitalist countries was held on 28-29 June in Tokyo. The conference focused on problems related to the energy crisis. The declaration adopted at the conference clearly shows the desire to intensify the neocolonialist exploitation of the young countries. At the same time, however, the participants drastically differed on the subject of reducing petroleum imports.

The Common Market big bourgeoisie is seeking a solution to the economic and sociopolitical crisis in measures to broaden the EEC and strengthen the principles of so-called "supranationality." Talks on the affiliation of Greece with the community as of 1 January 1981 were concluded in April. The next decision will deal with the acceptance of Spain and Portugal, i.e., of involving in the EEC the southern European countries, which have become the weak link in the chain of Western European capitalist states. The ruling circles of the EEC-member countries linked their plans for further economic and political integration within the community and the more active coordination of foreign and domestic policies of Common Market countries with the first direct elections for a European Parliament, held on 7-10 June. However, the results of these elections, in which only about 60% of the voters participated, could not fail to disappoint their organizers. Since large groups of working people failed to participate in the elections, centrist and rightist bourgeois parties gained the majority in the European Parliament.

A characteristic feature of the world in 1979 was the continuing unrestrained spreading, in width and depth, of national-liberation revolutions. Strengthening national independence against imperialism, achieving economic autonomy, and surmounting age-old backwardness is the main content of today's national-liberation movement.

In 1979 the political map of the world continued to change. On 7 January revolutionary armed forces, led by the United Front for the National Salvation of Kampuchea, together with the rebelled population and with the help of the Vietnamese People's Army, liberated Phnom Penh, the country's capital city, and overthrew the pro-Maoist Pol Pot-Ieng Sary regime. By 12 February the mass nationwide struggle swept off in Iran the despotic regime of the shah, who had turned the country into an imperialist stronghold. On 18 July the Somosa dictatorial regime in Nicaragua fell under the

blows of democratic forces. All this convincingly proves the conclusion of the revolutionary force of today that, whatever their garb, and whoever they may be relying on, anti-people's despotic regimes are doomed to inevitable failure.

In recent years, despite certain accomplishments achieved by some developing countries, as a whole their economic lagging behind developed countries increased. The developing countries account for over 70% of the population in the non-socialist part of the world, but only 18% of the global internal product, and 15% of the industrial and about 50% of the agricultural output. In the developing countries the army of unemployed or partially employed reached 300 million, while the number of people living in a state of hunger and poverty totals as much as 1 billion.

The symptoms of the crisis of the policy of neocolonialism pursued by imperialism toward the developing countries, i.e., the implantation and strengthening here of capitalist relations, and the integration of these countries within the global capitalist economic system, are becoming ever more obvious. In 1979 the line followed by the West on such matters acquired a more rigid and aggressive nature. The imperialist countries, headed by the United States, relied mainly on the strengthening and all-round support of pro-Western regimes and the establishment in the developing countries of politically influential social strata oriented toward a capitalist way of development. They began to resort more extensively to the organization of military interventions, gross interference in the internal affairs of independent countries, the provocation of conflicts between them, and the shipment of weapons and mercenaries to the aid of their puppets. This course was most clearly manifested in the accelerated "fast reaction corps" intensively promoted by Washington--an interventionist military formation to be used for aggression against developing countries. Meanwhile, fearing that it would totally repel such countries, the West resorted to demagogic promises of partial reviews of its economic policy in their favor. Imperialism aimed the wedge of its tactic of pressure, blackmail, subversion, and even military interventions, at the countries with a socialist orientation who saw radical social change as the key to surmounting backwardness.

The members of the socialist comity strengthened and expanded their cooperation with the developing countries. They systematically supported the efforts of the young states aimed at strengthening their sovereignty and developing their independent economies. The list of treaties of cooperation and friendship between the USSR and a number of Asian and African countries was extended by a similar treaty with the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

On the basis of their principled positions, the Soviet Union and the other fraternal states actively supported the non-alignment movement, which rallies a large group of countries from different continents. The energetic position adopted by these countries on the problems of war and peace

and their consistent support of peoples fighting for their liberation from the chains of colonialism and defending their independence against the encroachments of the neocolonizers made the non-aligned movement an important positive factor in international relations. The number of countries located in various parts of the world which have joined the movement lately gave this movement a more representative nature and contributed to the enhancement of its influence on world affairs. At the same time, objective prerequisites were created for the intensification of the existing differences among individual members of the movement. Its opponents, both within the imperialist camp and Beijing, launched a variety of maneuvers aimed at emasculating its anti-imperialist peaceful trend, divide it, and separate it from the socialist comity, its natural ally.

The movement was subjected to a particularly fierce offensive last year on the occasion of the Sixth Conference of Heads of States and Governments of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Havana, last September. The conference was faced with the task of preserving and strengthening the unity and solidarity of non-aligned countries facing hostile intrigues, and promoting their solidarity with the other detachments of anti-imperialist fighters. The conference, which became the most representative forum in the entire history of the non-aligned movement as it involved the participation of representatives of over 100 countries and national-liberation movements, proved the victory of the progressive forces and the failure of reactionary attempts to undermine the anti-imperialist direction of the policy of non-aligned countries. The trend toward a clearer definition of the positions of the non-aligned movement on basic problems reflected, in particular, the aggravation of contradictions between developing countries and the main centers of contemporary capitalism.

Throughout 1979 forces hostile to the cause of the freedom and independence of the nations persisted in their aspiration to stop the processes of positive change in parts of the world where they are developing most intensively. The peoples of Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea were targets of uninterrupted provocations and threats.

The aggression unleashed on 17 February by the Chinese militarists against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, which reached its gravest stage when Beijing committed to battle an army over half-a-million strong, for about a month, was an event which had a major adverse influence on the international circumstances in 1979. The Maoist aggression was committed in violation of the principles of the United Nations and of international law, with a view to "punishing" Vietnam for its help to the Kampuchean people in overthrowing the bloody Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique, and above all because it had become a major obstacle to the implementation of Beijing's great-power plans. The entire world saw the true nature of China's hegemonistic policy in Southeast Asia, while its general foreign political course proved to be a serious threat to peace the world over. The Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity expressed their combat solidarity with the Vietnamese people. The 19 February Soviet Government declaration

emphasized that our country will fulfill its obligations based on the Friendship and Cooperation Treaty concluded between the USSR and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. The Soviet Union firmly demanded a termination of the aggression and the immediate withdrawal of Chinese forces from Vietnamese territory.

As was to be expected, the adventure of the Chinese military in Vietnam and the attempt to defeat the Vietnamese armed forces and undermine the country's economy resulted in a shameful failure. Receiving a sobering rebuff from the heroic Vietnamese people, and facing the angry condemnation of world public opinion and the firm warning of the Soviet Union, the aggressors began to maneuver. They proclaimed the withdrawal of their forces from Vietnam and agreed to hold talks. The Sino-Vietnamese talks, initiated in Hanoi and, subsequently, moved to Beijing, were not completed by the end of the year, for the Chinese side tried to use them to exert gross pressure on Vietnam and raised conditions equaling a dictate. At the same time, the Beijing leaders are continuing to voice military threats against Vietnam.

The blocking of the military aggression mounted by the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique on the Vietnamese border and the defeat of its armed forces offered the Kampuchean people favorable conditions for a democratic and anti-Maoist revolution and dealt a heavy blow at the anti-people's Maoist ideology and practice and the expansionistic policy of the Chinese leadership. However, the organization of life in the People's Republic of Kampuchea is taking place under most difficult circumstances: The country's economy has been wrecked totally. There is a shortage of food and the overwhelming majority of skilled cadres have been physically destroyed. With the support of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states the people of Kampuchea are surmounting major difficulties. On the request of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Council, socialist Vietnam has assisted and helped the Kampuchean Revolutionary Army to liquidate the remnants of the Pol Pot troops. However, Beijing has been unwilling to tolerate the defeat of the Maoist puppets. Vestiges of their defeated gangs, hiding on the territory of Thailand, are continuing to receive extensive military aid. Beijing and Washington are engaged in a malicious propaganda campaign against the People's Republic of Kampuchea and are trying to interfere in its internal affairs.

The Afghani people waged an intensive struggle for the preservation and strengthening of the revolutionary gains of April 1978. Extensive revolutionary-democratic changes were carried out in the country in the interest of the working class and toiling peasantry. The first stage of the agrarian reform was completed. However, the changes which were initiated here met with the fierce resistance of social forces whose privileges ended with the revolution. The forces of imperialism and Maoism supported the Afghani reaction from the outside. The young revolutionary system had to resort to most decisive measures to block the actions of counterrevolutionaries and rebels.

The struggle in Iran developed for insuring true sovereignty and independence, defend the people's interests, and democratize life in the country. Foreign and domestic counterrevolutionary circles tried to disorganize economic life, divide the various revolutionary forces, and block the solution of socioeconomic, political, national, and other problems in the interest of the broad popular masses. Under those circumstances relations between Iran and the United States became particularly tense. In December Washington's provocative military preparations near the Iranian borders reached unprecedented scale.

The fall of the shah's regime in Iran spurred Washington to a new energizing of its Middle Eastern policy. The Government of the United States charted a course toward the creation of a military-political alliance between the Israeli and Egyptian ruling circles, subordinated to the United States and aimed against the national-liberation movements in the Middle East, the Persian Gulf area, and Africa. The Israeli-Egyptian separate "peace treaty," under the patronage of the United States, concluded in accordance with the 26 March Camp David agreements, was to prepare the grounds for such an alliance. This separate deal failed to resolve a single one of the vital requirements of the Arab peoples concerning a just, peaceful settlement and was rejected by virtually all Arab countries. A resolution rejecting the Camp David agreements was passed by the 34th United Nations General Assembly.

Political and economic sanctions against the Egyptian regime were unanimously approved at the Baghdad conference of ministers of foreign affairs and energy of the Arab countries, as a result of which the regime found itself virtually isolated in the Arab world. The increased Israeli aggressiveness, relying on the extensive economic and military aid of American imperialism and the factual complicity of Cairo, was the direct consequence of the separate deal. This is confirmed by the increased repression against the Arab population in occupied Palestinian lands, and the escalation of the aggression against Lebanon with a view to its dismemberment and the undermining of the Palestinian resistance movement. Under those circumstances the position of the Soviet Union remained unchanged: no lasting peace could be achieved in the Middle East, whose situation remains unsettled and explosive, without an all-embracing settlement of the problems involving the participation of all interested sides, based on the full liberation of the Arab lands occupied in 1967, granting the Palestinians the possibility to create their own state, and insuring the independence and security of all countries in the area.

In Southern Africa imperialism continued its maneuvers with a view to retaining here the colonial-racist regimes subjected to the anger of over 25 million Africans. Considerations of converting Southern Africa into a military-political bridgehead for exerting pressure on independent African countries threatened detente as a whole. That is why the peace-loving international public reacted so suspiciously to the October announcement that the racist South African regime had exploded a nuclear device.

The line followed by the United States and Great Britain, acting in direct partnership with the racist regimes in the exploitation of the African population, of diplomatic maneuvering with a view to weakening the level of the national-liberation struggle in the southern part of the continent and try to impose on the patriots in the countries of this area a neocolonial future, was clearly manifested in 1979. At the same time, the racists in South Africa and Rhodesia resorted to the tactic bandit military raids on neighboring independent African countries. The national-liberation struggle of the African population, developing within the very bastions of racism, is defeating the intents of imperialism.

Today the battle vanguard of the working class--the world communist movement--has become an ideological and political force whose influence on the course of world events is increasing further and further. There is virtually no place on earth where communists are not working with dedication.

In the non-socialist part of the world communist and workers parties operated in 76 countries, numbering nearly 5 million members. A distinguishing feature of the contemporary stage is that many of these parties have become an influential and authoritative factor of domestic life. For example, in France, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Japan, Finland, Greece, and Cyprus the communist parties have become nationwide political forces feared by the reactionary circles, who are doing everything possible to block their participation in defining governmental policy. The role of the communist parties in the political life of other countries has increased noticeably. Communists were represented in the supreme legislative organs of 27 countries. The number of communist representatives rose as a result of the 1979 elections in Japan, Mexico, Spain, Sweden, and Portugal. All in all, about 40 million people are voting for communist party candidates.

The communist parties suggested realistic measures to restrain inflation and eliminate unemployment and other social disasters intensified by the aggravation of crisis processes in the capitalist world. It was precisely the communists who formulated programs for democratic alternatives to state-monopoly policy, constantly indicating the close interconnection between social programs and the consolidation of the peace, and who drew the conclusion that a sufficiently broad base exists for joint or parallel actions on the part of different political detachments of the working class in defense of the basic interests of the working people. Certain changes took place in this respect, but a number of obstacles remained as well.

In the developing countries and the national-liberation movements the communist parties purposefully struggle for the organization of spontaneous national actions and for enhancing their political standard. Frequently and selflessly they acted within national-patriotic alliances, promoted the solution of basic development problems of their countries, and cooperated with revolutionary-democratic parties in the struggle for the supreme interests of their nations.

The communist parties of Chile, Uruguay, Paraguay, and 23 other countries waged a courageous struggle under difficult clandestine conditions and persecutions.

Trying to subvert the communist parties and isolate them from the masses, in its struggle against the communist movement imperialism made use of a variety of means--naked coercion and political provocations, ideological pressure, and social maneuvering. The bourgeois mass information media resorted to numerous fabrications, falsifications, and slanders. In particular, refined speculations and falsifications concerning differences within its ranks served the purpose of weakening the global communist movement. The Maoist leadership fought the communist movement allied with imperialist reaction.

Under those circumstances the testing of the political course of each communist party through Marxism-Leninism, and class and internationalist approach to the solution of foreign political and domestic problems assumed exceptional importance. Without belittling the significance of their accomplishments, the communists did not ignore existing difficulties and complex and unresolved problems. They proceeded from the fact that today, more than ever before, the success of each fraternal party is linked with the progress of the entire communist movement and with strengthening the positions of the forces of socialism and peace at large.

Loyalty to the revolutionary traditions of the labor movement, on the basis of which socialism has already won universal-historical victories, means, as the Marxists-Leninists emphasize, the recognition of the decisive role of real socialism in the entire revolutionary process, and comprehensive help to the development of the comity of countries building socialism and communism, and strengthening the solidarity with them. The position of petty criticism of real socialism hinders creative thinking and deprives creative search of its purposefulness and reliable internal concepts. This position is fraught with political distortions and threatens not only errors but major defeats. The fatal consequences of the rejection of the ideological and political heritage of Marxism-Leninism are visible in the tragic example of the CPC.

Differences of opinions or approaches to one or another matter occasionally appeared and are appearing among communist parties. However, anyone who would hope for a temporary tactical advantage at the cost of the abandonment of general principles inevitably commits a strategic error, for this is used by imperialism to promote interests hostile to the communist movement. On the other hand, the approach to any question from Marxist-Leninist and internationalist positions and concern for strengthening the unity of the entire movement, brings successes to each party and, consequently, to the entire communist movement, whose influence, prestige, and combat capability become the stronger the more systematically the communist parties are guided by the most progressive revolutionary theory--the theory of Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

The 1970's are retreating into the past. Like its predecessors, 1979 was the witness of number of important events in the life of mankind. The forces of peace and social progress strengthened their positions even further and broadened their influence, exerting a growing influence on daily life and on processes leading to historically inevitable changes. However, social progress is following complex and varied ways. Even though the final outcome of the struggle between the forces of progress and reaction, between socialism and capitalism, is predetermined, as confirmed by practical experience, successes in this struggle are achieved at the cost of adamant efforts. They require great ideological tempering, high political maturity, and principle-mindedness. Under such circumstances, with each passing year and decade, the irrefutable truth and revolutionary-transforming power of Marxism-Leninism, its most profound humanism and highly moral content are becoming ever more apparent. Leninism is victoriously marching on earth.

5003

CSO: 1802

DEVELOPED SOCIALISM--AN INTEGRAL SOCIAL SYSTEM

Moscow **KOMMUNIST** in Russian No 18, Dec 79 pp 109-112

[Review by Yu. Vostrikov of the book "Razvitoy Sotsializm" [Developed Socialism]. Edited by Yu. Ye. Volkov, F. N. Gel'bukh, and N. G. Kristostur'yan. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 432 pages]

[Text] The concept of developed socialism was formulated and the basic laws and features of this higher stage of social progress reached today were determined through the collective efforts of the CPSU and the fraternal communist and workers parties of the other members of the socialist comity. Hundreds of monographs and articles dealing with various problems of mature socialism were published over the past decade by Soviet authors alone. This enhances, both theoretically and practically, the task of the comprehensive consideration of the developed socialist society within the unity of all its elements. The monograph under review is a study of the overall social system. It was prepared by scientists from the CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism with the participation of scientists from several other institutions.

K. Marx' indication that the development of the social system "toward integrity consists, precisely, of subordinating to itself all the elements of society or creating the still lacking organs of the system. This way, in the course of its historical development, the system becomes integral" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 46, pt I, p 229). In terms of mature socialism, the integral nature of the society is the result of the internal unity of all the aspects of the social organism from the viewpoint of the principle of collectivism.

On the basis of the solid foundations of Marxist-Leninist methodology, the authors have presented the comprehensive picture of this concrete and live historical entity, the effect of the laws governing its development and future progress toward communism, and the international significance of the doctrine of the developed socialist society. The central problems of developed socialism are interpreted profoundly and comprehensively in the first chapter, entitled "Marxism-Leninism--Theoretical Foundation of the Building of Communism," from the viewpoint of the unity between the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the new system and the practice of its

embodiment. The significance of the activities of the CPSU and the other fraternal parties in creating an integral concept of developed socialism is revealed extensively. This is new major contribution to the treasury of scientific communism. The theory and practice of developed socialism, the book notes, made it possible for the socialist comity to formulate a clear and a realistic course of action, and to concretize the ways for the implementation of its programmatic objectives.

Considering the nature and place of developed socialism in the historical process of the establishment of communism, the authors pay great attention to explaining the basic features of the first phase of the communist system, emphasizing in this case the criteria governing the building of a mature socialist society.

On the basis of the fact that, according to the view of the authors, the idea of a single criterion for a given level of social progress would be hardly correct, and that in order to determine the level of accomplishments of mature socialism we should rather be guided not by any specific criterion, but a set of criteria (see pp 82, 84), the authors single out the following basic summed-up characteristics (criteria) governing the building of developed socialism:

Above all, the high level of development of the socialist production method, which makes it possible to make the satisfaction of the steadily growing material and spiritual requirements of the working people the immediate objective of social progress, insuring the coordinated, the comprehensive, and dynamic development of all basic realms of social life--economic, social, political, and spiritual.

The maturity of socialist social relations is organically linked with this criterion, since it is precisely at the developed socialist stage that the reorganization of the sum total of social relations is accomplished on the basis of internal collectivistic principles inherent in socialism.

In turn, on the basis of the high level of development of the production method and the comprehensive establishment of mature collectivistic relations, new heights are reached in the development of the socialist way of life and the shaping of the new man.

We agree with the authors that said criteria, considered together with the basic features of a given stage of social development, would enable us to provide an overall characterization of mature socialism. Yet, first of all, as the authors note, some of these features deal with the condition of socialist society at large, while others pertain to the characteristics of individual realms of social life at its present stage. This thesis appears to be more substantiated than the rigid demarcation among basic features as qualitative characteristic inherent in a given stage as a whole throughout its entire historical duration, and criteria which are specific only to the time when society enters the mature socialist stage (see p 81). Secondly,

the assertion that the idea of a single criterion for a given level of social progress is erroneous seems to us to be insufficiently substantiated.

We find unconvincing the thesis that despite the entire importance of the determination of the level of real socialization of labor and production within a socialist society for purposes of characterizing progress, this indicator "gives an idea of the development of merely the economic sphere, without characterizing progress in other realms of social life--social, political, and spiritual" (p 84). Yet, the high level of development of socialist production and the maturity of socialist social relations are the direct consequences of the real socialization of labor and production. This offers new opportunities for the solution of the basic socioeconomic problems, i.e., for the further enhancement of the prosperity of the Soviet people, improving working and living conditions, and achieving considerable progress in health care, education, and culture--in everything which contributes to the shaping of the new person and the all-round developed personality, and the improvement of the socialist way of life.

How to present the "economic" as separate from the "social"? Naturally, the process of socialization of labor and production expresses qualitative changes occurring, above all, in the mature socialist economy. At the same time, naturally, it covers a broad spectrum of social relations, closely interwoven with economics.

Therefore, the level of the factual socialization of labor and production is one of the system-forming factors which enable us to determine the level of integrity of the social system and its maturity, not from the economic viewpoint alone. Under developed socialist conditions the process of socialization "in fact" realistically determines the steady intensification of the socialist nature of socioeconomic relations.

Incidentally, it is precisely in the process of socialization that a single ownership of the whole people develops as a prerequisite and condition for surmounting class disparities. In this respect the creation of interfarm organizations and agro-industrial complexes is of particularly great social importance. They show the main way followed in the gradual rapprochement and, in the future, merger between the two basic forms of socialist ownership. The authors show the way the exchange of the goods of their activities broadens and cooperation between workers and peasants deepens through the creation of associations. They properly note that along with the establishment of a single form of ownership we must systematically eliminate all social differences among classes, including disparities in the way of life and social consciousness. This makes possible the conclusion that the study of the process of the factual socialization of labor and production must be conducted with a broader approach which takes into consideration the dialectics of the social and the economic. The adoption of another approach in the consideration of developed socialism as an integral system would hardly achieve this objective.

At this stage, under the influence of the scientific and technical revolution, ever rising economic power, and the further process of socialization of labor and production, a qualitative improvement occurs in the socio-class structure of Soviet society. The monograph describes the basic content of this process: rapprochement among classes and social groups and strata, and the establishment of social homogeneity.

The authors emphasized that it is important to take into consideration the still remaining socio-class division of society and demarcations separating social groups with a view to the scientific study and proper guidance of the processes of further improvement of the social structure. However, social boundaries must not be absolutized. The study of quality changes within the working class, as it develops and improves in accordance with changes in its sectorial, professional, and skill structures, enhanced general educational level, culture, social and labor activeness, and political conscientiousness, is of special interest. The authors also consider the shaping of new social groups objectively caused by differences in the nature of the job.

The authors thoroughly consider the processes governing the development of the political system of mature socialism and problems of the perfecting of the democracy of the whole people. Methodologically the study of the profound inner interconnection between the ever greater blossoming of socialist democracy and the solution of the basic problems of the building of communism is of interest. The development of the political system under the conditions of mature socialism provides clear answers to the questions of the possibilities contained by socialism as a socioeconomic system, and the solidity and depth of objective prerequisites for democracy which this system offers and whose implementation depends on it.

Transformed into a nationwide organization, following the building of mature socialism, our political system is continuing to develop and improve. In this connection, the authors pay great attention to the new USSR Constitution, which codifies the correspondence among all elements within the political superstructure and the level reached in social development. They show that this creates a firm political and legal base for the further perfecting of the political system and the intensification of its democratic foundations. The authors have been able to show the dialectical interrelationship and interdependence between the economic system of socialism and socialist democracy, and illuminate the leading role of the party in the further strengthening of the democratic foundations of the Soviet state.

Avoiding an unjustifiably broad interpretation of the socialist way of life, the authors agree with the thesis already developed in our scientific literature that the way of life is the sum total of the essential features of activities of nations, classes, social communities, and individuals, features which characterize such activities in their completeness and which are determined by the objective circumstances under which they develop (see

p 382). In this connection, the authors justifiably emphasize that improvements in the socialist way of life depend, above all, on the development in the people of an accurate and active position in life. The principles of communist outlook, as they show, become profound inner convictions, a factor which determines the behavior of the individual only when the working people through their own experience, and in the course of practical activities, are convinced of the correctness of the communist ideals and the vital need to implement them. Also interesting is the special analysis in the book of problems of molding a scientific outlook as the core of the education of the new man, the patriotic and internationalist education of the Soviet people, the basic trends of the spiritual development of the individual, and so on.

In conclusion, the authors state that, "present historical experience already proves that the concept of the developed socialist society, the idea of which was formulated for the first time by V. I. Lenin and, subsequently, was developed by the CPSU and the other communist and workers parties, is of international significance" (p 430).

In connection with this book let us say a few words on collective monographs in general. In our view, in working on such publications, it is important to insure the combination of creative efforts among scientists so that they would be not simply a collective of authors, but a collective author. Only in this case would the results of their work be a monograph rather than a conventional, even though interesting, anthology. In this respect this work is better than many similar editions. However, this does not mean that all differences in interpretation have been eliminated and all viewpoints coordinated in this monograph.

Let us take as an example the question we mentioned of the role of the real socialization of labor and production. Whereas in one portion of the book we read that its level "gives an idea of the development of the economic sphere alone, without characterizing progress in other realms of social life" (ch II), we read elsewhere that the new stage of socialization of socialist production "creates qualitative changes in the entire system of production relations" (ch V); again elsewhere it turns out that the further development of processes of socialization of labor are one of the factors determining the "intensive qualitative improvement of the socio-class structure of Soviet society at the contemporary stage of developed socialism" (ch VIII). This proves the need for a summing-up characterization of this methodologically important problem, rather than of its individual aspects only.

In some parts of the book the problems discussed are made artificially more complex. Thus, we are asked to consider the developed socialist society, as the legitimate stage in the first phase of the communist system, in a state of dialectical unity of three sides: "a. as a stage within the socialist phase; b. as a separate stage, a higher level of developed socialism; and c. as a level within which a gradual transition to the

higher phase of communism takes place" (pp 71-72). Yet, the very characterization of the mature socialist society, as the highest level of development of socialism, already means that it is precisely at this stage that its growth into communism takes place.

Other inaccuracies in the presentation or stylistic unevennesses, which could be easily eliminated by the editor, could be cited as well. However, it is not they that determine the tenor of the book.

Assessing as a whole the monograph, let us point out that this collective work by Soviet social scientists could be used as an example of a creative approach to the consideration of the topical problems of the theory and practice of the developed socialist society, and a successful attempt at the comprehensive study of mature socialism as an integral social system.

5003

CSO: 1802

BORN IN THE STRUGGLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 79 pp 112-114

[Review by V. Khlynov, doctor of economic sciences, of the book "Ocherki Istorii Kommunisticheskogo Dvizheniya v Yaponii do Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny" [Studies of the History of the Communist Movement in Japan before World War II] by I. I. Kovalenko. Nauka, Moscow, 1979, 271 pages]

[Text] The problems of the world communist movement and the history of its establishment and development in the capitalist countries have always attracted, and still do, the attention of Soviet researchers. This ever deepening interest is based on the conviction of the communists that the study and mastery of historical experience has always been an effective tool in the revolutionary struggle. Noteworthy, in this connection, is the work by Doctor of Historical Sciences I. I. Kovalenko, dedicated to the memory of the Japanese communists who heroically fell in the struggle against the reaction.

This book is the first attempt in the field of Soviet Japanese studies, to give a systematic presentation of the history of the creation and prewar activities of the Japanese Communist Party (JCP).

The author extensively uses Comintern documents, new JCP materials, speeches by its leaders, studies by Soviet and progressive Japanese scientists, and periodicals of the times. The scientific analysis of problems, characteristic of the monograph, is expressively backed by lively descriptions of the selfless activities of the Japanese revolutionaries who initiated and organized the communist movement in the country.

The author notes the specific features of Japanese imperialism which largely determined the characteristics of the shaping of the working class and the difficulties accompanying the growth of its class self-awareness. The author has paid considerable attention to the appearance of the organized workers and socialist movements, and of the first Marxist groups. However, the book deals mainly with the direct history of the creation of the Japanese Communist Party and its struggle in the prewar period.

The author links the development of the workers and socialist movements and, particularly, the preparations for its new stage, which began in the 1890's, with the outstanding revolutionary San Katayama, who made a tremendous contribution to the dissemination of Marxism in Japan.

The activities of this acknowledged leader of the Japanese proletariat, member of the Comintern Executive Committee and founder of the JCP, whose figure, to this day, is a symbol of boundless loyalty to the people and the great cause of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, are described by the author in a number of vivid pages.

Particularly interesting is a chapter on the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution on the development of the revolutionary movement in Japan. Welcoming the successes of the Russian proletariat, San Katayama wrote: "The fact that the elimination of autocracy and the creation of a free revolutionary republic in Russia created such an explosion of enthusiasm among the Japanese people was entirely natural, for the Japanese were suffering under the cruel regime of the bureaucratic imperialist constitutional monarchy, nominally restricted, yet factually absolutely autocratic." Through his numerous articles and speeches, this outstanding revolutionary extensively disseminated the experience of the October Revolution and adamantly promoted the idea of the fastest possible creation of a vanguard party of the Japanese proletariat, capable of heading the revolutionary struggle of the broad Japanese people's masses and leading them to the making of a socialist revolution. "In each country," he wrote, "imperialism must be defeated directly by the proletariat of that given country: the latter must struggle under the guidance of a communist party relying on the Communist International."

The victory of the revolution in Russia led the Japanese revolutionaries to the study of V. I. Lenin's works and activities. Progressive publishing houses began to publish Lenin's works in editions considered large at the time, emphasizing their tremendous importance to the struggle of the toiling masses. "Lenin's figure," stated the announcement made by the [Hakuyosya] Publishing House on the occasion of the publication of Lenin's works in 10 volumes, "rises high above the horizon of history, predicting the victory on earth of a new system. To understand Lenin's thoughts means to understand the nature and meaning of the turn in the history of mankind. Lenin's works are an inexhaustible well of knowledge. They are the basis for studies in the field of the liberation movement of workers and peasants." At that time works by Vladimir Il'ich, such as "What Is to Be Done?" "Development of Capitalism in Russia," "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism," "State and the Revolution," "Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism," "The Left-Wing Infant Disease of Communism," and works on the new economic policy, imperialism and the national problem, and many others became particularly popular. They provided the progressive public of the country with answers to problems which interested them.

Under the influence of the October Revolution a number of popular actions broke out in Japan in opposition to the rightlessness and poverty of the

toiling masses and against the participation of Japanese imperialism in the global imperialist slaughter and its enslavement of neighboring nations. The famous "rice mutinies" of 1918, involving the participation of over 10 million people, were particularly powerful.

The upsurge of the workers and democratic movements energized anarcho-syndicalism, which acted on the basis of "left-wing" positions, and the social democratic movement with its right-wing concepts. The tireless struggle among such movements harmful to the proletariat, the immaturity of the labor movement, and above all the lack of a truly Marxist political party, prevented the working class from following the true path.

Under these complex socioeconomic and political conditions, the question of creating a "revolutionary political party of a new type, which, guided by the theory of scientific socialism, could equip the Japanese working class with a clear prospect for its progress, rally the broadest toiling strata and lead them in the struggle for peace, democracy, and social progress, and to the onslaught against capitalism and for the building of a socialist society" (p 68) was formulated.

Such a party was indeed organized. It was born on 15 July 1922 as a result of the gigantic efforts of professional Japanese revolutionaries, supported by the international communist movement.

As during the initial years of its life and, frequently, to this day, the bourgeois historians have tried to present the birth of the party as a phenomenon alien to Japan, inconsistent with the country's social conditions, and ignoring "Japanese specifics." The factual data contained in the book clearly proves that it was precisely the conditions of Japanese life that dictated the upsurge of the class struggle, which would have been inconceivable without an independent party of the working class equipped with Marxist-Leninist theory. At the same time, historical facts proved that the founding of the JCP was accelerated by the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, and was carried out with the direct support of the Comintern, which was fulfilling its international duty to the international working class.

The fourth chapter, which describes the founding of the JCP and its first steps, describes in detail the specific assistance which the Comintern and, personally, Lenin gave the Japanese communists in creating and strengthening the political vanguard of the working class.

At the same time, the author also describes the difficulties encountered by the young communist party. Less than one year after its founding, the JCP was subjected to fierce repressions. In June 1923 the first mass detentions of communists and of those suspect of sympathizing with the party were initiated. In subsequent years this became a permanent phenomenon. The author further analyzes the reasons for liquidationism, which brought about the factual self-disbanding of the JCP in March 1924, and the

struggle waged by the consistent Japanese Marxists for its restoration. With Comintern support this took place in December 1926. In this case the famous revolutionary Kyuichi Tokuda, justifiably considered, along with San Katayama, one of the founders of the party, played an important role.

All JCP activities in the prewar years provide an infinite number of examples of selfless service by the Japanese communists to the great cause of Marxism-Leninism and the struggle for peace, democracy, and socialism. In the final chapters (6-12), step by step, the author traces its specific directions and results. Using known and relatively unknown facts, he comprehensively describes the uncompromising actions of the Japanese communists against "left-wing" opportunism and right-wing deviationism, for unity within the communist party and for increasing its influence among the masses, against the fascist turn taken by the country and the aggressive foreign policy of Japanese imperialism, against the intervention by the Japanese military on the territory of the young Soviet State, against the military's preparations for a "big war" with China and the Soviet Union, and for improving the situation of the working people and creating a united anti-imperialist front. Even after 1935, when the last member of the JCP Central Committee was arrested and the legal organizational activities of the party, conducted on a national scale, came to a total end, until the party came out of clandestinity (autumn of 1945), its influence did not vanish. The remaining free communists continued their clandestine activities in the spirit of the Comintern. In this connection the author pays particular attention to the tremendous international support which the international communist movement gave the Japanese Communist Party. Entire chapters deal, in particular, with the 1927 and 1932 Comintern theses which played an important role in the development of the communist movement in Japan.

Yet, in our view, the work suffers from some shortcomings as well. An important problem such as the process of the shaping of the Japanese proletariat is considered in the book quite briefly. There should have been a more detailed study of the serious difficulties which hindered the fast dissemination of scientific socialism and of the revolutionary struggle in prewar Japan. Finally, the author has not been able to avoid certain repetitions.

As a whole, this is a solid scientific study. The author convincingly proves that, covering the difficult yet glorious road of struggle for the interests of the working class, the Japanese communists retained their loyalty to the invincible ideas of Marxism-Leninism. Despite the cruel repressions and police persecutions, mass detentions, and long years of jail, they remained loyal fighters for the noble cause of the liberation of the working masses from the yoke of capitalism. Even in the most difficult periods of confrontation with the stronger reaction, they believed in the inevitable defeat of militarism and the liberation of the people from the oppression of military-fascist dictatorship. In December 1944, in jail, where the security service had kept him for almost 12 years, Kinji

Miyamoto, the famous Japanese revolutionary and now chairman of the CC JCP Presidium, properly predicted that "the hour of the sentence of the court of history is nearing," and that "Japanese imperialism . . . will be defeated" (pp 223-224).

The surrender of militaristic Japan marked the end of World War II and turned a new page in the activities of the JCP. The work under review leads us to this postwar stage in the development of the communist movement, which should be the subject of a separate study. Imbued with the spirit of proletarian internationalism and class solidarity with the Japanese communists, this work will, unquestionably, be welcomed with interest by anyone interested in the history of the communist movement.

5003

CSO: 1802

IN THE JOURNALISTIC SHOPS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 79 pp 114-117

[Review by N. Plakhotnyy of the books "V Otvete za Kazhdoye Slovo" [Answerable for Every Word] by V. P. Zhidkov, Mysl', Moscow, 1979, 165 pages; "Gazeta Vykhodit Vecherom" [The Newspaper Comes Out in the Evening] by S. D. Indurskiy, Mysl', Moscow, 1979, 164 pages; and "Soyuz Pera, Mikroфона i Telekamery" [The Alliance Between the Pen, the Microphone, and the Television Camera] by V. S. Khelemendik, Mysl'. Moscow, 1977, 316 pages]

[Text] The work of journalists, per se, is rarely written about. Yet, the creative laboratory of the representatives of our press--publicists, essayists, reporters, columnists, and radio and television correspondents--includes a great deal of important and instructive matter for their colleagues in the other detachments of ideological workers and students of the creative process and the secrets of professional mastery in this field, as well as the wide audience of readers and viewers. The valuable experience of the Soviet journalists of the senior generations, whose activities have greatly contributed to the high prestige and influence of our press, radio, and television, is of invaluable importance to the further upsurge in the level of ideological-educational work and the training of new journalists. The great attention and interest displayed by the CPSU and the Soviet public in the activities of mass information media encourage the thoughtful and critical study of journalistic experience. That is why the initiative of Izdatel'stvo Mysl', which initiated this year a special series of books entitled "In the Creative Workshop of the Journalist," is topical and contemporary. Its purpose, as planned by its organizers, is systematically to familiarize the mass readership with the practice of editors and outstanding masters of essays, reports, and columns, and to cover basic problems of the theory of party journalism.

The series begins with the book by V. P. Zhidkov "V Otvete za Kazhdoye Slovo." Its author, the editor in chief of the journal ZHURNALIST--has set himself the difficult task of assessing the effectiveness of journalistic work on the basis of the study of specific publications carried by a number of central and local newspapers, down to and including rayon and city newspapers. The book is rich in factual data, documentary proof, and

publicistic thoughts on the ways of the establishment and development of journalistic skills and professional ethics, without which, naturally, no creative individuality can be developed even in the presence of talent.

The author has found the proper, accurate, and meaningful words to describe the difficult work of those who write. ". . . By the nature of his profession and vocation," he states in one of the chapters, "the journalist always 'draws the fire on himself.' Writing about the creative successes of a person or a collective, he dares to measure and assess their labor efforts and contribution to the building of the new society. A journalist who criticizes someone's omissions, shortcomings, or errors, assumes the responsibility to condemn, on behalf of society, the violation of the norms of our morality, our laws, and our rules of life" (p 8).

Essentially, all journalistic work is a major or minor study of a specific problem, and an attempt to understand the complex phenomena of life with a view to drawing on them the attention of society.

The clear word of the publicist, essayist, and reporter helps the readers to understand the world around them more profoundly and accurately. It promotes high civic feelings. As the poet once said, such words must fire the hearts of the people! Anyone who tries to master this art to perfection should not rely on a happy combination of circumstances. Each great success is the result of tremendous amounts of work, profound knowledge of the subject, inflexible civic mindedness, principle mindedness, and honesty and, if necessary, the ability to defend one's own viewpoint. It is from such positions that all journalistic output must be assessed. This is the yardstick of the effectiveness of workers in the press.

The author knowledgeably interprets the experience in preparing newspaper materials, which must be topical and operative, dealing with problems of economics, morality, or education. The author has substantiated quite convincingly his idea that any subject--even the most topical--requires vivid and expressive means and that they do not detract in the least from the heart of the matter, as is the case according to the supporters of the so-called "strictly official" writing. Popular cliches and wornout stereotyped expressions could detract from a much needed article, essay, or report, for counterindicated in journalism in general are officialese and oversimplification, which frequently lead to a percentage-citing mania, extensive descriptions of strictly specialized topics, and superficial empiricism.

A clear party position, passion, and sincerity are guarantees for the full implementation of the journalistic intent. Such is the conclusion of this book. It contains a number of interesting parts describing the profound meaning and civic responsibility of everyone who has assumed in the eyes of society and his conscience the strict obligation to be a propagandist for the great communist ideas.

Naturally, it is agreeable to deal with positive examples. However, a bitter lesson is also an experience if properly treated. That is why the author discusses so thoroughly and painstakingly clearly inadequate works. It turns out that there seems to be a kind of "law" which triggers boring, inexpressive, and ineffective materials. . . . A journalist is given a responsible assignment knowing, in advance, what he will write. He does not even think of making a thorough study of the situation, having reached his conclusion even before the trip. This leads to the publication of a "traveling" article containing elementary truths and entirely acceptable and totally unbinding advice. . . . Another correspondent, not competent in the field of his topic, expresses in general terms confused considerations in such a way the even a knowledgeable person would be . . . Or else an author insufficiently exact toward himself and his social behavior may undertake to discuss a moral topic lightheartedly. Could one trust the sincerity of his judgments, follow his advice, and rely on his logic! We fully accept the view of the author of this book that the significance of the articles also depends on the lofty professional, civic, and moral qualities of the journalist. Willy-nilly, the effectiveness of the printed word is weakened when the strict yardstick applied by the reader is ignored.

The question of effectiveness and quality, currently given priority by the party, directly applies to the work of editors. The book by V. P. Zhidkov is a successful example of the thoughtful and skilled analysis of journalistic output within the broad range of its genres and methods. The work will be useful not only to the press, but to anyone interested in Soviet journalism.

The party decisions on improving information and propaganda work met with the profound understanding and total approval of the journalists. This is discussed in the book "Gazeta Vykhodit Večerom" by S. D. Indurskiy, the oldest Moscow journalist, whose name has invariably appeared for two decades at the end of each issue of VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA.

Traditionally, the evening press is considered as strictly informative. However, information is a broad and comprehensive concept. In the broad meaning of the term, it means a sum total of precise information on reality around us, past and future, processes under way, and factual subjects. . . . Essentially, all journalistic genres are informational, for they use a variety of means and specific examples to show the meaning and content of economic, social, and political processes in our country and throughout the world, and take to the masses the truth of the domestic and foreign policy of the CPSU, and propagandize the Soviet way of life.

However, the evening city newspaper has its own identity, its specific nature. One of its fixed qualities is operativeness. The reporter has no right to ignore a news item, for the next morning it will be spread throughout the world by other editions. Therefore, the evening newspaper must always stick to the rigid rule of "today or never!"

From the outside it may appear that writing notes and reports covering the area within city limits would not be so difficult, as everything is clear and near. All it takes is to grab it. However, as we read this book we see the warmth with which the author describes his colleagues:

". . . Reporters do not have to take airplanes, cover the paths in the tayga, or cross stormy rivers to meet with his characters and be the first to describe them. The capital is big, and using the subway it could be crossed from end to another in one hour. Nevertheless, in our editorial office, this work of the reporter and the chronicler, surrounded by the spirit of romanticism, demands particular professional qualities. The reporter must be ready to go and take off at all times, for the airport of the railroad station, to welcome a guest of the capital, ask him a few questions, and find things of interest to the Moscovite. A chronicler is, by vocation, omniscient and, as a rule, the doors which open to him carry the warning sign of 'Do Not Enter Through The Back Door'" (p 7).

Then, step by step, the author describes the way the collective of VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA, surmounting inertia and a tendency to use conventional and tested methods, looks for new means for the presentation of the material and masters complex genres previously typical of the big newspapers only. For the pleasure of the numerous readers of VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA, the newspaper broadened the range of topics covered mainly by publishing analytical, problem, and militant materials. Its material is published in sections entitled "Alarming Signal," "Penalty," and "Answer." Frequent articles are published in different genres discussing topical problems of the city's economy. In the past such information was fragmented and, frequently, openly read like an official report. It was important to a narrow circle of office workers, leaving the general reader uninterested. Yet, if skillfully and interestingly covered, economic topics are of interest to our public and originate a great deal of editorial mail.

According to the author multiple-genre publications do not contradict the spirit and traditions of the evening press. Their variety is determined not only by the requirements of reality, but by different reasons as well, in particular the increased skill of the reporter. On the other hand, the question has appeared of insuring the greater specialization of the contributors, for dwelling on economic problems demands of the newsman not only a "energetic pen," but extensive knowledge and proper training. That is what makes such materials exceptionally valuable. It is not accident that many such publications were discussed by the Moscow City Party Committee and by central departments and ministries.

The interpretation of personal experience is an excellent training for editorial workers. True, the entirely natural doubt arises after reading the book: does the editorial collective work without hitches, or rough spots, do all plans succeed without a clash of opinions and without organizational difficulties? Actually, S. D. Indurskiy seems to have anticipated the question by answering it, so to speak, preventively: this

would be the topic of another book. . . . Nevertheless, such an approach to the question is hardly justified. In any case, it does not give a full impression of day-to-day life. . . .

Scientific and technical progress has a beneficial influence not only on the development of production forces, but directly on mass-information media, improving and increasing the power of their technical base. Thanks to this, year after year, the effectiveness of their impact on all population strata grows.

Members of the older generation well remember what an important event the radiofication of town and country became in the 1930's. The appearance of loudspeakers, and even homemade radios, was an exceptional novelty. Hours on end crowds of peasants would gather in reading rooms, to listen to the distant voice of Moscow which "thanks to a miracle" had come to them. It was very important to receive truthful first-hand information on what was taking place in the land of the Soviets and throughout the world.

This was followed by the age of television, and the effectiveness of the spiritual impact of mass-information media rose immeasurably, for there is an accurate saying according to which "one picture is worth a thousand words." Naturally, television is omnipotent. However, along with it there developed, if one may say so, the standard of the televiewer. With every passing year it became stricter and more demanding, critically reacting to television programs. He does not simply accept them, but actively interferes in their preparation. He personally participates in interesting television undertakings whether dealing with entertainment or specific problems.

Nor has technical progress bypassed the press. Today the majority of central newspapers are in the hands of the readers the same day they are published, even though, occasionally, thousands of kilometers may stand between publishers and subscribers. Briefly stated, journalism gained a powerful industrial base and its shops became an integral ideological association. Despite all this, in the socialist society the press, radio, and television are not competitors, ideologically or economically, but enjoy equal favorable possibilities for fruitful work. How are they used? Naturally, in different ways. A detailed analysis of relations among the press, radio, and television is the topic of the monograph by V. S. Khelemendik "Soyuz Pera, Mikrofonta i Telekamery," which was awarded this year's prize of the USSR Union of Journalists.

The topic is considered in its historical aspect. Studying relations between the press and the radio in the 1930's, the author proves the vital need which then existed for the duplication of sociopolitical information, which made it possible to exclude different or even distorted interpretations of events occurring in the country on the part of the readers and radio listeners.

Even before the first experiment in transmitting pictures with sound was made in our country, on 15 November 1934, the journal GOVORIT SSSR described "telebroadcasting in the immediate future," which will show to the audience "all interesting events occurring in all parts of the world"; "telereporting will be organized, i.e., the transmission of events . . . wherever they may occur, directly from the place of the event, similar to the currently existing broadcasts and radio relays" (GOVORIT SSSR, No 3, 1932, p 14).

As we may see, such daring predictions at that time were proved correct quite rapidly. Television required no more than three decades to become a mass-information medium, compared with half a century for the radio and over 300 years for the press. Such a high pace of development is explained by vital social requirements and the enhanced role of all mass-information media in the life of society.

Each type of journalism is not only specific, but lacks something the others have, the author notes. Whereas the advantage of the press is that the published communication or any other interesting data could be read whenever convenient, and that the shortcoming of television is that it chains the viewer to the screen and prevents him from engaging in any other type of activity at the moment, unquestionably, the radio benefits from the fact that it could follow a person wherever he is, while leaving him free to engage in one or another unpostponable project. The author explains the organic interconnection among heterogeneous information media by citing the common sociopolitical tasks they must carry out. Television neither restricted nor replaced journalism. It only supplemented it, raising the overall potential. True, the methods used in controlling mass-information and propaganda media have become more complex and have changed. The need for their reciprocal cooperation has developed and for insuring organization and interaction which exclude duplication. Such experience has been acquired in the Ukraine, Leningrad, and Estonia. The author emphasizes that specific studies of the mentality of readers, listeners, and viewers could be of tremendous help to the practical activities of journalistic collectives.

This work is an expanded study of the problem of interaction among mass-information and propaganda media, and it is entirely natural for some of the author's views and conclusions to be debatable. However, such a debate would be fruitful, for it would cover under studied yet very topical problems closely linked with the tasks of upgrading the effectiveness of a powerful party ideological weapon.

Each one of the books under review enriches our concepts of the processes currently taking place in the various shops of Soviet journalism, thanks to the party's purposeful efforts and consistent concern for upgrading the effectiveness of mass-information and propaganda media. The party considers the press, television, and radiobroadcasting an irreplaceable means for the communist upbringing and organization of the masses, and an

important factor in the shaping of public opinion. As was pointed out at the all-union conference of ideological workers, the overall level of our printed and radio and television propaganda should be made consistent with the increased scale and complexity of the building of communism, the higher educational and cultural standards of the Soviet people, and the aggravation of the ideological struggle in the international arena. This means the skillful and vivid interpretation of ripe problems, and enriching readers, listeners, and viewers with a correct understanding of the experience of the past and contemporary problems facing our society. This is a truly beneficial field for creative activities, open to anyone who has firmly and seriously linked his career to journalism!

A proper research course has been charted in covering the major and topical problems of contemporary journalism. This could be greatly assisted by the series of books on the creative laboratory of the journalist. Let us wish its organizers and authors a good trip!

5003

CSO: 1802

BRIEF REVIEW OF BOOKS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 79 pp 118-121

[Review of two books]

[Text] A. D. Kosichev, "Tvorcheskoye Razvitiye KPSS Teorii Nauchnogo Kommunizma. (Po Materialam XXV S"yezda KPSS)" [Creative Development of the Theory of Scientific Communism by the CPSU. (Based on Materials of the 25th CPSU Congress)], Mysl', Moscow, 1978, 188 pages.
Reviewed by Ts. Stepanyan, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member.

The decisions and documents of the CPSU and of the fraternal communist and workers parties of the socialist countries are the most important result of the development of the theory of scientific communism. As was stated at the 25th congress, they "sum up the tremendous experience acquired in building the new society and provide an analysis of the latest processes of international development." It was precisely the 25th congress that became the biggest landmark in CPSU theoretical activities. It creatively summed up the practice of revolutionary transformation of the contemporary world and of the building of socialism and communism, made a new contribution to the treasury of scientific communism, and gave a new impetus to its further development.

In a book dealing with such matters A. D. Kosichev offers a philosophical-sociological analysis of the creative development of the theory of scientific communism by the Leninist party.

The author's study is based on the extensive use of the founding ideas of the Marxist-Leninist classics on the two phases of the communist system. This enables us to trace the continuity of the creative development of the theory of scientific communism and determine the new features contributed to it by the 25th CPSU Congress. The author directs the attention of the reader to the elaboration of topical problems of scientific communism in the works and speeches by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and the other party and government leaders. Guided by the works of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, the

CPSU program, and other party documents, in my view, the author properly emphasizes the fact that scientific communism, as a structural component of Marxism-Leninism, studies, above all, "the general sociopolitical laws governing the building of socialism and communism, and the development of the world revolutionary process" (p 11).

The author shows that, after summing up the experience acquired in revolutionary construction, the congress provided an expanded characterization of the developed socialist society, profoundly analyzed the laws, motive forces, and sources of its progress, and indicated the ways and means for the further perfecting of socialism and its gradual growth into communism.

The concept of developed socialism, the book emphasizes, developed and comprehensively substantiated by the CPSU and the other fraternal parties, made it possible for the 25th congress to bring to light the basic features of contemporary Soviet society.

At the present stage the economy and the entire system of social relations, characterized by high-level socialization of production, further rapprochement between the two forms of socialist ownership--state and kolkhoz-cooperative--conversion to intensive expanded reproduction, and gradual elimination of major disparities between town and country and between mental and physical labor, are experiencing qualitative changes. Unity among production, distribution, and exchange is developing steadily. This, as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out "reflects the new stage in the development of our national economy." A major characteristic of mature socialism is the completion of the reorganization of all social relations on a proper collectivistic basis. Ever more favorable conditions are developing for the harmonious and comprehensive utilization of the objective laws of socialism with a view to insuring the proportional development of the national economy and the maximum satisfaction of the material and cultural needs of the people and insuring comprehensive social progress. The author emphasizes that in this case the people do not passively adapt to the objective laws, but actively master them and make them serve the interests of all citizens. Successful progress depends on the knowledge and effective utilization of such laws. In a state of dialectical unity, the objective laws of socialism are given extensive possibilities "to show its advantages in all realms of social life . . ." (L. I. Brezhnev).

The special attention which the 25th congress paid to the role of proportionality, comprehensiveness, and balancing of the economy as the most important factor in the improvement of our social system, makes it possible to consider developed socialism as an integral economic and social system with identical socialist production relations shared by the entire society.

The author provides an interesting study of the social aspect of the building of the material and technical base of communism, which is "the foundations for the reorganization and development of social relations,

steady upsurge of the material prosperity and cultural standard of the people and the comprehensive development of all members of society" (p 44).

He raises the question of the laws, ways, and means for enhancing the level of production forces under developed socialist conditions. These laws include qualitative changes and the comprehensive renovation of labor tools, the development of machine systems of a new type, the finding of new materials, the all-round linking of industrial projects within a single complex, and the elaboration and implementation of large-scale long-term production programs.

The strengthening of the material and technical base of agriculture has been described meaningfully. The author considers the creation of agro-industrial organizations, interfarm cooperation, and the organization of specialized associations a qualitatively new stage in the development of agricultural production.

In accordance with the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress the author analyzes in detail the question of the most important directions followed in the development of production forces in agriculture--mechanization, reclamation, and chemization--as well as the development of selection and seed growing. These trends are contributing to the accelerated conversion of agricultural production to an industrial base, to considerably ungrading its effectiveness, developing new breeds of animals and plant species, reducing the dependence on weather factors, and promoting the steadily growing similarity of living conditions between town and country.

The author draws the readers' attention to the comprehensive and profound study of socio-class and national relations and of the political system of developed socialism contained in the documents of the 25th congress. On the basis of the theoretical and methodological stipulations of the congress, he provides an expanded definition of our social structure and shows the objective laws governing the progress of society from social differentiation to social homogeneousness. The all-union conference of ideological workers paid particular attention to these problems. In his report to the congress entitled "A Cause of the Entire Party," M. A. Suslov emphasized that "today priority is given in the field of historical materialism and scientific communism to problems such as the further growth of the social homogeneousness of our society, with the leading role of the working class, the rapprochement between nations and nationalities, the strengthening of the new historical community--the Soviet people--and the legitimacy and characteristics of the formation and development of the social consciousness under contemporary conditions."

Let us note the sections analyzing the development of the spiritual potential of mature socialism and the problem of communist education and of the comprehensive development of the individual in which the author discusses the unity of the individual's ideological-political, labor, and moral components. Discussing the problem of the socialist way of life, the

author notes that the 25th congress substantiated its significance and role in the development of the socialist society and showed the content, characteristic features, and factors of its further advancement.

The book provides a meaningful interpretation of the problems discussed at the 25th party congress dealing with contemporary global developments and the revolutionary process and their motive forces. The program for the further struggle for peace and international cooperation and for the freedom and independence of the peoples, representing a development of the peace program, is considered in detail.

The work has shortcomings as well. This applies, above all, to a number of definitions and formulations provided by the author. Some of them are loose and tautological. Thus, the author describes the contemporary stage in the development of socialism as "first of all, as having more mature features compared with the second half of the 1960's, when our country entered the period of mature socialism; secondly, the appearance of new features, confirming that our country has reached a new, a higher stage of development" (p 21); "machine systems of a new type, created under the conditions of a developed socialist society," the author claims, "are not a simple automatic mode of technical progress" (pp 47-48). Extensive Soviet publications on this problem offer meaningful and proven definitions and characteristics of the phenomena occurring at the present stage of development of the socialist society, which should have been taken more fully into consideration.

As a whole, the book by A. D. Kosichev could be useful to scientific workers, teachers, lecturers, propagandists, and those engaged in the study of scientific communism.

M. A. Morozov, "Natsiya v Sotsialisticheskom Obshchestve" [The Nation in the Socialist Society], Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 175 pages. Reviewed by Prof M. Kulichenko, doctor of historical sciences.

The question of the socialist nations and of the radical distinction between them and capitalist nations demands constant attention. The reason, above all, is that life goes forth and new data are acquired on the national development of the peoples and relations among them. The study of the real process of the forming and development of socialist nations is necessary also in order to expose the subversive role of contemporary anti-communism. The bourgeois ideologues are not abandoning their attempts to impose the thesis that the socialist nation is an "ideological fiction," since, allegedly, as an "eternal" category, the nation does not change its nature in converting from one social system to another. This argument is needed by the anti-communists to "prove" the fact that nations and national relations under socialism have the same characteristics as under capitalism, i.e., inequality, hostility, nationalism, and chauvinism and, consequently, that socialism, allegedly, does not provide in this area any advantages to the peoples, compared with capitalism.

M. A. Morozov attempts to characterize the nations new in terms of socio-economic nature on the basis of the experience in their reorganization and development, gained both in the Soviet Union and in the other socialist countries. He has paid particular attention to the socialist nations of the USSR which are already developing under mature socialist conditions.

Taking into consideration the need for the further elaboration of the problems of the socialist nation and the exposure of the falsifications of the anti-communists, the author considers the theoretical aspects of such problems and analyzes the practice of the development of nations and national relations under capitalism and socialism, showing the radical differences between them. The Marxist-Leninist theory of the socialist nation is the nucleus of the book's content. Noting that the concept of "socialist nation" was first introduced into science by V. I. Lenin, the author proves the way our party, the Soviet social scientists, and the Marxist scientists of other countries are developing this most important theoretical concept.

The question of the nature of the socialist nation and its development, based on social practice, is of major scientific and political interest. Let us point out that this book is among the most successful attempts to resolve it. Convincingly proving the groundlessness of the critics of the theory of the socialist nation, the author is guided by the Leninist methodological stipulation that nations are the inevitable product and inevitable form of the bourgeois epoch of social development (see V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 26, p 75). This concept, expressed in its time in terms of the capitalist nations, is applied by the Marxist scientists to the socialist nations as well. On this basis, the author notes that the nation "grows on a specific socio-economic base and has its own content" (p 11). In his view, a definition of the nation--with a view to emphasizing the direct dependence between the nature of the nation and the socioeconomic system in which it is developing --must mandatorily include the stipulation that it is a historical community of people in the ages of capitalism and socialism (see p 16).

Studying the practice of the reorganization of all nations or the establishment of new ones, on a socialist basis, using extensive specific-historical data from the life of the peoples of the USSR and the other socialist countries, the author traces the qualitative renovation of all characteristics and features of the nations. He writes that the nation changes its nature with the change of socioeconomic systems (see p 13). Describing the new nature of nations under socialism, the author notes the importance of the national statehood of the peoples. Its significance is that it reflects the common political life of the people as was pointed out by the Marxist-Leninist classics themselves (see V. I. Lenin, *ibid*, vol 24, pp 385 and others), contributing to the strengthening of its national unity and serving as a tool in the building of the new society. The author also justifiably emphasizes that national statehood is not a determining characteristic of the socialist nation (see p 45) and that the USSR Constitution guarantees the real rights and freedoms of all Soviet citizens of

any nationality, rather than the nation with which the statehood is identified (see p 45). The fabrications of the critics of the theory of the socialist nation concerning the existence of some kind of "state nation" and the unequal situation of national minorities in our country are absolutely groundless. Equally groundless are attempts to draw the far-fetched concept of a "state nation" from the theory of the socialist nation itself.

The author deals extensively with the solution of the national problem in the USSR and the establishment of essentially new, socialist national relations. The socioeconomic system is determined not only by the nature of the nations, but the nature of national relations as well (see p 15). Discussing the interrelationship between the processes of the renovation of the characteristics of nations and changes in the nature of national relations, the author states that, "It is important to note one common feature of the changes in the characteristics of the nations: all of them objectively reflect the process of rapprochement among socialist nations, confirming the creation of unbreakable economic, political, and cultural relations among the peoples of the USSR and the strengthening of their friendship" (p 71).

The friendship among the peoples of our country, justifiably points out M. A. Morozov, cannot be reduced merely to the results of the implementation of the Leninist national policy of the CPSU, even though this is of exceptional importance. "The friendship among the peoples of the USSR is the result of the successful implementation by our party of the Leninist theory of the socialist revolution, the Leninist plan for the building of socialism, and the Leninist theories on the agrarian, national, and other problems" (p 87). The author emphasizes the tireless concern of the party for the further strengthening of the friendship among the peoples of the Soviet state.

The book considers the nature of the international unity of the peoples of the USSR and the objective foundations and subjective factors of the rapprochement among all nations and nationalities within our country. In this connection he discusses the role of the socialist development of nations in the course of their steadfast and gradual rapprochement and establishment of a new historical community--the Soviet people. He shows the great theoretical and political significance of the USSR Constitution to the effect that this new historical community developed "on the basis of the rapprochement among all classes and social strata, the juridical and factual equality among all nations and nationalities, and their fraternal cooperation" (p 40).

The interconnection between national traditions and Soviet patriotism and between the national and the international aspects of the culture of the peoples is a subject separately considered in the book. "Under the conditions of the socialist system," the author writes, "many national traditions acquire a new content and are enriched with the ideas and concepts

reflecting the current level of development of nations and national relations, the consciousness and mentality of the peoples, and the contemporary range of their spiritual requests and interests" (pp 107-108). Interesting considerations have been expressed in the book on the contemporary process of development of national cultures and the contribution to this development made not only by members of a given nation, but by members of other nationalities living with it. Some works in which the national aspect in culture is reduced mainly to its form are substantively criticized.

The chapter on the internationalization of the education of the working people and the indivisible unity between it and patriotic upbringing describes the development in the working people of all nationalities in our country an awareness and feeling of belonging to the Soviet people as a new historical community. Discussing the reasons for individual manifestations of national exclusivity at the present stage as well, the author expresses his views on the specific measures needed to surmount them. He cites a number of instructive examples of the way the implementation of the task set by the 25th CPSU Congress of improving the forms and methods of educational work has a beneficial influence on developing in all working people, the youth above all, of the active life-stance of the builder of communism.

The theoretical and political significance and topical nature of the questions raised in M. A. Morozov's book have triggered the lively interest of scientists, propagandists, and broad readership circles.

5003
CSO: 1802

INDEX OF ARTICLES AND MATERIALS PUBLISHED IN 'KOMMUNIST' IN 1979

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 79 pp 122-128

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
From Karl Marx' Manuscript Legacy About Russia . .	13	3	1
CPSU Central Committee Appeal to All Voters, Citizens of the USSR	3	3	1
Awards Presented by the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU, and Komsomol Central Committee	3	11	10
In the Central Committee of the CPSU	5	3	1
Information Announcement on a Plenum Held by the CPSU Central Committee	7	3	1
At the CPSU Central Committee	7	10	9
Visit of USSR Party-Government Delegation to the Hungarian People's Republic	9	3	1
Results of the Brezhnev-Carter Meeting	10	3	1
At the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Council of Ministers	11	3	1
At the CPSU Central Committee	11	4	3
CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Minis- ters Decree on the Further Development of the Higher School and Upgrading the Quality of Spe- cialists' Training	11	5	4

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Perfecting the Economic Mechanism and the Tasks of Party and State Organs	12	3	1
At the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers . . .	12	5	3
At the CPSU Central Committee	13	7	6
CC CPSU Decree on Improving the Work on the Pres- ervation of Law and Order and Intensifying the Struggle Against Violations of the Law	14	3	1
On the Results of the Visit of the USSR Party- Government Delegation to the German Democratic Republic	15	3	1
Information Communication on the CC CPSU Plenum .	17	3	1
On the Draft State Plan for the 1980 Economic and Social Development of the USSR and the USSR State Budget	17	4	2
Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's Replies to Questions of American 'TIME' Magazine [22 January 1979 issue, pp 20-22, 25]	2	3	1
Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's Speech at the Meeting with the Electorate	4	3	1
L. I. Brezhnev's Supreme Soviet Speech	7	4	2
L. I. Brezhnev Addresses Supreme Soviet Presid- ium	7	7	5
L. I. Brezhnev's Statement on Soviet-French Talks	7	9	7
L. I. Brezhnev's Address on Hungarian Television .	9	5	3
L. I. Brezhnev's Speech at the Ceremonious Meet- ing in Berlin on the Occasion of the 30th Anni- versary of the Founding of the GDR	15	5	3
L. I. Brezhnev's Answers to a Question by a 'PRAVDA' Correspondent	16	15	14

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
L. I. Brezhnev's Speech to the 27 November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum	17	6	4
A Cause of the Entire Party	15	22	22

Editorials and Editorial Articles

Communist Idea-Mindedness--An Alloy of Knowledge, Convictions, and Practical Action	1	3	1
In the Name of Peace and Social Progress	1	12	
Weapon of the Doomed	3	97	123
Beijing: Yesterday a Reserve of Imperialism, To- day Its Aily	4	71	85
Soviet Society's Priceless Political Capital	5	9	8
Victorious Banner of Millions	6	3	1
Safeguarding and Effectively Utilizing Material Resources	8	3	1
Party Propagandist	9	8	6
Strategy of Communist Building	9	117	
The Socialist Comity is the Greatest Revolution- ary Achievement	10	5	
Socialism Ideal and Real Socialism	11	11	11
In Defense of Life and Freedom, Democracy, and Social Progress	11	25	
For Effectiveness in Ideological-Political Educa- tion	14	7	6
Revolution, People, History	15	10	9
State and Directions of Philosophical Studies	15	66	71
Creativity of the Millions	16	3	1

	Issue No	KOMFU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Toward New Achievements in Communist Construc- tion	18	3	1
Course of Construction and Peace	18	14	
Major Problem of Historical Materialism	18	25	26
Theory and Practice of Party Construction			
Supreme Principle of Party Leadership	12	30	30
Raykom and Local Soviets	13	46	52
At the Head of the Masses	7	21	21
Concern for Middle-Level Cadres	12	54	58
Problems of the Ideological Struggle at the Cen- ter of Attention	5	45	53
Portrait of a Deed--Portrait of a Man	5	67	79
Virgin Land Developed, Continuing Development . .	17	62	74
Primary Party Organization and Labor Collective .	15	44	46
Rule of the Soviets--Absolute Power of the People			
Political System of Developed Socialism	12	62	67
Armed Forces in the State of the Whole People . .	2	59	66
For Better Living and Working Conditions	4	43	48
Law of Developed Socialism and Freedom of the Individual	1	46	50
School of Statesmanship	4	33	36
Soviet Constitution and Ideological Struggle . . .	12	74	81
Social 'Anatomy' of Health	9	41	44
Concern for the Children is Concern for the Future	9	37	38

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
From the Midst of the People's Masses	4	25	26
Young Generation of the Land of the Soviets . . .	9	33	33
On the Positions of the Building of Communism			
Outstanding Chapters of a Great Book	6	11	10
Components of Production Intensification	17	39	46
The Town as an Integrated Socioeconomic Complex .	2	48	53
Enterprise: Services Sector	13	34	38
Soviet Finances as a Factor in Raising Production Efficiency and Work Quality	16	16	15
Great Exploit of the People	10	17	16
Sectorial Reserves at the Service of the Five- Year Plan	3	36	45
Nuclear Power Operation: Achievements and Prob- lems	14	19	19
City and Environment	16	81	98
Experience in Agricultural Management	6	86	101
Important Stage in Perfecting Planned Economic Management	12	16	15
On the Subject of USSR Economic Geography and Its Present-Day Tasks	15	91	103
Vital Need to Expand Cooperation Between Industry and Science	1	37	39
New Upsurge in Domestic Machine Building	3	23	29
Scientific Organization of Labor at the Present Stage	2	37	40
Scientific and Technical Progress and Production Intensification	13	23	25

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Robots Assist Humans	15	80	89
Powerful Means for the Unity of the Soviet People Over the Tyumen' Region	13	10	9
Keeping Abreast of Consumer Demand	16	29	30
Work Without Stragglers According to Tense Plans .	11	48	53
Perfection of Management as an Important Reserve for Raising Social Production Effectiveness . . .	8	41	45
Time of Beneficial Changes	7	35	37
Division of Labor and Development of Infrastruc- ture	9	53	57
Lessons of the Shchekino Method	17	51	60
Great Force of Fraternal Unity	11	37	40
Gauges and Incentives in Upgrading Production Effectiveness	1	24	24
All-Party Cause			
Reliable Instrument of Soviet Democracy	6	74	87
Reliable Instrument of Soviet Democracy	8	50	56
Topical Issues of Moral Education	8	27	28
Words and Deeds of 'Integral' Personnel	10	26	26
For a Communist Attitude Toward Labor	6	26	29
Communist Education of the Toilers of the Sea . .	15	57	61
In Close Connection with Practice	17	19	20
Vigorousness of Moral Position in Life and Literature	17	28	28
Improving Ideological and Moral Upbringing	12	42	44
Influence of Newspaper Articles	8	57	66

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Example of Specific Concern for Press Effective- ness	11	60	67
Powerful Factor of Our Development	8	13	12
One Fate and Common Concerns	8	61	72
Unity of Internationalist and Atheist Indoctri- nation: Experience and Problems	5	56	66
Lenin's Advice to the Generations	16	62	74
In the Spirit of Internationalism and Soviet Patriotism	10	34	35
Science, Culture, and Art			
Sociology and Roads of Social Development	2	96	110
Creative Power of the Leninist Concept of Social- ist Management	6	61	72
Art Addressed to the Masses	18	59	72
'I Am Counted with Russia'	8	67	79
Education of Talent	18	47	56
Careful Treatment of History	8	126	157
Current Tasks of Cultural Development in the Village	5	30	32
Freedom of an Artist-Citizen	14	65	74
VUZ Regional Scientific Center	14	29	32
Topical Aspects of the Correlation of Fundamental and Applied Research	10	58	62
Militant, Hence Dialectical Materialism	6	47	54
On the Subject of Scientific Communism	16	45	55
'With Truth in the Heart'	16	57	68

The Soul is Obligated to Work: Writer's Notes . . .	3	46	57
Profound Content of Lenin's Words: Painter's Notes	6	42	49
Trilogy about the Soviet Person	14	53	61
Tolstoy and the Theater	10	80	86
Leninist Concept of Law and Contemporary Scientific Knowledge	10	46	48
Dialectical-Materialistic Philosophy in the Modern World	14	39	45
Marxist-Leninist Philosophy Consolidates Its Positions in the World	4	97	123
Ringing Side	9	64	69
N. K. Krupskaya and the Modern School	3	56	70
Latest Compilation of Human Knowledge	8	81	98
Logic of Revolutionary Thinking and Class Approach in Logic	11	63	71
Civic Principle--Artistic Principle	11	76	85
Scientific Integration Under the Conditions of the Scientific and Technical Revolution	10	68	73
In the Hand of Vladimir Il'ich	7	49	53
Pages from the Struggle			
Some Lessons of the First Proletarian Dictatorship in Hungary	4	48	54
Loyalty to Ideals	13	108	125
Two Letter by N. K. Krupskaya	3	53	66
'With Him We Are One! He Is Inseparable from Us!'	6	38	44
This Must Never Be Repeated	13	53	60
On the History of Soviet-Chinese Relations	14	87	102

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
True Son of India	5	77	93
New Documents of the Great Patriotic War	13	75	84
New Documents about the Heroes of Khalkhin-Gol	14	76	87
First People's Revolution in the Epoch of Imperialism	18	71	94
Comrade 'AVANTE!'	18	83	110
Unfading Light	7	58	64
'We Take Pride in the Memory of Our Fathers'	10	91	100
Ready to Be a Rank and Filer	17	106	129
At the Sources of the Contemporary Communist Movement	11	85	95
Creative Endeavors of the Hungarian Soviet Republic	4	56	63
Beastly Face of Fascism	13	65	73
Unfading Glory	14	82	97
'I Am Pleased by the Successes of Your Social Revolution'	12	85	94
In the Socialist Comity Countries			
Socialist Internationalization of Production	2	79	91
Socialist Comity--For Peace and Disarmament	4	13	13
Summation of SED Revolutionary Experience	9	90	105
In Fraternal Cooperation with the USSR	9	74	84
Initiative of the Masses Must Serve Scientific and Technical Progress	9	82	95
Steel and Friendship	11	107	120

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Growing Strength of International Cooperation . .	9	18	17
CEMA'S 30th Anniversary	3	15	15
Victorious Progress of Socialism on German Soil .	13	85	98
In the Family of the Socialist Community	1	74	85
Inalienable Feature of the Socialist Comity's Life	14	91	108
World Revolutionary Process			
Democratic Youth Faces the Sociocultural Contra- dictions of Capitalism	16	70	85
Socialism, Peace, and Our Struggle	17	70	83
The Collapse of Absolutism	3	76	95
Theme of the Century	2	8	6
Effective Internationalism	8	91	111
Victory of the Nicaraguan People	13	95	109
Upholding National Independence and Democracy . .	2	90	103
Important Sector of the Anti-Monopoly Struggle . .	16	105	127
Insult to an Idea	14	102	120
Revolutionary Vanguard	5	87	105
Imperialism and the Proletarian Revolution	1	58	63
For a Turn Toward Democracy and Social Progress .	3	84	106
In the Interests of the Working People	13	103	119
[He Was Always True to Himself	13	109	127]
[Master of Party Journalism	13	111	131]
Under the Sign of Changes	7	71	79

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Development Trends in the International Trade- Union Movement	7	61	67
On the 60th Anniversary of the Founding of the Communist International	5	19	19
Real Socialism and Its International Significance	2	17	16
Outstanding Victory	2	75	86
Countries with a Socialist Orientation	11	114	130
Ineluctable Trend in History	2	71	80
Mounting Struggle: On the Strike of the West German Steel Workers	7	82	92
Realities of the Contemporary Epoch			
Right to Life	1	111	130
'Still in the Old Positions . . .': Notes on U.S. Sovietology in the 1970's	5	107	128
Working Class Against the Arms Race	17	87	102
On the Road of Ideological-Political Maturing . .	17	79	93
Vienna: An Important Step Forward	11	98	110
Iran: Making of a Republic	9	110	129
New Horizons of Cooperation	9	100	118
Global Problems and Mankind's Future	7	92	104
Significance of the Victory over the Chinese Reactionary Aggressors	7	86	97
This Proud Name--Vietnam	3	68	84
Concern for the Future of a Society Without a Future	15	100	115
Ecology as a Sphere of International Cooperation .	16	93	114

	Issue No	KOMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Internationalism--The Banner of Socialism's Foreign Policy	1	89	103
Year 1979: Survey of International Life	18	95	128
Absurd but Dangerous Myth	12	91	103
Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee Appeal	4	67	80
Letter from the U.S. Communist Party Central Com- mittee to the Communist Party of China Central Committee	1	97	112
Artist and Time	8	106	128
On the Covered Tracks of the Past	8	112	135
Thirty Days of War	6	97	114
Strengthening of Peace and Social Democracy	5	96	115
Biggest Lie of the 20th Century, review by B. Sukhorukov of the book "Die Bedrohungsluge. Zur Legende von der 'Gefahr aus dem Osten'" [The Lie on the Threat. On the Legend of the 'Threat from the East']	17	99	116
Influential Factor of World Politics	14	119	142
Source of Increased Danger	15	113	129
On Democratic Centralism and Political Pluralism . .	10	96	108
Capital and Labor: Crisis in the System of Managing Man in Production	4	85	110
Letters to the Editor in 1979			
Drafting a Single Social Science Teaching Curriculum	8	119	146
Western Great Responsibility and Irresponsible Strategy	16	116	140

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Following the Publications in 'KOMMUNIST'	10	124	147
Journal's Mail in 1979	10	119	141

Criticism and Bibliography

Critique of the Bourgeois Versions of Socialism, review by V. Alekseyev of the books "Burzhuaznyye i Melkoburzhuaznyye Ekonomicheskiye Kontseptsii Sotsializma (Kriticheskiye Ocherki). 1848-1917 gg." [Bourgeois and Petit Bourgeois Economic Concepts of Socialism (Critical Essays), 1848-1917; "Burzhuaznyye i Melkoburzhuaznyye Ekonomicheskiye Teorii Sotsializma (Kriticheskiye Ocherki). 1917-1945 gg." [Bourgeois and Petit Bourgeois Economic Theories of Socialism (Critical Essays), 1917-1945]; "Burzhuaznyye i Melkoburzhuaznyye Ekonomicheskiye Teorii Sotsializma (Posle Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny). Kriticheskiy Ocherki" [Bourgeois and Petit Bourgeois Theories of Socialism (After WWI). Critical Essays] . . .	6	126	168
Marxism-Leninism on Proletarian Dictatorship, review by A. Amvrosov and F. Teplov of the book "K. Marks, F. Engel's i V. I. Lenin. O Diktature Proletariata" [K. Marx, F. Engels, and V. I. Lenin. On the Dictatorship of the Proletariat]	8	121	148
Methodological Problems of Social Knowledge, review by I. Apsheronov of the books "Printsi Sistemnosti v Teorii i Metodologii K. Marksa" [The Systems Principle in K. Marx' Theory and Methodology] by V. P. Kuz'min; "Metodologicheskiye Osnovy Poznaniya Sotsial'nykh Yavleniy" [Methodological Foundations of the Knowledge of Social Phenomena] by I. D. Andrevev; "Metodologiya i Logika Istoricheskogo Issledovaniya" [Methodology and Logic of Historical Research] by V. V. Kosolapov	12	117	134
Main Task on the Ideological Front, review by B. Arkhipov of the book "Borbata za Pretvoryavane v Strategiyata na Partiyata za Visoka Efektivnost i Visoko Kachestvo--Zadacha nad Zadachite na Ideologicheskiya Front" [The Struggle for the			

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Implementation of the Party's Strategy for High Effectiveness and High Quality--The Main Task on the Ideological Front]	12	122	143
Height of Moral Ideals: Documentary Novels on the Ul'yanov Family, review by Grigoriy Brovman of the books: "Otets" [Father] by N. P. Grigor'yev, documentary novel on Il'ya Nikolayevich Ul'yanov; "Povest' o Materi" [Story of the Mother] by Ye. A. Vechtomova, on Mariya Aleksandrovna Ul'yanova; "Aleksandr Ul'yanov (1866-1887)" by V. A. Sutyryn; "A. I. Ul'yanova-Yelizarova" by Ye. Ya. Drabkina; "Ol'ga Ul'yanova" by R. A. Kovnator; "Sestra Il'icha" [Il'ich's Sister] by V. Ya. Dyagilev; and "Mladshiy Brat" [Younger Brother] by R. I. Khigerovich, documentary novel on D. I. Ul'yanov	6	108	132
Pages of Aesthetic Heritage, review by A. Vishnevskiy of a book series entitled "The History of Aesthetics in Monuments and Documents": "Estetika" [Aesthetics] by Francis Hutcheson, David Hume, and Adam Smith; "Iskusstvo i Zhizn'" [Art and Life] by William Morris; "Estetika" [Aesthetics] by Voltaire; "Russkiye Esteticheskiye Traktaty Pervoy Treti XIX Veka" [Russian Aesthetic Treatises of the First Third of the 19th Century]; "Izbrannyye Esteticheskiye Proizvedeniya" [Selected Works on Aesthetics] by N. G. Chernyshevskiy; "Izbrannoye" [Selected Works] by N. A. Dobrolyubov; "Esteticheskiye Opyty" [Experiments in Aesthetics] by Shaftesbury; "Estetika i Kritika" [Aesthetics and Criticism] by Giuseppe Mazzini; "Estetika i Poetika" [Aesthetics and Poetics] by A. A. Potebnya; "Kriticheskiye Razmyshleniya o Poezii i Zhivopisi" [Critical Thoughts on Poetry and Painting] by Jean-Baptiste Dubau; "Esteticka Amerikanskogo Romantizma" [Aesthetics of American Romanticism]; "Fantazii ob Iskusstve" [Fantasies on Art] by V.-G. Vakenroder; "Osnovaniya Kritiki" [Foundations for Criticism] by Henry Home; "Ispanskaya Estetika" [Spanish Aesthetics]; "Ervin. Chetyre Dialoga o Prekrasnom i ob Iskusstve" [Ervin. Four Dialogs on Beauty and Art] by W.-F. Solger; "Etika i Estetika" [Ethics			

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
and Aesthetics] by Giacomo Leopardi; "Estetika i Sotsiologiya Iskusstva" [Aesthetics and Sociology of Art] by G. V. Plekhanov	17	119	149
Developed Socialism--An Integral Social System, review by Yu. Vostrikov of the book "Razvitoy Sotsializm" [Developed Socialism], edited by Yu. Ye. Volkov, F. N. Gel'bukh, and N. G. Kristostur'yan	18	109	146
Leninist Understanding of Politics and Humanism, review by I. Gavrilentov and A. Logachev of the book "Leninskoye Ponyatiye Politiki i Kritika 'Gumannoy Demokratii'" [The Leninist Concept of the Policy and Critique of "Humane Democracy"] by Jaromir Obzina; translated from the Czech with a conclusion by G. D. Karpov and A. P. Sertsova . . .	7	123	154
Developing Countries: Ideological Currents, review by V. Granov of the book "Bor'ba Idey v Sovremennom Mire. Razvivayushchiyesya Strany: Problemy i Ideologicheskiye Tcheniya" [The Struggle of Ideas in the Contemporary World. Developing Countries: Problems and Ideological Currents], in three volumes, volume three	5	123	153
Aesthetics in the Struggle of Ideas, review by Ye. Gromov of the book "O Prirode Iskusstva" [On the Nature of Art] by Aleksandr Lilov, critique of contemporary concepts of bourgeois aesthetics . . .	4	124	165
Topical of the Most Modern History of Developing Countries, review by Anat. Gromyko of the books: "Ocherki Natsional'no-Osvoboditel'nov Bor'by" [Essays on the National-Liberation Struggle] by R. A. Ul'yanovskiy, problems of theory and practice; "Aktual'nyye Problemy Sovremennogo Natsional'no-Osvoboditel'nogo Dvizheniya" [Topical Problems of the Contemporary National-Liberation Movement] by B. G. Gafurov, the developing countries of Asia and Africa; "Mezhdunarodnoye Razdeleniye Tzuda i Razvivayushchiyesya Stran" [International Division of Labor and Developing Countries] by V. L. Tyagunenko; "Methodological Problems of the Theory of Socioeconomic Systems"			

Issue No	KOMMU-NIST Page	Translation Page
----------	-----------------	------------------

by Ye. M. Zhukov (in the book "Obshchestvenno-Ekonomicheskiye Formatsii. Problemy Teorii" [Socioeconomic Systems. Problems of Theory]; "Anatomiya Blizhnevostochnogo Konflikta" [Anatomy of the Middle Eastern Conflict] by Ye. M. Primakov; "Melkaya Burzhuaziya: Oblik i Sud'by Klassa" [The Petit Bourgeoisie: Aspect and Fate of a Class] by A. I. Levkovskiy; "Politicheskiye Sistemy Razvivayushchikhsya Stran" [Political Problems of the Developing Countries] by L. M. Entin (the state and political parties in Asian and African countries); "Afrika: Problemy Sotsialisticheskoy Oriyentatsii" [Africa: Problems of Socialist Orientation]; "Sotsial'nyye Sdvigi v Nezavisimyykh Stranakh Afriki" [Social Changes in the Independent African Countries]; "SSSR i Strany Afriki" [The USSR and the African Countries] (friendship, cooperation, and support of the anti-imperialist struggle); "Nigeriya. Sovremennyy Etap Razvitiya" [Nigeria: Contemporary Stage of Development]; "Istoriya Natsional'no-Osvoboditel'noy Bor'by Narodov Afriki v Noveysheye Vremya" [History of the National-Liberation Struggle of the Peoples of Africa in Most Modern Times]; and "Bor'ba Idey v Sovremennom Mire" [The Struggle of Ideas in the Contemporary World], in 3 vols, vol 3

4	117	151
---	-----	-----

Guide in the History of the Dissemination of Marxism, review by M. Zaborov of the handbook "Brizhiznennyye Izdaniya i Publikatsii Proizvedeny K. Marksa i F. Engel'sa" [Editions and Publications Issued During the Lifetime of K. Marx and F. Engels], prepared by a group of associates of the sector on the works of K. Marx and F. Engels and the Marx and Lenin Library of the CC CPSU, N. U. Belousova, K. I. Konnova, and Ye. G. Svetlanova, in 2 pts

7	106	121
---	-----	-----

Theory of Ideology and Ideological Activity, review by V. Kelle of the book "Sotsialisticheskaya Ideologiya" [Socialist Ideology] by N. B. Bikkenin

5	117	141
---	-----	-----

Historical-Theoretical Study of Soviet-Related Legislation, review by M. Kirichenko and

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
N. Kuprits of the book by A. I. Luk'yanov, "Razvitiye Zakonodatel'stva o Sovetskikh Predstavitel'nykh Organakh Vlasti" [Development of Legislation on Soviet Representative Power Organs] (certain problems of history, theory and practice)	12	114	129
Pages from the Struggle: Recollections of an Italian Communist, review by K. Kobylanskiy and V. Grigor'yev of the book "Figlio della Classe Operaia" [Son of the Working Class] by A. Roasio	5	120	147
New Marxist Yearbook, review by N. Kolpinakiy of the yearbook "Marx-Engels-Jahrbuch" [Marx-Engels Yearbook], eds Rolf Dlubek, Erich Kundel (editor in chief) and Boris Tartakovskiy (editor in chief) et al	7	112	131
Motion Picture and Theater, review by V. Komissarzhevskiy of the book "V Kino i Teatre" [At the Motion Pictures and the Theater] by Ye. Surkov	17	118	146
Party and Army in Three Revolutions, review by Yu. Korablev of the book "Bol'sheviki i Armiya v Treh Revolyutsiyakh" [The Bolsheviks and the Army in Three Revolutions] by P. A. Golub	2	119	
Socialist Realism--Creative Method of Soviet Cine- matography, review by L. Kulidzhanov of the book "Sotsialisticheskiy Realizm i Sovremennyy Kino- Protsess" [Socialist Realism and the Contemporary Movie Process], eds V. Baskakov, V. Murian (editor in chief) et al	12	123	146
New Progress in the Study of Historiography, review by L. Kutakov of the works "Istoriografiya Novogo Vremeni Stran Yevropy i Ameriki" [Modern Historiography of European and American Countries]; "Istoriografiya Novoy i Noveyshev Istorii Stran Yevropy i Ameriki" [Historiography of Modern and Most Modern History of European and American Coun- tries]; and "Istoriografiya Novoy i Noveyshev Istorii Stran Yevropy i Ameriki," eds A. V. Ade and I. S. Galkin (editor in chief), I. P. Dement'yev, and A. D. Kolpapev	5	125	156

On the Eve of the New Era: The International Workers' Movement Between 1905 and 1917, review by B. Likhachev of the book "Mezhdunarodnoye Rabocheye Dvizheniye. Voprosy Istorii i Teorii" [The International Workers' Movement. Problems of History and Theory], in 7 vols, vol 3, "Nachalo Revolyutsionnykh Bitv XX Veka" [Beginning of 20th Century Revolutionary Battles], editor in chief S. S. Khromov; heads of authors' collective S. S. Khromov and R. Ya. Yevzerov	1	120	
Socialist Foreign Policy--History and Theory, review by B. Likhachev and V. Sobakin of nine books on Soviet foreign policy	7	117	142
Jamaica: Years of Struggle, review by Yu. Loginov and V. Ulasevich of the book "Struggles of the Jamaican People" by T. Munroe and D. Robotham	2	122	
Comprehensive Study of Ethnic Processes in the USSR, review by V. Maamyagi of the book "Sovremennyye Etnicheskiye Protsessy v SSSR" [Contemporary Ethnic Processes in the USSR] by a collection of authors; editor in chief, Yu. V. Bromley	4	109	136
Books on the USSR Constitution Published by Local Publishing Houses, review by F. Makarov of the books: "Narodnyye Deputaty" [People's Deputies] by B. K. Alekseyev and M. N. Perfil'ev; "Slovo o Velikom Zakone" [Tale About a Great Law] by L. Voskresenskaya; "Dlya Schast'ya Tvoyego" [For Your Happiness]; "Pravo i Obyazannost" [Right Plus Obligation] by V. V. Dyukov; "Za Vse v Dvete" [Answerable for Everything]; "Zakon Vsey Nashoy Zhizni" [Law of Our Whole Life]; "Zakon po Kotoromu my Zhivem" [Law According to Which We Live]; "Zakon po Kotoromu Schastiye Prikhodit" [Law Which Brings Happiness]; "Konstitutsiya Deystvuyet, Zhivet, Rabotayet" [The Constitution Acts, Lives, and Works]; "Rozhdeniya Zhizniyu" [Born of Life] by M. D. Kravtsova; "Sem'ya, Obshchestvo i Zakon" [The Family, Society and the Law] by V. S. Zakarova; "Sobetskaniye Lichnogo i			

	ISSUE No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Obshchestvennogo v Trudovom Prave" [Combining Personal with Social Factors in Labor Legislation] by E. R. Marirosyan; "KPSS v Sovetskoy Politicheskoy Sisteme" [The CPSU in the Soviet Political System] by F. F. Petrenko; "Gorzhus', Moye Otechestvo!" [My Country, I Am Proud!] by B. S. Ryabinin; "Sovety i Zhizn'" [The Soviets and Life] by T. S. Sushkov; "Chem Gord Chelovek" [What Makes a Man Proud] by V. N. Syromyatnikov; "Konstitutsionnyye Osnovy Politicheskoy Sistemy Sovetskogo Obshchestva" [Constitutional Foundations of the Political System of Soviet Society] by B. Topornin; "Sila Trudovogo Kollektiva" [The Strength of the Labor Collective] by L. V. Ulitina; "Partiya Rodnaya" [My Party] by B. N. Tsvetkov; "Shkol'nikam o Novoy Konstitutsii SSSR" [Students on the New USSR Constitution . . .	15	125	143
G. V. Plekhanov's Life, review by I. Mindlin of the book "Plekhanov" by M. Iovchuk and I. Kurbatova	10	110	123
Revolutionary Path of the Cuban People, review by M. Mokhnachev of the books "Oktyabr'skaya Revolyutsiya i Kubinskaya Revolyutsiya" [The October and the Cuban Revolution] by Fidel Castro, speeches and addresses 1960-1977; "Geroicheskaya Epopeya. Ot Monkada do Playya-Khiron" [Heroic Epic. From Moncada to the Bay of Pigs], collection compiled by O. T. Darusenkov	4	113	144
World-Changing Doctrine, review by V. Panov of the book "Marksizm-Leninizm i Sovremennaya Epoka" [Marxism-Leninism and the Contemporary Age] by M. A. Suslov; collection of speeches	16	120	146
Socialism and Peace Are Indivisible, review by Ye. Petrov of the book by A. A. Gromyko, "Vo Imya Torzhestva Leninskoy Vneshney Politiki" [For the Sake of the "triumph of the Leninist Foreign Policy]	12	103	116

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
For Those Turning to the Great Heritage, review by R. Petropavlovskiy of the index "Predmetnyy Ukazatel' ko Vtoromu Izdaniyu Sochineniy K. Marksa i F. Enge 'sa (1-39 toma)" [Index to the Second Edition of the Works of K. Marx and F. Engels (Volumes 1-39)], first and second part, eds M. P. Mchedlov et al	14	126	150
In the Journalistic Shops, review by N. Plakhotnyy of the books "V Otvete za Kazhdoe Slovo" [Answerable for Every Word] by V. P. Zhidkov; "Gazeta Vykhodity Vecherom" [The Newspaper Comes Out in the Evening] by S. D. Indurskiy; and "Soyuz Pera, Mikroфона i Telekamery" [The Alliance Between the Pen, the Microphone, and the Television Camera] by V. S. Khelemendik	18	114	157
Historical Experience in the 1940 Socialist Revolutions, review by B. Popov of the book "Sotsialisticheskiye Revolyutsii 1940 g. v Litve, Latvii i Estonii. Vosstanovleniye Sovetskoy Vlasti" [The Socialist Revolutions of 1940 in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The Restoration of the Soviet System], eds I. I. Mints (editor in chief) et al	3	120	149
Collective Study of Revolutionary Experience, review by P. Pospelov and D. Kukin of the works "Iz Istorii Velokogo Oktyabrya i Posleduyushchikh Sotsialisticheskikh Revolyutsiy" [From the History of the Great October and Subsequent Socialist Revolutions], eds V. Khadzhinikolov (Bulgaria), D. Milei (Hungary), E. Laboor (GDR), B. Shirendyb (Mongolia), A. Czubinsky (Poland), V. Zaharescu (Romania), I. I. Mints (USSR), A. Ya. Manusevich (USSR), J. Krzizek (Czechoslovakia), and P. Moraca (Yugoslavia); and "Velikiy Oktyabr' i Revolyutsii 40-kh Godov v Stranakh Tsentral'noy i Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevropy" [The Great October and the Revolutions of the 1940's in Central and Southeast Europe], a comparative study of socioeconomic changes in the revolutionary process	7	114	136
Great School for Theatrical Art, review by N. Sibiryakov of the books "V Sporakh o			

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
Stanislavskom" [Discussions on Stanislavskiy] by V. N. Prokof'yev, second revised and expanded edition; "Zhizn' i Tvorchestvo K. S. Stanislavskogo" [K. S. Stanislavskiy's Life and Works] by I. Vinogradskaya, chronicle in 4 vols (1863-1938)	2	124	150
Reorganization of International Economic Relations and Ideological Struggle, review by G. Skorov of 11 books	11	125	141
Guarding the Right Cause, review by S. Sokolov of the book by D. F. Ustinov, "Izbrannyye Rechi i Stat'i" [Selected Speeches and Articles]	13	115	136
Outstanding Scientist and Science Organizer, review by B. Stepanov and F. Fedorov of the book "Sergey Ivanovich Vavilov" by L. V. Levshin	4	112	141
Correct Course, review by B. Tulunin of the book "Izbrannyye Rechi i Stat'i" [Selected Speeches and Articles] by D. A. Kunayev	3	112	140
Communist International and the Orient in the Works of Soviet Historians, review by F. Firsov of 11 books	6	122	160
Peaceful Socialist Atom, review by G. Flerov of the book "Mirnyy Atom v Strankh Sotsializma. Sotrudnichestvo Stran-Chlenov SEV" [The Peaceful Atom in Socialist Countries. Cooperation Among CEMA-Member Countries]	12	125	150
On the Eve of the Conversion to Peaceful Construc- tion, review by V. Fomichev of the ninth volume of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin's biographic chronicle, "Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biograficheskaya Khronika, 1870-1924" [Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biographical Chronicle, 1870-1924], vol 9, June 1920-January 1921	6	102	121
Important Factor in the Growth of the Leading Role of the CPSU, review by O. Forsikov of the book by N. A. Petrovichev, "Vazhnyy Faktor Vozrastaniya Rukovodyashchey Roli KPSS" [Important Factor in the Growth of the Leading Role of the CPSU]	13	126	150

	Issue No	KOMMU- NIST Page	Trans- lation Page
In the Struggle for a Socialist Art, review by G. Fridlender of the books by Clara Zetkin, "Kunst und Proletariat. Herausgegeben von H. Koch" [Culture and Proletariat. Compiled by H. Koch]; "O Literature i Iskusstve" [On Literature and Art]	17	115	140
Born in the Struggle, review by V. Khlynov of the book "Ocherki Istorii Kommunisticheskogo Dvizheniya v Yaponii do Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny" [Studies of the History of the Communist Movement in Japan Before World War II] by I. I. Kovalenko .	18	112	152
Part of the All-Party Cause, review by I. Chernoutsan of the book by A. G. Dement'yev "V. I. Lenin i Sovetskaya Literatura" [V. I. Lenin and Soviet Literature]	6	115	147
Live, Create and Struggle like Lenin, review by A. Chernyak of the book "Izbrannyye Rechi i Stat'i" [Selected Speeches and Articles] by A. Ya. Pel'she	2	111	130
In the Crucible of the Class Struggle, review by A. Chuzhakin of the book by A. Cunhal, "Stranitsky Bor'by" [Pages from the Struggle], from the history of the Portuguese Communist Party and the anti-fascist struggle in Portugal	3	124	158
World-Transforming Theory, review by L. Sheydn of the book "Teoriya Sotsialisticheskoy Revolyutsii: Leninskoye Naslediye i Sovremennost'" [Theory of the Socialist Revolution: Leninist Heritage and Contemporaneity] by Yu. A. Krasin	6	118	153
Short Book Reviews			10, 16, 17, 18
Bookshelf		3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 16,	17

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

5003
CSO: 1802

- END -

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

MARCH 5, 1980

Jones

