

JPRS 75677

12 May 1980

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 4, March 1980

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.

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 4, March 1980

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

CONTENTS

L. I. Brezhnev Meeting with the Electorate	1
Historical Correctness of Lenin's Ideas and Cause (M. Suslov)	10
Big Results and Broad Prospects (V. Golikov)	32
Interfarm Cooperation: Experience, Problems, Quest (V. Gvozdev)	43
Kuban's Rice Virgin Land (S. Medunov)	55
Einstein and Contemporary Natural Science Thinking (V. Barashenkov)	68
Portrait of an Artist (Yu. Melent'yev)	83
In the Struggle for National and Social Liberation (Le Duan)	97
Coeval with the Century (T. Timofeyev)	114
Subversion as a Tool of Imperialism (S. Tsvigun)	128
In the Interest of the People (B. Tulunin)	144
Student Enrollment at Republic and Inter-Oblast Higher Party Schools .	153

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No 4
Mar 1980

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : Mar 1980

Signed to press : 4 Mar 1980

Copies : 914,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda," "Kommunist."
1980

L. I. BREZHNEV MEETING WITH THE ELECTORATE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 80 pp 3-10

[Electoral speech by L. I. Brezhnev delivered on 22 February 1980]

[Text] Dear comrades!

Dear Muscovites!

I am sincerely pleased to meet with you--residents of the capital, the voters of Baumanskiy District and, I would add, my old acquaintances (applause). It is pleasing to know that you have come to the elections with great achievements. Many thousands of working people of your and other rayons in the capital have already fulfilled their five-year plans. Hundreds of thousands of Muscovites have pledged to complete them for the 110th anniversary of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin's birth. I wish you success, friends, with all my heart! (Lengthy applause.)

Our country, all Soviet republics, are welcoming Lenin's anniversary with a new scope in the socialist competition and a nationwide creative upsurge. And, as always, Moscow is ahead as the initiator of many undertakings, the hero-city, worker-city, creator-city (applause).

The present elections are being held on the watershed separating two decades. The 1970's are now in the past. A new decade has come. Probably each one of us asks himself: What kind of decade will the 1980's be? What will it bring? How will the destinies of the people, of nations and states develop? Naturally, there are always surprises in the future, turns of events which would be difficult to predict. Nevertheless, we, communists, believe, and not only believe, but are convinced, we know, that the 1980's will be years of new successes in the building of communism (lengthy applause). They will be years of the strengthening and development of world socialism and of new progress in the struggle for insuring a lasting peace (applause).

This confidence is based on the study of the results of our own and of global developments, and a consideration of leading trends in economics, social relations and politics.

From this viewpoint, what characterized the 1970's?

The entire decade was marked by the stable growth of the economic and scientific and technical potential of our homeland and of industrial and agricultural possibilities. This made it possible to substantially upgrade the living standard of the people, which was and remains the main objective of all our economic activities. In the 1970's real per capita income rose by one-half. Over 180 million people improved their housing conditions. This, comrades, accounts for over 40 percent of the country's population (applause).

The defense power of the Soviet Union is also being maintained on the necessary level. Now, on the eve of Soviet Army and Navy Day, the Central Committee can assure the Soviet people that we have everything necessary to rebuff any military provocation (lengthy applause). The peaceful future of the Soviet state is insured, reliably so (lengthy applause).

We are approaching the 35th anniversary of the victory of the Soviet people over fascism. I have the pleasure of telling you that the CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers passed the decree "On Improving Further the Material Situation of Veterans of the USSR Armed Forces and of Their Families" (applause). This is yet another confirmation of the constant concern displayed by the party and the state for the veterans of the Great Patriotic War (applause).

In the 1970's we initiated a turn of our entire economy toward intensive development, upgrading effectiveness and quality, and emphasizing end results of economic activities. In the 1980's we must continue and complete this most important project, which is the pivot of the party's economic strategy.

The results of the development of the national economy were sharply and critically discussed at the November CC CPSU Plenum. The plan is still not being fulfilled by all sectors and enterprises. There remain difficulties involving some comestible and industrial commodities, housing and organization of consumer services.

In order to eliminate such shortcomings and improve the state of affairs, the plenum has deemed it necessary to implement even more adamantly and energetically the party's economic policy. This is achieved by enhancing the level of management in all units, improving the economic mechanism, increasing responsibility and strengthening the discipline at all work places and sectors.

In this case a great deal depends on the work of the central departments. That is why the plenum has faced them with stricter requirements. Local initiative, however, is no less significant, for there simply is no single prescription applicable to the various economic areas and all parts of this huge country. One thing is clear: No success can be achieved wherever the

people are standing by waiting for instructions from above. Conversely, should the people boldly take up projects, give scope to initiative and follow effective undertakings, success is guaranteed.

Comrades, our country is huge and beautiful. Our accomplishments are gigantic. Now, on the threshold of the 1980's, when preparations are underway for the 26th party congress, we have all the necessary reasons to look into the future calmly and confidently (applause). As in the past, our course is one of peaceful creation, further reorganization of the huge areas of this country and multiplication of the material and spiritual resources of the Soviet people. No one shall turn us from this course! (Lengthy applause).

Naturally, the party approaches economic tasks on the basis of broad social positions, considering the economy as inseparably linked with the entire system of social relations. What was the main trend of development of such relations in the 1970's? I think that the main thing was the further strengthening of the unity and feeling of solidarity within Soviet society (applause).

I mean by this ideological and political solidarity. It is expressed in the closest possible unity between party and people, the inviolability of the bloc of communists and nonparty people, and the approval by the whole people of the electoral platform of our party—a platform embodied in the decisions of party congresses and CC CPSU plenums.

I also mean social solidarity. It is expressed in the unbreakable alliance among the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia, the common basic interests of all social groups and strata and the gradual elimination of major disparities between town and country and between mental and physical labor.

Finally, I have in the mind the feeling of solidarity among nations and nationalities of our country. It is expressed in the closely interwoven, the merging of Soviet patriotism and internationalism, the creation of a single all-union national economic complex and the beneficial interpenetration of national cultures.

Let me particularly single out the tremendous role which the Russian Federation has played, and is playing, in such processes. Its contribution to the creation of equal relations among all nations in our homeland and in achieving the voluntary union of Soviet republics is truly invaluable (applause).

Solidarity and unity within society is a unique accomplishment of socialism. It is our priceless, invincible strength. Naturally, like us, the imperialists have missiles. Like us, they have substantial natural resources. They too have talented scientists, engineers and men of culture. However, they neither have nor could have a united society. Let our

enemies remember the lessons of history. Let them know that the unity of the Soviet people is manifested with particular emphasis precisely when attempts are made to speak to us in the language of threats (lengthy applause).

The unity of the Soviet people is the reliable base for the power of our socialist state. In the 1970's Soviet statehood and economic, social and political foundations became even stronger. Socialist democracy is intensifying. A new constitution was adopted--the constitution of developed, mature socialism. The renovation of legislation in full swing.

Over the past decade the activeness of the soviets rose noticeably. The tremendous opportunities at their disposal became even clearer. They include initiative in resolving many economic and cultural problems, and problems of population services and production of consumer goods; tireless and exacting control over the work of administrative organs and of all enterprises and organizations; and steady expansion and intensification of relations between the soviets and the people's masses and the implementation of the instructions of the voters. I believe that this is precisely the channel which will be followed by the work of the new membership of the supreme soviets of the Russian Federation and of all union and autonomous republics (applause).

As you know, in the course of such elections the entire system of local soviets of people's deputies is shaped as well. The party believes that their role must rise steadily. It is a question, above all, of kray and oblast soviets. They must become the main force in the comprehensive economic and social development of their territories. Their material possibilities must be linked even more closely with the results of enterprise work. Soviet control over the implementation of plans and the strict observance of Soviet laws must be tightened considerably more. As chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet "residium, I can report that the basic rights of kray, oblast and okrug soviets of people's deputies will be strengthened legally. A draft of such a law will be submitted for consideration by the next session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The soviets of people's deputies today form a tremendous aktiv, millions of deputies and apparatus personnel. The working people judge the soviet system on the basis of their principle-mindedness and exactingness, their concern for the people. The strength of the soviets does not lie in their mass nature alone. It is determined above all by the work of each, I emphasize, each deputy and official.

"Duty" and "obligation" stem from a single root. One must always remember one's duty to the people--whether party, official or human. There could be no true party or soviet worker who does not strictly implement this duty and who is unable to link words strongly with actions. Great industriousness and discipline, exactingness towards oneself and unbribable honesty are the foundations of his good reputation. This reputation must be proved by all life and throughout life.

The prestige of a worker, whatever his position, does not come from the outside. It is earned through personal effort, daily toil and real accomplishments. This is the only way to earn the respect of the people (applause). There neither is nor could there be anything higher than this to a soviet deputy or state official (applause).

Comrades! Allow me now to discuss a few problems of foreign policy and the contemporary international situation.

Let us emphasize, above all, that the past decade was marked by the further development and enrichment of cooperation among the members of the socialist comity. This cooperation is a powerful booster for the development of each of the fraternal countries. It is also our joint guarantee for successful progress in these complex and troubled times.

The force of the unity of fraternal countries and of socialist internationalism was manifested particularly convincingly in the powerful support given to the people of Vietnam in their struggle against American and, subsequently, Chinese aggressors. Such will continue to be the case should anyone, once again, contemplate making an attempt against the peace and security of this heroic country (lengthy applause). Our solidarity and support are also on the side of the peoples of Laos and Kampuchea, who earned their right to a new life after a lengthy struggle (applause).

The policy of peace, pursued by the members of the socialist comity, and their joint struggle for detente and for abating the threat of a global nuclear missile war, have become one of the basic factors of international life. Today this struggle is the main guarantee for the peaceful future of mankind.

Virtually all most-important decisions in the field of strengthening peace and restraining the arms race, passed over the past decade at international forums, and the most important talks on such matters have been the result of the initiative of the socialist countries. Their specific proposals on matters of disarmament and international cooperation represent a broad, farsighted and realistic program for safeguarding the peace in our age. We shall continue to struggle adamantly and tirelessly for its implementation (applause).

Today, when the forces of imperialism have mounted a counteroffensive against detente, peace and the rights of nations, unity of action on the part of socialism to defend these greatest values is important more than ever. I am confident that our countries will properly implement this historical task! (Lengthy applause.)

The strength of our foreign policy lies in the fact that it is consistent with the vital interests of both the socialist countries and, in general, the tremendous majority of the population on earth. This applies, above all, to peoples who have freed themselves from colonial oppression and are

engaged in the difficult project of building a new, an independent life. No less than the socialist countries they need a lasting peace and a strict respect for the sovereignty of countries and the rights of nations, as well as truly equal international relations.

It is precisely on this basis that our good relations and mutually profitable cooperation are developing with many tens of countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, be it the great India or small Benin, republican Algeria or monarchic Jordan, neighboring Turkey or distant Brazil.

We value relations with all these countries. We respect their rights. We do not hanker after their wealth or seek military bases on their territories. We value the closeness of the positions we hold on many international problems, but do not try to dictate to them what policy to pursue.

The USSR has made a noteworthy contribution to strengthening the economy, cultural construction and defense of some countries. We are proud of this. Loyal to Lenin's behest, we are always on the side of peoples defending their freedom and independence. However, we shall never use our help to exert pressure on its recipients.

It is precisely all this that creates an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust in our relations, leading to reciprocal benefits and the good of universal peace (applause).

I particularly wish to note the successful development of good relations with India. They are properly consistent with the interests of the peoples of both countries and to the cause of peace in Asia and the world over. The recently concluded agreement on joint space flights, in the near future, of a Soviet and an Indian cosmonaut has become something of a symbol of our friendship (lengthy applause).

Mrs Indira Gandhi's government accepted this suggestion, which pleases us.

However, the militant imperialist circles--U.S. imperialism above all--do not like the consolidation of the peace and successes of the liberation struggle of the peoples. Look at their answer to the development of mutually profitable contacts between socialist and many capitalist countries, the success of the European Conference in Helsinki and the victory of the revolutionary peoples of Angola and Ethiopia over the interventionists and imperialist mercenaries. Their answer was characteristic. They began to drag out the SALT II talks and, subsequently, the ratification of this treaty. They encouraged Sadat's treason, which split the front of Arab unity against the aggressor. They imposed upon the NATO countries a long-term program for intensive rearmament. They hindered and, in a number of cases, wrecked the talks underway on disarmament problems. Finally, they took the provocative decision to deploy in Western Europe new American missiles aimed at the USSR and its allies.

It became obvious that the current U.S. leadership is pursuing a line of undermining detente and aggravating the international circumstances. It is trying to dictate its will to the socialist states and other countries.

Was this unexpected? Naturally, it was not. It was clear from the very beginning that peace and detente could be reliably secured only in the course of adamant political struggle. Detente is consistent with the interests of the peoples. The need for detente is understood by responsible and realistically thinking politicians. However, it is opposed by major forces in the capitalist countries which are engaged in preparations for war, directly or indirectly: the military, the monopolies related to it and its stooges in the state apparatus and the mass information media.

The more the possibilities of imperialism to dominate other countries and peoples become curtailed, the more fiercely its most aggressive and near-sighted representatives react to this. Such aggressiveness can be restrained only through the strength and sensible policy of the peace-loving states and the resolve of the peoples to defeat the dangerous plans of the pretenders to world domination.

After the United States imposed its "missile" plans on the Western European countries, it turned its eyes on Asia and the Middle East. It directed major forces of its navy to the shores of revolutionary Iran, allegedly to rescue a group of captured diplomats. Subsequently, they latched onto a pretext they found convenient--the events in Afghanistan. The malicious anti-Soviet stir raised in this connection in America beats all previous records.

Naturally, this is merely a pretext. Mr Carter and his retinue know perfectly well that there neither has been nor is there any Russian "intervention" in Afghanistan. The USSR acted on the basis of the Soviet-Afghan Friendship Treaty. Three consecutive Afghan governments turned to us with an adamant request for help to defend the country against the foreign invasion of counterrevolutionary forces.

Washington is well familiar with everything related to the intervention launched against Afghanistan from Pakistani territory. Together with the Chinese and others, the Americans themselves are directing this intervention, which has created a serious threat to the Afghan revolution and to the security of our southern border.

The White House also knows that the USSR will withdraw its military contingents from Afghanistan the moment the reasons which caused their presence in that country have been eliminated and the Afghan Government will deem that this presence is no longer necessary. The United States is thunderously demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops. Yet, in fact, it is doing everything possible to postpone this possibility: it is continuing and increasing its interference in the affairs of Afghanistan.

Let me state most clearly that we shall be ready to withdraw our forces the moment all forms of foreign intervention aimed against the Government and people of Afghanistan have been totally stopped (applause). Let the United States, together with Afghanistan's neighbors, guarantee this and the need for Soviet military assistance will be removed. The Government of Afghanistan, in turn, as we know, has clearly stated its intention to maintain relations of peace and friendship with its neighbors, Iran and Pakistan in particular. Naturally, we welcome this Afghan position.

The U.S. leaders also know that the Government of Afghanistan shows complete respect for the religious beliefs of the population. It released the clergymen Amin had sent to jail and officially took Islam under the protection of the law. The attempts of the supporters of the Israeli aggressor and the organizers of reprisals against Iran, to depict themselves as "defenders of Islam" are quite clumsy.

Therefore, why is Washington throwing hysterical fits around the world? What are the purposes for the dissemination of lies on the "war waged by the Russians against the Afghan people," the "Soviet threat to Pakistan and Iran" and other such?

The answer is clear: Washington simply needs a pretext for broadening its expansion in Asia and it is creating it by all possible means.

Anti-Soviet hysteria was necessitated not only by the fact that on the crest of this wave, someone might win the presidential elections this autumn. The main thing is that the United States has shown its intention to create a network of military bases in the Indian Ocean, in Middle and Near Eastern countries, and in Africa. The United States would like put these countries under its own hegemony and pump out their natural resources unhindered. At the same time, it would use their territories for their strategic plans against the socialist world and the national-liberation forces. This is the essence of the matter.

However, the modern colonizers may be proven wrong. This is no longer the prewar time or not even the 1950's. Tens of previously dependent countries have gained experience in autonomous life and politics. The peoples have begun to understand better the imperialist game and know who their friends are and who their enemies are. Even in parts of the world such as, for example, Western Europe or Japan, through personal experience the people have been exposed to the advantages of tranquil and peaceful life and profitable trade. They will not so easily abandon detente to please the American plan for world domination. In turn, as before, we favor the development of peaceful cooperation with these countries along all lines, as we do, in fact, with the United States as well.

Washington loves to talk about the need to secure its oil supply lanes to the United States. To a certain extent, this could be understood. However, could this be achieved by turning such routes into a powder keg? Obviously, the opposite result would be achieved.

The adventuristic "doctrines" of the new preachers of the "policy from the position of strength" are dangerous not only to any specific country or groups or country. They threaten the peace and security of all countries and nations. Anyone who needs and values the peace must rebuff such sinister plans (lengthy applause).

No one can intimidate the Soviet Union. Our forces and possibilities are tremendous. Together with our allies we shall always be able to defend ourselves and rebuff any hostile sally (lengthy applause). No one will be able to provoke us. The "doctrine" of military hysteria and the feverish arms race are countered by us with a doctrine of systematic struggle for peace and security on earth (applause). We are loyal to the peace program formulated at the 24th and 25th party congresses. That is why now, in the 1980's, as in the 1970's, we favor the strengthening rather than the destruction of detente. We are in favor of reducing rather than inflating armaments. We are in favor of rapprochement and reciprocal understanding among nations rather than for artificial alienation and hostility.

We are holding confidently and high the banner of our Leninist foreign policy--the banner of the peace, freedom and independence of the peoples, the banner of social progress (lengthy applause).

In conclusion, dear friends, allow me to express my warm gratitude to the labor collectives and all working people who nominated and supported my candidacy for deputy of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. Thank you for the good words which were heard today from this rostrum (lengthy applause). I consider the trust of party and nonparty people an approval of the domestic and foreign policy of our great Leninist party and a high rating of the collective activities of the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo (lengthy applause).

Allow me to assure you, comrades, that as in the past I shall try to justify your great trust. The communists live and struggle for the sake of insuring the peaceful life of the people, their creative toil, their prosperity and their spiritual growth (lengthy applause). That is what we, the Soviet people, will be voting for (tempestuous and lengthy applause). All rise. Those present in the hall chant, "Glory to the Leninist communist party!"

5003

CSO: 1802

HISTORICAL CORRECTNESS OF LENIN'S IDEAS AND CAUSE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 80 pp 11-29

[Article by M. Suslov, CC CPSU Politburo member and CC CPSU secretary]

[Text] The Soviet people and all progressive mankind are preparing for the solemn celebration of the 110th anniversary of the birth of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin, the creator of the communist party and of the first socialist state in the world, and the acknowledged leader of the international working class.

All of V. I. Lenin's activities and struggle are inseparable from the living history of mankind. One cannot understand the meaning and social direction of our age without turning to his many-faceted work and doctrine. At the same time, the greatness of Lenin's ideas and cause can be truly known only in connection with the real course of modern history.

I

V. I. Lenin is justifiably described as the brilliant architect of the new, the communist society, and its first organizer and builder. The practice of the revolutionary struggle of the working class for socialism and communism, under whose sign our tempestuous 20th century is living, promoted Lenin to this role.

In his work, "The Historical Fate of Karl Marx' doctrine," Lenin emphasized that "the main aspect of Marx' doctrine is the explanation of the universal-historical role of the proletariat as the builder of a socialist society" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 23, p 1). It was Lenin, and the Bolshevik party he created, who assumed the great mission of laying the beginning of the practical implementation of this main feature of Marxism, of converting socialism from theory, from a science, into the daily life of millions of people.

Yet, does Lenin's role in the Russian and international workers' movements consist merely in his ability to practically implement what was theoretically predicted by Marx? To reduce matters to this would mean not only to

misrepresent Lenin's place in history, but to distort the scientific understanding of sociohistorical practice and the nature of its complex, dialectical interaction with theory.

As we know, the source of the power of the biggest proletarian ideologues and politicians lies in the fact that the profound hopes and expectations of the popular masses and the objective requirements of social development find their scientific expressions in their views. At the same time, the factual influence of progressive ideas on the course of history and their role as a power which could crush the obsolete and build a new social order directly depend on the extent to which these ideas have been accepted by the masses. ". . . Material force," Marx emphasized, "must be upset by material force as well. However, theory becomes a material force the moment it conquers the masses" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 1, p 422).

The power of Lenin's genius was manifested precisely in the fact that he realized accurately and fully the needs of his time, clearly expressed them and ideologically armed the proletariat and the broadest possible popular masses for the struggle for the implementation of socialist ideals in the new historical age, an age in which society as a whole had become ripe for conversion from capitalism to communism and when new problems which required a scientific interpretation and solution objectively arose in the world liberation movement. It was precisely Lenin's doctrine that answered them.

The penetration and establishment of Leninism in the class awareness of the proletariat, in the social awareness of our time, is inseparable from the systematic struggle waged by Lenin to defend the doctrine of Marx and Engels. This is directly related to the principled attitude of the communists toward scientific theory and its role in revolutionary struggle and construction. "There can be no revolutionary movement without revolutionary theory" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 6, p 24). This precise formula expresses Lenin's position, which he invariably held throughout the turns of the class struggle. It is a key to understanding the great victories of Leninism and its inherent organic unity between revolutionary word and revolutionary action. Conversely, the indifferent, scornful or careless attitude toward theory, characteristic of the opportunists, has always ended in lack of success in politics and failures in practical activities. This is the lesson of the experience of all revolutionary movements.

As a consistent Marxist, V. I. Lenin never restricted himself merely to the profound study of the works of Marx and Engels or the dissemination of their ideas. He was tirelessly concerned with the scientific summation of the experience of social development and the use of the Marxist theory and method in the study of the practice of the revolutionary struggle. Yet this necessarily requires not only the dissemination, but the steady creative development of revolutionary theory in accordance with the continually changing objective circumstances.

To Lenin, the loyal perpetuator of Marx' doctrine, it was always unquestionably true that one cannot successfully and convincingly defend this doctrine without developing it further. However, he considered equally unquestionable the fact that one cannot develop Marxism without defending its basic concepts against all distortions, for these concepts accurately and precisely reflect the profound laws of reality and the basic interests and ideals of the most revolutionary class of our time--the proletariat. Such is one of the most important principles of a truly Marxist attitude toward revolutionary theory.

Curious interest in the study and mastering of the entire worldwide political experience of the liberation struggle, the most active participation in the international organizations of the working class and, in Lenin's words, the display of excellent information concerning global forms and theories of the revolutionary movement (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 41, p 8) were manifested with lively emphasis in Lenin's works and Bolshevik activities.

We know that in the first 15 years of its existence (1903-1917), Bolshevism covered a distance which, in terms of the wealth of revolutionary experience--the experience of the three Russian revolutions--was unparalleled. In this case Lenin considered the revolutionary movement in Russia as an inseparable link in the single universal-historical process of the social renovation of the world. That is precisely why he studied scrupulously, to the most minute detail, the experience of the workers' movement in Germany, France, England, Italy and America, the 1848 revolution and the Paris Commune and Marx' attitude toward it. Despite all the differences of conditions existing between Russia and other countries, Lenin was able to find in their experience features common to the entire revolutionary movement and, on their basis, to elaborate the Bolshevik political line. ". . . We must not reject in the least the examples of Marx' tactics. This would mean to preach Marxism in words, while breaking from it in fact," Vladimir Il'ich pointed out. "We must draw from their specific study invaluable lessons for the future" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 30, p 39).

As the extension of Marxism and an answer to the objective requirements of its further development under the conditions of the change in epochs in world history and the turn to a new, a communist system, Leninism is a profound scientific summation of the overall revolutionary experience of the proletariat of all countries and, at the same time, the ability to successfully and creatively apply this international experience, together with the general laws and principles stemming from it, to the national and concrete-historical specifics of each country.

The shaping, development and establishment of Lenin's views appear like an all-embracing process of creative enrichment and multiplication of Marx' and Engels' theoretical legacy applicable to new historical conditions.

Indeed, it was precisely Lenin, on the basis of Marx' theory of the laws governing the development of the bourgeois society, who provided a most

profound study of the qualitatively new phenomena which developed in the capitalist socioeconomic system by creating an integral scientific theory of imperialism as the highest and final stage of capitalism and as the eve of the socialist revolution. This theory became a reliable methodological weapon for the communists of all countries fighting imperialism and for democracy and socialism. It makes it possible to provide scientific answers to questions facing the various detachments of the international proletariat, in the developed capitalist countries above all.

Having discovered the law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism, and on its basis, Lenin formulated and elaborated the concept that socialism can win initially in a single country or in a few countries, while the other countries will remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois for a while (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 26, pp 354-355; Vol 30, p 133). Today as well we, the witnesses of the practical confirmation of the accuracy of this Leninist idea as well, a guideline in developing a contemporary view on the fate of the revolution and the world, must not forget that it was confirmed in the course of an acute struggle with the obsolete and stagnant views which predominated among the leaders of the Second International.

On the basis of the Marxian concept of the class struggle and dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin comprehensively developed the theory of the socialist revolution and elaborated the scientific strategy of the broad class alliances between the proletariat and the peasantry and the other toiling strata in the struggle for democracy, national independence and socialism as the most important prerequisite for the victory of the revolution and the defense and consolidation of its gains. Lenin's ideas found their brilliant confirmation in the practice of the victorious proletarian, people's-democratic and national-liberation revolutions of the 20th century. Today they are an accurate guideline in the struggle waged by the communist parties of the developed capitalist and developing countries.

V. I. Lenin, the leader and organizer of the Great October Revolution, and the immediate leader of the building of socialism in the first years of the Soviet system, creatively developing Marx' and Engels' doctrine of socialism and communism, created a streamlined science of the ways and means of the economic, sociopolitical and cultural construction of the new society. Guided by this science, the communist parties within the socialist comity are achieving today ever new successes.

Lenin's contribution to the sociopolitical and economic theory of Marxism and the strategy and tactics of the class struggle is truly tremendous. It was largely due to the fact that Lenin masterfully applied in his analysis the latest phenomena and the processes of Marx' dialectical-materialistic method. He not only splendidly mastered dialectical materialism, which he described as the "living soul" of Marxism, but steadily developed it as well.

Like Marx and Engels, considering philosophy the "spiritual weapon" of the proletariat, in his sharp struggle against idealistic and metaphysical concepts, Lenin moved dialectical and historical materialism further ahead, in all directions. The broadest possible range of topical problems always remained within his field of vision, ranging from the latest achievements in the natural sciences, the philosophical interpretation of nature and the properties of the electron and atom, to the most refined realms of spiritual life of society and the individual, and the ideology and social psychology of the masses.

Let us emphasize that, like his other works, Lenin's works on philosophy are imbued, in the final account, with the aspiration toward a single great objective: the struggle for the social liberation of the proletariat and all working people. Lenin's accomplishments in the sociopolitical, economic and historical sciences are inseparably linked with his general philosophical and sociological summations and discoveries.

Lenin's creative enrichment of the theory, strategy and tactic of the struggle of the working class against capitalist oppression and for socialism and communism is inseparable from the sum total of his views on the interaction between social life and social consciousness, economics and politics, the role of the subjective factor and the dialectics of social development under capitalism and under socialism.

The historical fate of Lenin's ideas and their very way of development and triumph offer irrefutable proof of the organic integrity of the great proletarian doctrine and of the inseparable unity among all its components. There neither is nor could there be any scientific communism not based on its corresponding philosophical and economic theory, or which is not a structural part of Marxism-Leninism as a whole. Equally, neither the philosophy of dialectical materialism nor Marxist economic theory could be properly understood and accurately developed outside of a close organic interaction with the scientific theory of socialism and communism and the struggle waged by the working class for its practical implementation. We learn this from Lenin's life, struggle and comprehensive creative work. We learn this from the entire experience in the development of the international workers' and communist movements, from their past and their present.

Today it is obvious to any unprejudiced person that what Lenin did in the realm of revolutionary practice is directly related to the fact that he was the greatest philosopher and brilliant scientist who inaugurated a new stage in the development of Marxism, enriching all its structural components--philosophy, political economy and scientific communism--with essentially important discoveries and summations.

Marx' theory, Lenin wrote, "combines strict and superior scientificity (as the latest word in the social sciences) with revolutionism. This combination is not accidental or merely because the founder of the doctrine personally combined within himself the qualities of the scientist and the

revolutionary, but achieves this combination within the theory itself, internally and inseparably" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 1, p 341). These words could be applied with full justification to Lenin's entire doctrine.

Lenin dedicated his entire creative genius, the entire zeal within his heart and his entire life to the struggle for the implementation of the great historical task of organically blending the theory of scientific communism with the broadest possible practice of the people's masses. Obviously, this problem could not be resolved by a single person, however great. This could be achieved only by the vanguard political organization of the working class--the revolutionary party of a new type, guided by a progressive theory.

Lenin's immortal service to Russia and the international revolutionary movement and all progressive mankind is that he not only profoundly and comprehensively elaborated the theory of a party of a new type and its ideological-theoretical, political and organizational principles, but that he created such a party as well.

Life itself, the existing reality of our century, have proved that only such a party, as Lenin emphasized, could lead the entire people to socialism, to direct and organize the new system, and be the teacher, guide and leader of all working people.

The creation of a revolutionary party of a new type meant that a force had appeared in the world which could factually challenge the system of exploitation and oppression, and lead the masses in the storming of capitalism. This refuted the social-reformist views according to which the working class organizations could achieve only petty reforms which would not affect the essence of the capitalist order. The revolutionary proletarian party, Lenin taught, could gain prestige among the masses if its policy is distinguished, with all necessary flexibility, by a principled consistency and class firmness. Lenin's thought that "in the final account, a broad principled policy is the only, the truly practical policy" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 13, p 368) was brilliantly confirmed in the struggle waged by the communist parties for socialism.

Showing one of the most important laws governing the ideological confrontation between the proletariat and bourgeoisie, Lenin pointed out that unable to honestly and openly oppose it, the opponents of Marxism are ever more frequently "dressing up" as Marxists in order to undermine Marxism from within. The external forms of this ideological "masquerade," naturally, change in the course of time. However, their main characteristic remains unchanged. It consists of emasculating the revolutionary essence of our doctrine. The far-from-new opportunistic attempts to separate Lenin from Marx and to pit Marxism against Leninism are also relying on this.

However, such contraposition is deprived of all grounds. This is not only because Lenin's theory is inseparably linked, with all its roots, with

Marx' and Engels' basic ideas. The practical confirmation of the accuracy of the Marxist theory was found in Lenin's activities, in the activities of the Bolshevik party he created and hammered out, and in the struggle waged by all revolutionary parties of the working class, armed with Lenin's doctrine.

Relying on the entire contemporary historical experience, we say with full justification that there neither is nor could there be true Marxism outside of and despite Leninism. "Leninism," emphasizes the CC CPSU decree "On the 110th Anniversary of the Birth of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin," "is the Marxism of the contemporary age, single, integral and continually developing doctrine of the international working class."

II

Leninism is the ideology of the working class. Leninism is an integral outlook, a true science of society and of the laws governing its functioning and development. Consequently, it is subject to the same criteria as any other science. This applies, above all, to the criterion of practice, which enables us to determine the accuracy of the theoretical interpretation of reality and the ability of theory to predict the development of events and insure the possibility effectively to influence them.

The victorious making of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which inaugurated a new era in universal history, under the leadership of the party created by Lenin and according to his plans, offers decisive proof of the accuracy of Leninism. The development of real socialism in the USSR and, subsequently, in other countries proved that the basic laws governing the socialist revolution and the building of the new society, discovered by Lenin and initially tried under our country's conditions, are repeated and reproduced in other national and historical circumstances. The possibility for such duplication is the most important characteristic of the accuracy of the established laws and, since it is a question of different countries, also an indicator of the international nature and significance of Leninism.

Leninism today is not only the scientific theory, but the living practice of real world socialism under whose conditions tens of millions of people of many nationalities work. In order to judge it properly, we must proceed not only from theory, but from experience as well. It is no accident that, in order to undermine or, at least, weaken the influence of Leninism among the broad popular masses, its enemies are trying to concentrate their fire precisely on the socialist system as the true embodiment of Leninist ideas, doing everything possible to distort its nature.

This hostile tactic is not new. It has merely changed its form in the course of time. When the October Revolution won and the working people of the Soviet republic faced the question of the ways of progress toward socialism, the accomplices of the bourgeoisie--opportunists and dogmatists--pedantically interpreting some Marxist concepts, and unwilling to

understand Marxist revolutionary dialectics, claimed that Russia, allegedly, had not reached the level of socialist reorganization, that it lacked the "objective economic prerequisites for socialism" and that a socialist revolution in our country would "contradict" what Marx and Engels had written on a conversion to a new society.

Refuting the "arguments" of the opportunistic dogmatists, Lenin said: "The times when one could argue about socialist programs from booklets are past for Russia as well, and I am confident they are past forever. Today one can speak of socialism only on the basis of experience" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, p 499). Lenin proved and practical experience confirmed that the Soviet people have everything necessary for the creation of a new, a socialist society.

Following the creation of socialism in the Soviet Union, the bourgeois theoreticians and political leaders tried to claim that the Soviet Union was merely a "giant with feet of clay" which would crumble with the first blow. It was precisely with this self-confident paltry idea in mind that the Hitlerite leaders invaded our country with their hordes. What happened? The Soviet social and governmental system withstood this armed pressure of incredible power. It defeated the fascist aggressors totally, thus creating favorable prerequisites for the people's democratic revolutions under whose blows the bourgeois system crumbled into dust in a number of countries.

The victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War proved that socialism is not only the youngest, but the most viable and durable social system on earth.

Now, when socialism has reached its maturity in the Soviet Union, when it is being built in some and is assuming developed forms in other countries, and when a global socialist system exists, a powerful system, capable of steadily increasing its advantages in the historical dispute with capitalism, a denial of the reality of socialism has become practically impossible. That is why the opponents of socialism are resorting to other methods of struggle. Presenting themselves as defenders of Marxism, some of them are trying to prove that real socialism is not consistent with what Marx, Engels and even Lenin taught. The bourgeois and revisionist "critics" display, in this case, their total lack of understanding of both Marxism-Leninism and real socialism.

What is real socialism? Briefly stated, it is a society based on the social ownership of productive capital and collective labor, or in Marx' words, a society based on collectivism, on the joint ownership of productive capital (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 19, p 18). The main principle of the socialist society is "from each according to his capabilities and to each according to his work." This means that any able-bodied person in the socialist society works for the common good to the extent of his forces, capabilities and gifts, and is paid for his work according to

its quantity and quality. Under socialism there are no antagonistic, hostile classes. There is no exploitation of man by man. There is an alliance and cooperation among the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia. There is no national oppression, as all nations and nationalities are equal, regardless of size. Under socialism the state is not a power alien to the majority of the citizens, standing above them, but a politically organized people with the leading role of the working class as the most progressive social class.

It is precisely these, rather than any other principles of scientific socialism that were formulated in the basic works of Marx, Engels and Lenin as the principles of the first phase of communism. This first phase of the communist socioeconomic system has been reached by the USSR and by a number of other countries, fully in accord with the Marxist principles. This means that, as a social system, socialism has become reality in these countries.

Sometimes the bourgeois and revisionist critics of real socialism pathetically exclaim: "What kind of socialism is this, when it does not offer total economic equality among people and when so many things needed to fully satisfy all requirements are in short supply?" Yet Marxism-Leninism has never claimed that all this would be achieved in the first phase of the communist society. Such impractical views are typical not of the Marxists but of the supporters of petty bourgeois equalization. "In its first phase," Lenin taught, entirely consistent with Marx' idea, "in its first stage communism cannot be as yet economically entirely mature and entirely free from the traditions or traces of capitalism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 33, p 98). At this stage, as Marx noted, even the vestiges of "bourgeois law" have not as yet been fully surmounted.

Naturally, in the course of its progress real socialism is eliminating the basic shortcomings and faults of the bourgeois society. To an ever greater extent it is developing on its own economic base. However, even in its mature aspect socialism, nevertheless, remains within the framework of the first communist phase, when neither production forces nor the people themselves have achieved a comprehensive development.

The socialist system provides the most just organization of social life today, a social life which is unfamiliar with exploitation or with the social and national antagonisms inherent in capitalism. However, this does not mean in the least that socialism is some kind of problem-free society without difficulties and contradictions, the more so under the circumstances of its coexistence with capitalist countries.

In his time Lenin noted that "antagonism and contradiction are not identical in the least. The first disappears, while the second remains under socialism" ("Leninskiy Sbornik XI" [Leninist Collection XI], p 357). Our experience and the experience of the development of real socialism in a number of countries confirm the accuracy of this Leninist conclusion.

Experience has also proved that the nucleus of the political system of the socialist society is the communist party, which can promptly note, analyze and resolve contradictions which arise in the course of its forward development. It is a party equipped with a scientific revolutionary theory and relying on the labor and sociopolitical creativity of the broadest possible popular masses. It is precisely thanks to it that non-antagonistic socialist contradictions could be successfully established and surmounted without assuming aspects hindering the cause of the building of socialism and communism. It is precisely for this reason that sober Marxist analysis and consideration of the leading trends of social development, constant close ties with the people, profound attention to the people's needs and feelings and flexible reaction to ripe economic and social needs have been, and remain, the mandatory Leninist requirements governing party policy.

All this proves that under conditions in which the communist party becomes a ruling party, when it assumes responsibility for the successful development of society, the importance of the scientific formulation of its policy rises, as Lenin predicted. Real socialism is the first society in history which offers the people the opportunity for conscious management and administration of social processes and of the radical conditions governing their own lives. Eliminating the random nature of the effect of social laws, socialism necessarily ascribes science the role of one of the most important factors of social progress.

Marxism-Leninism has always been the firm scientific foundation of all revolutionary-reorganizing activities of the communist party. That is why we are firmly convinced that, while giving today its due to Lenin's brilliance, we are also obligated to learn from him a truly creative attitude toward revolutionary theory, comprehensively developing and upgrading its effectiveness. Hence the tremendous importance which the CPSU ascribes to the development of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the philosophical, economic and historical sciences, and the continuing creative elaboration of social and political problems.

Being the first to take the path of building socialism and communism, through its own experience our party has proved the correctness of the fundamental Marxist-Leninist concepts, as well as the need for their further development, enrichment and concretizing in accordance with changing specific historical conditions. Thus the example of our country was the first proof that the proletariat is the only class in history which not only does not try to perpetuate its governmental power, but which creates conditions for the gradual development of a political organization of an essentially new type, expressing and implementing the will of all working people. As we know, this process found its scientific interpretation in the concept of the socialist state of the whole people, which naturally grows out of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the course of the creation of a developed socialist society. The theory of developed socialism, creatively elaborated in recent years by the CPSU and the other fraternal parties, is a major contribution to the common treasury of

Marxism-Leninism. Through our own experience we saw that this theory will enable us to substantially broaden and refine concepts of the laws governing the establishment of the new socioeconomic system and concretize the means for the implementation of our programmatic objectives.

V. I. Lenin taught that steadily developing and intensifying democracy is a mandatory prerequisite for the successful building of the new society. Life and the practice of the building of socialism and communism have confirmed this completely.

Democracy in its Leninist understanding means the rule of the people and for the people. This Leninist principle is comprehensively revealed in the new USSR Constitution, under whose beneficial influence the Soviet people have been working for the past three years. Socialist democracy presumes the ever broader participation of the masses in the administration of all governmental and social affairs, and the development of principled criticism and self-criticism, which makes it possible to expose and eliminate existing shortcomings. It grants and guarantees the citizens the broadest possible socioeconomic and political rights and freedoms. It insures the ever fuller satisfaction of the needs and interests of the various toiling social groups, all nations and nationalities, and all generations.

The socialist society is an open society. That is why extensive publicity is one of the most important features of its democracy. The communist party always remembers Lenin's instruction that the state is strong through the conscientiousness of the masses, when the masses know everything, can judge of everything and undertake everything consciously. Through extensive publicity the CPSU gains support for its policy from the entire people and strengthens the socialist state of the whole people.

The Soviet state has nothing to conceal from the other fraternal socialist states or our friends as well. Extensive and constant reciprocal information concerning politics, activities, successes and shortcomings can only benefit the world socialist comity and each separate fraternal country. Systematic meetings among representatives of socialist countries at different levels and frank and comradely exchange of experience have become a major positive factor.

The Soviet socialist states does not hide its experience in building the new society from anyone. The Soviet Union's doors are wide open to anyone who comes to us with good intentions, with an open heart and a clear conscience.

Systematically implementing the Marxist-Leninist theory of the economic base of the new society, within a short historical period our party and the Soviet people created powerful production forces and elevated the USSR among the most developed industrial countries in the world. The share of the Soviet Union in global industrial output rose from 1 percent in 1922 to approximately 20 percent today.

The country's national economy today is a dynamic and widespread complex of all modern sectors. On the basis of the extensive utilization of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution, the USSR economy can insure the country of progressive equipment, symbolized by spaceships and nuclear-powered vessels, high-precision machine tools, well-known in many countries, productive and reliable agricultural machinery, and many other goods.

The country's agriculture is a large-scale highly mechanized sector, steadily progressing toward insuring stable yields of all crops and, on this basis, meeting the growing needs of the country for food and raw materials.

The USSR is engaged in intensive capital construction, the biggest in the world. Every year we complete over 200 big industrial enterprises and over 2 million new residential units. The development, in recent years, of the Tyumen' petroleum and gas extraction complex, the Kama Automotive Plant, Atomash, the building of the Baykal-Amur Main Line and the development of the resources of Siberia, the Far East and the North, famous throughout the world, are vivid examples of the steady growth of our national economy and the dedicated toil of the Soviet people.

The communist party achieved great successes in raising the cultural standard and political consciousness of the working people. Over the past decade alone over 42 million people acquired a 10th-grade secondary (general and specialized) training. In 1979 over 800 out of 1,000 people employed in the national economy were with higher or secondary (complete or incomplete) education.

The developed socialist society, gradually growing into a communist society, faces the Leninist party, as a ruling party, with ever new tasks. This applies, above all, to improving the entire system of managing the country, public production above all.

V. I. Lenin ascribed prime importance to the management of the national economy and to planning its development. In over 60 years the party has acquired extremely rich experience in this area. However, the new conditions demand new solutions. This was the purpose of the decree passed last year by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers on improving planning and intensifying the influence of the economic mechanism on upgrading production effectiveness and work quality.

The November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum played a most important role in the elaboration and concretizing of these tasks. Addressing this plenum, and describing the condition of our national economy today, L. I. Brezhnev said: ". . . Whatever work sector we may consider, everywhere we see tremendous opportunities and tremendous reserves for successful progress. However, in order to utilize them we need an upsurge in the level of management in the broadest meaning of the term." It is on this that the party

is working today and this is the aspiration of all party organizations. This is a long-term project. However, we can justifiably expect positive results in the immediate future, with the completion of the 10th Five-Year Plan.

The CPSU proceeds from the fact that raising the level of management will largely depend on the active participation of the broad toiling masses at all its levels, and on the further comprehensive development of Soviet democracy. It is seeking and applying new ways and means for involving the broad toiling masses in the active management of all social and governmental affairs and, above all, in a most important area such as public production.

Corresponding to socialist social relations and the socialist way of life are forms of social awareness which determine the domination of most progressive, communist ideology. Yet by virtue of the lagging of social consciousness behind social life, the influence of imperialist propaganda and, occasionally, some shortcomings in ideological-educational work, private ownership feelings and vestiges, a variety of prejudices and vestiges of the mores of the old society remain and come to life among a certain segment of the population. This leads to anti-social and immoral actions and delinquencies on the part of individuals. Our party and entire people are engaged in irreconcilable struggle against all this.

Extensive possibilities have been created in the country for the implementation of the programmatic party objectives in the area of molding the new man. The objectives are raising all working people in a spirit of high idea-mindedness, loyalty to the socialist homeland and the cause of communism, a communist attitude toward labor, total elimination of vestiges of bourgeois views and mores, comprehensive and harmonious development of the individual and all-round enrichment of spiritual culture. The 1979 CC CPSU decree on improving further ideological and political-educational work directs us toward reaching them. Today all party organizations are working on the implementation of this decree.

The party itself--the leading and guiding force of Soviet society--is developing along with it. In 1922, when the party extensively undertook the implementation of socialist changes following the end of the civil war, compared with the multimillion-strong population in the country it represented merely a small group of political fighters, numbering slightly over 528,000. At that time Lenin compared the party with a "small grain" and expressed the firm conviction that this small grain of communism would radically change everything in the country. This was precisely what happened.

Where does the strength of the party lie? In the fact that it consists of the most conscientious and initiative-minded segment of the working class and all working people, expressing their interests and using their support. They trust it, they follow it, they contribute to the implementation of its

policy. Emphasizing the significance of the party's vanguard role, Lenin wrote that, "At the head of the masses (otherwise all of us would be a drop in the sea)" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 45, p 414).

As the party of the working class, in the course of building developed socialism, the CPSU also becomes the political leader, the vanguard party of the entire Soviet people. Today it numbers within its ranks over 17 million members. One out of nine working citizens of the USSR is a party member. It accounts for 43 percent of the workers and 13 percent of the peasants-kolkhoz members. The education, political consciousness, theoretical standard and experience of the party members have risen. The network of primary party organizations operating in all sectors of our great construction site has widened.

Today the CPSU is a big and powerful political organism. It well knows how and where to direct the building of communism. It is rallying the people into a powerful collective capable of resolving any problem.

The party, Lenin taught, is the leader, the guide. The Leninist style of leadership is based on a collective judgment, on a scientific approach to all events and processes occurring within and outside the country, high exactingness toward oneself and intolerance toward any manifestation of bureaucracy, political blathering and formalism, placidity and complacency. To guide the developed socialist society created in our country means maximally to determine and make fuller use of its possibilities. This task is the party's focal point of attention.

Characterizing the condition of the party today, the 25th CPSU Congress noted that it is properly fulfilling its role as the political leader of the working class, all working people and the entire Soviet people building a communist society. The party will steadfastly continue to fulfill this role bequeathed by the great Lenin with a feeling of complete responsibility.

III

In our time, it would be impossible to understand the establishment of a new, a communist civilization, the dynamics of changes in the nonsocialist part of the world, the correlation of forces between the two or the basic trends of development of international circumstances were we to ignore the determining influence of Leninism. The attitude toward Leninism and its assessment runs through the entire spectrum of historical, philosophical, economic, political and other views and concepts, representing the core of the confrontation between ideologies representing and expressing two class outlooks--proletarian and bourgeois--and two opposite social systems--socialism and capitalism. This fact alone clearly proves the great international importance of Lenin's doctrine in the present age.

An age of triumph of Marxism-Leninism and of the ideas and cause of the October Revolution: This is the truly synthesized definition of our time,

since it encompasses all profound sociohistorical processes of the 20th century.

Six decades ago Lenin wrote that, ". . . We are the weakest (materially, militarily, now) and we are the strongest. . . . Because the universal economic and political development . . . is as we predicted it" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, p 485).

Lenin foresaw that in the confrontation between the two systems the balance of world forces will steadily shift in favor of socialism. Today this trend is embodied in the growing power of socialism, which, precisely in accordance with Lenin's words, has become an international force "which can have a decisive influence on all global politics" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 41, p 165). The comity of socialist countries is strengthening on the basis of the growing comity of their economic, political and spiritual life. Coincidence of basic interests and all-round cooperation and mutual aid multiply their constructive possibilities and positive role in the international arena.

Lenin foresaw that the development of the bourgeois society would go through the intensification of the exploitation of the working class, the ever higher concentration of capital in the hands of a few financial groups, the intensification of the general crisis of capitalism, the merger of the monopolies with the state, decay and parasitism.

We see today the way the monopolies are siphoning off multibillion profits, attacking the living standards of the working people and applying ever stronger pressure on the working class with a view to recovering some of the concessions extracted at the cost of a long and an adamant struggle. Gigantic corporations, which have gone beyond national boundaries and have taken over the leading economic sectors of a number of countries, are absorbing to an ever greater extent petty and medium sized ownership. We are witnessing one economic crisis after another, including acute ones, such as those of the 1930's and 1970's, which have shaken to its foundations not only the economic, but the sociopolitical realm of the capitalist system.

The unrestrained growth of living costs, mass unemployment, lack of social guarantees of basic human rights, such as the right to work, housing, education, health care, childhood and motherhood; scandalous exposures of open bribes of governmental officials by the monopolies, degradation of culture and crime; hunger, diseases and illiteracy affecting hundreds of millions of people as a result of the plundering of former colonies by imperialism are all clear manifestations of the inability of capitalism to cope with the internal antagonisms which are tearing it apart.

Lenin foresaw the intensification of the vanguard role of the working class in the struggle against imperialism and for peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism. This prediction was fully justified. Regardless

of all sorts of petty theories of "deproletarianization" of the capitalist society, the working class is becoming an ever more powerful social force. In our century its numerical strength has risen manyfold.

In the socialist countries the working class is the main booster of social progress. It is exerting a decisive influence on the domestic and foreign policy of the states. In the industrially developed capitalist countries its possibilities are expanding to dominate, in Lenin's words, "the center and nerve of the entire economic system . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 40, p 23). Its level of organization is rising. Strikes, acquiring ever more frequently a nationwide scope and a clearly expressed anti-capitalist direction, are spreading, decade after decade. The ranks of the allies of the proletariat among the peasantry, the intelligentsia, the employees, the students and other nonproletarian strata in the struggle against monopoly domination and for democracy and social progress are multiplying. The working class of the countries freed from colonial dependence is growing and assuming ever stronger positions in the life of the peoples.

Taken as a whole, the international working class is the most dynamic and invincible social force of our time. It represents the future of mankind. That is why the most promising policy, capable of surmounting all obstacles, is the one which is oriented toward the working class, supporting and defending its interests and fighting for its immediate and final objectives. This is the prime source of the increased prestige and influence of the communist parties, which are systematically pursuing precisely such a class policy.

V. I. Lenin predicted a great future for the world communist movement, at whose origins he stood. He inspired the creation of revolutionary workers' parties of a new type. He was a zealous fighter for the strengthening of their unity and solidarity. "We need," Lenin pointed out, "the type of parties which would always maintain real ties with the masses and which would be able to guide these masses" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 41, p 237). Such parties were organized by the proletariat of many countries. In the nonsocialist part of the world alone, there are active communist and workers' parties in 77 countries, numbering over 4.5 million members. Communists are playing an ever more substantive role in the political life of many countries. As a whole, the international communist movement has become the most influential political force of our time.

Naturally, the national tasks facing each party become more complex with the growth of the communist movement. Its responsibility to its own working class and to all working people in the country increases. At the same time the experience of the development of the world revolutionary process proves that true national interests have never conflicted with the international interests of the working people and that the systematic implementation of the principle of proletarian internationalism leads the struggle of the entire international working class to success.

Lenin defined with extreme clarity the class nature of proletarian internationalism, based on the common class interests of the international proletariat, as dedicated work for the development of the revolutionary movement in one's own country and comprehensive support of the same struggle in all other countries. Our party continues to prove its loyalty to this principle through all its activities. Throughout its entire history the Soviet Union has invariably done the maximum possible to support the struggle waged by the working people and the peoples of other countries for national independence and social progress, and for peace and socialism.

The strengthening of the international ties linking the communists does not conflict in the least with the autonomy and independence of the fraternal parties, however intensively the propaganda of the class enemy, which is trying to divide the international communist movement, may be proclaiming the opposite. On the contrary, the true autonomy and independence of the communist parties under the conditions of an uninterrupted pressure on the part of the anti-communist forces rallying on an international scale would be simply inconceivable without the development of relations of fraternal cooperation, mutual aid and support provided by the entire world communist and workers' movement.

The content and forms of proletarian internationalism are steadily enriched under the influence of the processes of social and national liberation and of the deep historical changes occurring in the world. Yet its nature--solidarity of the working class and the communists of all countries in the struggle for common objectives, voluntary cooperation among fraternal parties and effective support given by the communists to the struggles of the peoples for national liberation and social progress--remains unchanged. Proletarian internationalism was, and remains, the powerful and tried weapon of the communist parties and the entire workers' movement.

V. I. Lenin predicted that the socialist revolution "will not be only and mainly a struggle waged by the revolutionary proletariat in each country against its own bourgeoisie. No, it would be a struggle waged by all colonies and countries oppressed by imperialism, by all dependent countries against international imperialism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 39, p 327). Today we see the grand results of this struggle. The imperialist colonial system has crumbled and about 100 independent countries, playing an ever more important role in world affairs, opposing the imperialist policy of aggression and dictate, and favoring peace and social progress, have come to life. Today, when the liberated countries face in their entirety the tasks of eliminating economic backwardness and dependence on imperialism and problems of social rebirth and choice of ways of further development, the Leninist ideas of the possibility of a noncapitalist way of development, and on the ways and means for the socialist reorganization of the mixed economy of such countries, have become particularly topical.

The experience of the post-October revolutions--both the victorious and those which were defeated--and the experience in reorganizing life on a new

basis in the socialist countries, convincingly proved that many of the essential features of the revolutionary strategy of the Bolsheviks, which brought about the victory of the October Revolution, have retained their topical significance.

Naturally, postwar dislocation and hunger, the civil war unleashed by reactionary forces, the intervention of the imperialist countries, the economic blockade, conspiracies and sabotage, and the tremendous pressure of the petit bourgeoisie element, along with other factors, could not fail to give a specific imprint to the socialist reorganizations in our country. However, in those difficult years as well, Lenin set as the cornerstone for all party activities tasks which expressed the very essence of socialism and whose implementation is necessary whenever it is truly a question of the socialist reorganization of society:

The creation of socialist statehood, securing the power of the working class allied with the other toiling strata;

Elimination of the capitalist and establishment of the public ownership of productive capital;

Gradual reorganization of the entire system of production and other social relations on a socialist basis;

Creation of modern industry where it does not exist and of an independent economy, giving the land to those who cultivate it and securing favorable conditions for the organization of collective farming;

Establishment of a new socialist organization and labor discipline and new incentives for production and social activities;

Involving the working class and the broadest possible toiling masses in managing production, the state and society;

Comprehensive development of socialist democracy and guaranteeing the rights and freedoms of the citizens;

Surmounting all forms of resistance on the part of the overthrown exploiting classes and the counterrevolutionary feeble impulses of the international bourgeoisie; protecting the revolutionary gains of the working class with steady reliance on the support of the tremendous majority of the people; and

Securing the vanguard role of the communist party.

The victorious socialist revolutions in the countries of Eastern Europe and Asia and in Cuba, and the development of a number of Asian and African countries along a socialist oriented way, prove that the main content of the Leninist concept of the socialist and anti-imperialist revolution has

been preserved and is confirmed, and that the experience of the October Revolution is both unique and carries essential universally valid features. No other experience, an experience which would prove the possibility to accomplish a basically different transition to communism, may be found in nature.

Naturally, it is necessary to formulate a political line, strategy and tactic which would be consistent to the highest extent with the national, the specific-historical conditions of each country, and to take into consideration the existing international circumstances. The task pointed out by Lenin, which is "to be able to apply the general and basic principles of communism to the characteristic aspect of relations among classes and parties, to the characteristics of the objective development toward communism inherent in each separate country and which must be studied, found or guessed" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 41, p 74), remains entirely topical to the proletarian vanguard. In each specific case a thorough study and a creative search for the best solutions are required. Such studies are conducted by the communist parties and the CPSU fully understands them. A number of interesting and promising conclusions and hypotheses may be found among such recent developments. At the same time, in the course of such searches, debatable postulates and assumptions are formulated, requiring further studies and discussions in the light of the essential conclusions of the Leninist theory of socialist revolution and the already available experience in its practical implementation.

The general laws governing socialist changes, discovered by Lenin and tested through the international experience of many countries, offer broad scope for the adoption of a truly innovative approach to the study of reality and the formulation of political decisions fully taking into consideration the characteristics of any given country at any given stage of global development. Such common laws are precisely the reliable guidelines for any such study and determination of a political line. Their rejection inevitably leads the researcher-sociologist and the practical politician to the positions of a pragmatism which slides toward empiricism. It is no accident that attempts to depict Leninism as a theory and practice suitable only to Russian conditions at a specific moment of Russia's history, and the rejection of the universal significance of the Leninist doctrine, have frequently turned into a rejection of Marxism in general and, above all, of the dialectical-materialistic interpretation of the correlation between the general and specific laws governing social development. These are attempts which call for "Back to Marx!" and then "Back to Kant!" or, rather, to neo-Kantianism with its basic rejection of the laws of history depicted as a random sequence of unique facts subject merely to empirical description.

The great power of Lenin's ideas lies in the fact that, interwoven within the fabric of living reality, they develop together with it, steadily acquiring new, vital substance. Such is the Leninist idea of the unbreakable link between socialism and peace.

According to the historians, over the last 5,000 years some 15,000 wars have been fought. They have cost the lives of about four billion people, or approximately the size of the entire current population on earth. Capitalism and imperialism brought the most disasters among them. Lenin saw in victorious socialism, for the first time in history, the appearance of a material force which could oppose war. From the very beginning of its existence, the government of workers and peasants he headed opposed the imperialist policy of national hatred, colonial oppression and predatory wars with a social policy of international fraternity among working people and friendship among the peoples of all countries, national independence and full equality, a policy of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems.

Lenin considered the struggle for excluding wars from the life of mankind and for asserting the principle of peaceful coexistence as a norm of international relations the most profound, the permanent foundation of the foreign policy of the socialist state and bequeathed to our party its tireless implementation. ". . . Undertaking our peaceful construction," he said, "we shall dedicate all efforts to continue it uninterruptedly" ('Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, p 300).

V. I. Lenin cautioned against the illusion that peace could be achieved easily. The aggressive nature of imperialism has not changed. World War II and tens of local wars unleashed by the imperialist aggressors in various parts of the planet, nuclear blackmail, the creation of networks of military bases throughout the globe, the putting together of aggressive military blocs and decades of cold war convincingly prove this.

Today as well imperialism, American imperialism above all, is hindering the just settlement of the situation in the Middle East. It has created a most dangerous situation in the area of the Persian Gulf by sending there an armada of warships. It is building new military bases threatening the security of many nations. A separate army whose special purpose will be to intervene in the domestic affairs of other countries under the pretext of "defense of American interests" is being raised.

Whenever the people of one or another country rise to the struggle against corrupt systems, a mass campaign is fanned on the topic of "Moscow's intrigues" and attempts to export counterrevolution undertaken under its cover. Such was the case in Angola, Ethiopia, Kampuchea and Afghanistan. Whenever the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries provide assistance on the request of the legitimate government of one or another country to repel the intrigues of foreign reaction, the act is presented as "intervention" and international tension is increased under this false pretext.

Ever more obviously the imperialist circles are trying to use the anti-Sovietism of the Beijing leaders in the struggle against real socialism and the liberation movements of the nations. They are helping to equip China with modern armaments. They are encouraging its hegemonistic and aggressive aspirations against neighboring states.

The arms race is the greatest threat to mankind. For quite some time such a large amount of nuclear weapons have been stockpiled that, in terms of TNT, there would be several tons of explosive per every person on earth. The possibility for the reciprocal potential destruction, several times over, of potential enemies has been long acknowledged. There is no part of the planet to which a deadly payload could not be delivered. Nevertheless, the arms race is not only continuing but is speeding up.

The culprit here is imperialism and imperialism alone. Recent events have confirmed this for the umpteenth time. It is precisely the United States and its NATO allies who have agreed on an unprecedented increase in military appropriations. They took the decision to produce and deploy in Europe qualitatively new types of nuclear missiles, thus, in fact, launching a new and most dangerous spiral in the arms race. They are trying to disturb the existing approximate balance of armaments and armed forces and change the military-strategic situation to the detriment of the security of the Warsaw Pact members. The American Administration has postponed for an indefinite time the ratification of the SALT II treaty, which opened the way to the reaching of further agreements in the area of arms limitations.

All this proves the size of the obstacles remaining on the path to a durable peace and how difficult it is to achieve positive changes in the international arena when dealing with the political representatives of monopoly capital. Our party is drawing proper conclusions from the developing circumstances. It will not allow a weakening of the positions of socialism in the face of aggressive imperialist preparations. It will not weaken the internationalist support of the liberation struggle of the peoples. At the same time the Soviet Union will continue to do everything it can to lower the level of military confrontation while observing the principle of equal security of the sides. As L. I. Brezhnev has said, our course "combines consistent love for peace with firm rebuff of aggression. It proved itself in the past decades and we shall continue to follow it. No one will deflect us from this course."

In the imperialist camp, in the United States in particular--the center of militarism and world reaction--powerful forces exist opposing detente and urging on the arms race, which is nothing but a material preparation for war. However, the forces favoring peace, security and disarmament have grown immeasurably. They consist, above all, of the joint power of the members of the socialist comity, which is the material foundation for the policy of peace. They are the international communist and workers' movements. They are the national-liberation movement. They are the entire progressive and peace-loving public.

The great vitality of the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems has been proved by the facts and by many positive changes in world politics. Our party, its Central Committee and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev are displaying exceptional energy in the practical implementation of this Leninist course, promoting the intensification

of political detente and adding military detente to it. "Disarmament is the socialist ideal," Lenin emphasized ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 30, p 152). The Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries are most energetically and adamantly working for the implementation of this ideal.

More than ever before, today the struggle for peace and international security and national freedom and democracy and social progress come together. Today mass actions in the defense of the peace and for restricting the arms race are directly related to the struggle for limiting the power of monopoly capital and for democracy, national liberation and social justice. The broadest possible masses must clearly see this link and understand that, engaging in actions of solidarity in opposition to military preparations and aggressive imperialist actions, whether in Europe, the Middle and Near East, the area of the Indian Ocean, Southeast Asia, the Caribbean or southern Africa, they are thus defending their own interests.

Of late the aggressive imperialist forces have mounted adamant and fierce attacks against the policy of detente and peaceful coexistence and cooperation among countries in an effort to turn the world back to the cold war. Such attempts must be energetically rebuffed. The Leninist party and the entire Soviet people are convinced that the united actions of the members of the socialist comity, all communists and democrats, the forces of national liberation and all peace-loving people will be able to defend and strengthen the first human right--the right to a peaceful life.

History convincingly proves that Leninism is the most profound manifestation of the basic requirements of universal social progress and the interests of all mankind. One of the most important programmatic stipulations of the communists is being brilliantly confirmed: Liberating itself from capitalist oppression, the working class promotes true and full social freedom and gradually creates conditions for the free and comprehensive development of one and all.

The basic processes determining the socioeconomic and political aspect of the contemporary world confirm the accuracy of Lenin's ideas and prove that history is developing as foreseen by the great Lenin.

5003
CSO: 1802

BIG RESULTS AND BROAD PROSPECTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 80 pp 30-39

[Article by V. Golikov on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the March 1965 CC CPSU Plenum]

[Text] Addressing the solemn session in Alma-Ata on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the development of the virgin and fallow lands, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said: "Turning to the history of our party, we will see that agrarian policy has always been its focal point of attention. This is natural. It is a question of an important component of the party's political course insuring the alliance between the working class and the peasantry and directed toward the victory of the proletarian revolution, the implementation of socialist reorganizations and the building of the new society."

The CC CPSU plenum was held 15 years ago, in March 1965. It was a regular plenum convened within the period stipulated by the CPSU bylaws. It considered problems of the further development of socialist agriculture. One would think that there was nothing extraordinary in this: in the past agrarian problems had been repeatedly discussed at party congresses and Central Committee plenums. However, their theoretical elaboration at the March 1965 Plenum and the practical measures which were earmarked had a particularly high, one could say, exclusive influence on the entire subsequent development of agricultural production in the country. Therefore, one could say with full justification that this plenum assumed an outstanding place in the history of the struggle waged by our party for triumph of socialism and communism.

I

The March CC CPSU Plenum took place under circumstances in which our agriculture was experiencing major difficulties, many of which had been the consequence of subjectivism in management and in resolving the ripe problems of the development of agricultural production. Naturally, the attention of the plenum participants was focused above all on criticizing the accumulated shortcomings and errors of previous years.

However, it was not this aspect of the matter that determined the particular role which the history of the past 15 assigned the March Plenum. Following the historical October 1964 CC CPSU Plenum, the profound analysis of the situation in the country's agriculture, provided by the Central Committee and, personally, by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, most clearly indicated that the agrarian sector of our economy, having completed its postwar restoration, had entered a new stage of development. The objective need arose to review a number of previously operating principles and methods of management in that area and the elaboration of new ones. In other words, the question arose of party agrarian policy consistent with the conditions and requirements of developed socialism. It was precisely the March 1965 CC CPSU Plenum that expressed the first and decisive word in this area.

The plenum embodied the theoretical stipulations, ideas and principles of Leninism to practical formulations insuring the steady upsurge of agriculture. A new and more advanced system for the purchasing of grain and other agricultural commodities, an essentially different approach to the planning of capital investments, a line of all-round comprehensive development of mechanization, reclamation and chemization of the land, as the only true way for upgrading its fertility and increasing commodity output, a radical change in the principles governing kolkhoz wages (the introduction of a guaranteed daily wage), along with many other decisions passed at the March Plenum were basically innovative and consistent with the objective requirements of the further development of the socialist economy. They created real prerequisites for putting the kolkhozes and sovkhozes on a solid material base, managing agriculture on a planned and confident basis through intensification, and its conversion to an industrial base.

The participants in the plenum welcomed with tremendous attention and warm approval the report submitted by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev "On Urgent Measures Aimed at the Further Development of USSR Agriculture." The scientific depth and Bolshevik sharpness of analysis of the condition of this most important national economic sector, and the firm rejection of routine and formalism which had existed in the recent past, the novelty and daring in defining means for the further upsurge of agricultural production, and a realistic assessment of difficulties along this way and profound conviction that this course was accurate were powerful sources for the great energy with which the aktiv of our Leninist party and, with it, the entire multi-million-strong army of party members and the entire Soviet people rose to the struggle for the implementation of contemporary CPSU agrarian policy.

We know that after the March CC CPSU Plenum, on four occasions, at Central Committee plenums (May 1966, October 1968, July 1970 and July 1978) the party especially considered problems of the development of the country's socialist agriculture. Great attention was paid to such problems at the 23d, 24th and 25th CPSU congresses. At that time a number of important measures, codified in proper documents, which, as life confirmed, were of invaluable national importance, were adopted on Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's personal initiative, to insure the successful practical implementation of

the decisions of the Politburo and Central Committee Secretariat. They included the decree on specialization and concentration of agricultural production on the basis of interfarm cooperation and agro-industrial integration, the development of agriculture in the Nonchernozem Zone of the RSFSR, improved utilization of equipment, and others.

Thus, relying on Lenin's theoretical legacy and summing up the experience acquired under the Soviet system and that of the fraternal socialist countries, step by step, our party perfected its agrarian program. Now, noting the 15th anniversary of the March CC CPSU Plenum, we can most definitely emphasize that the main, the decisive political result of the distance covered is the scientifically elaborated Leninist agrarian policy of the period of developed socialism, tried through practical experience. The Communist Party and Soviet Government are steadfastly guided by the new concepts and conclusions based on the great Leninist cooperative plan in the elaboration and implementation of five-year and annual plans for the economic and social development of socialist agriculture.

II

The history of the Soviet state irrefutably proves that, resolving one of the most important and complex problems of the socialist revolution--strengthening the alliance between the working class and the peasantry and involving the latter in the building of socialism--the party has always ascribed particular importance to the elaboration of a proper and most effective economic policy in the country. This problem held a central position in the theoretical and political documents and practical activities pursued by the party, both during the period of the restoration of the country's national economy, destroyed as a result of the first world imperialist war, and the attacks of the White Guard counterrevolution and foreign military intervention, which immediately followed the victory of Great October Revolution, imposed upon our people by the American, British and Japanese imperialism and their servants, as well as in subsequent decades.

Defining its agrarian program, the party has always proceeded from V. I. Lenin's instructions that economics is "the policy of the greatest interest to us" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 43, p 330). This instruction remains topical to this day. It is precisely above all the proper and comprehensively planned economic policy in agriculture that insured the maximum possible economic results under given circumstances.

We are well familiar with the low level and virtually total dislocation which czarism, the White Guards and imperialist interventions had brought to our country's national economy. At that time Lenin pointed out that the only proper way for coming out of the catastrophic economic condition was to mobilize all efforts for the upsurge of agriculture as the most important priority task. At that time, however, the country lacked the

possibility to provide the peasantry with any substantial material help. Under those conditions, Lenin suggested a brilliant solution: to replace the requisitioning of farm produce with a food tax and introduce free trade with the controlling role of the state, i.e., to review economic policy in the countryside as it was in the civil war period ("war communism"). We must, he said, provide an "incentive, an encouragement to the petty farmer in his farming" ("Poin. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 43, p 71).

To the great amazement of many governmental leaders, both domestic and foreign, the changed economic policy in the country not only played the main role in resolving the problem of the restoration of agriculture, which, as Lenin believed, was required in order to start the "economic revival" (see *ibid*, Vol 44, p 227) and, on this basis, "undertake to rebuild large-scale industry" (*ibid*, Vol 43, p 155), but made it possible to eliminate the mortal threat of hunger and, at the same time, give a rebirth to industry, transportation and other vitally important economic sectors.

Lenin considered the proper socioeconomic policy in the countryside a prime factor in the building of socialism. He taught that "the system of civilized cooperative farmers, with the public ownership of productive capital and the class victory of the proletariat over the bourgeois represents the socialist system" (*ibid*, Vol 45, p 373). He emphasized in his cooperative plan, whose ideas will remain alive through the centuries, that all activities of cooperatives at all their development levels should be based in such a way that the peasants be materially interested in participating in this project. We must, said he, "offer bonuses to peasants who participate in cooperative trade" (*ibid*, p 371).

Naturally, the complex international circumstances, the intrigues of the imperialist countries, the economic blockade, the openly hostile actions of the world bourgeoisie against the state of the workers and peasants, and the war unleashed by German fascism created conditions under which it was not always possible to systematically implement Lenin's ideas of the prime significance of the economic factor in rural development. Furthermore, in some periods, such as, for example, the beginning of the 1960's, subjectivism and the arbitrary solution of major agricultural development problems hindered the scientific approach to the management of this sector.

Today, looking back at the distance covered by our agriculture following the March CC CPSU Plenum, proudly noting the great accomplishments which it started, we realize that the powerful motive force of our party's agrarian policy is found, above all, in the skillful specific implementation of Lenin's doctrine. "We realize," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the plenum, "that the upsurge of agriculture is what we vitally need for the successful building of communism. In order to resolve this nationwide task we must put agriculture on a firm economic base. V. I. Lenin considered this problem as one of the important problems of the party's economic policy, for it affects the very foundation of the Soviet state--relations between the working class and the peasantry."

When the results of over ten years of implementation of the long-term program for the development of agriculture, started in March 1965, were drawn up at the July 1978 Plenum, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that "contemporary agrarian policy is the Leninist strategy and party tactics in the field of agriculture under developed socialist conditions. . . . We are aspiring," Leonid Il'ich stated further, "to make the entire variety of economic conditions within the farms and on the scale of the entire agro-industrial complex a comity, a unity of interests shared by the state, the kolkhozes and the direct commodity producers. V. I. Lenin considered one of the main principles of socialist economic management the proper combination of the interests of all parties participating in commodity production and marketing."

The party's current economic policy in agriculture has a number of characteristics. The most essential among them is the fact that thanks to the high level of development of production forces reached in kolkhozes and sovkhoses, socialist economic relations have become dominant in the individual farms, as well as on the scale of the entire agro-industrial complex. Another major characteristic is that, in addition to the basic problem--insuring a stable growth and commodity-exchange relations (purchasing of agricultural commodities from and selling industrial commodities to kolkhozes and sovkhoses)--the present economic policy includes the solution of basic social problems. One of the first among them is the progressive principle of guaranteed kolkhoz wages. Also of tremendous social importance are party measures aimed at reducing disparities in the wages of rural and industrial workers, and the further rapprochement between town and country.

The present economic policy pursued by the party in agriculture is characterized by a truly Leninist approach to the problem of capital investments. As we know, Lenin ascribed a primary role to this matter. He taught that in order for large-scale public production to develop successfully it must be "supported more than usual," and be lent state funds to the same extent as to heavy industry (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 45, p 371). The party firmly supports the line of systematically increasing capital investments in agriculture. As we know, a voluntaristic approach has been allowed in this matter relatively recently, as a result of which the sector was not given adequate possibilities for expanded reproduction.

At the July 1978 CC CPSU Plenum the party's position on the matter of capital investments in agriculture was not only fully asserted, but assumed several new important features. In addition to pointing out that we must firmly support the party's essential line of systematically increasing capital investments in agriculture, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that their share in the overall amount of funds allocated for economic development in the 11th Five-Year Plan should be no less than the level already reached. Therefore, it is not a question of one or another addition of capital investments in kolkhoz-sovkhos output, but of retaining as a minimum the present share in overall capital investments. Only thus could we insure the accelerated growth of agricultural production forces.

The scientifically substantiated and profoundly realistic economic policy of our party was a powerful lever for the upsurge of the production forces of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, the growth of the prosperity of the rural workers and the further strengthening and improvement of the entire socialist agricultural system. We see its practical results, above all, in the fact that, as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted at the July 1978 Plenum, "the 1977 kolkhoz gross income was twice the annual average in the Seventh Five-Year Plan. Over the past 12 years the sovkhoz system as a whole has shown a profit. . . . The wages of kolkhoz members and sovkhoz workers have doubled." In the 15 years since the March Plenum the overall volume of gross agricultural output in the country rose by a 1.4 factor.

The party's economic policy is being steadily perfected in accordance with the changes occurring in the development of kolkhoz and sovkhoz production forces. The party exposes existing shortcomings and adopts constructive measures for their elimination. At the July 1978 Plenum Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said that, "The all-round intensification of agriculture objectively broadens and intensifies its relations with industrial sectors which deliver material and technical facilities to the villages and process their raw materials. Under such circumstances a well-organized cooperation between partners is needed. Unfortunately, we have not been able so far to eliminate some negative phenomena in this area." They are manifested, above all, in the fact that of late the ratios of trade between agriculture and industry have not developed to the benefit of agriculture. The increased growth of prices of productive capital delivered by industry leads to increased production costs of agricultural output, lowers kolkhoz and sovkhoz profitability and adversely affects expanded reproduction processes. Another negative aspect is the high cost of agricultural construction and services provided to kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

The plenum's instruction on the need to establish properly organized relations within the agro-industrial complex applies, above all, to state organs such as the USSR Gosplan, USSR Ministry of Finance and USSR State Committee for Prices. Their proper understanding of the essence of the party's economic policy in agriculture and its systematic practical implementation, within the entire complexity of various economic interrelationships, determine, in the final account, the strengthening and further upsurge of the kolkhoz and sovkhoz economy—the economy of the main producers of food and raw materials for industry. At the same time, the farms themselves must proclaim a most decisive struggle against negligence, waste and amateurish organization of the production process, a struggle against anything which lowers the economic effect of the efforts of the workers in the kolkhoz-sovkhoz sector.

In the light of the requirements of the July 1978 Central Committee Plenum, serious attention should be paid also to the fact that a still large group of kolkhozes are showing an insufficient level of profitability. What does this prove? Above all, that such kolkhozes (or, at least, a considerable percentage of such kolkhozes) do not have the possibility to conduct their

farming to the fullest extent on an expanded reproduction basis. As a result of this situation they are unable to systematically increase their contribution to the comestible fund of the country. Obviously, the urgent need exists to make a profound study of this problem and formulate effective measures for upgrading production profitability in such farms, including giving them the necessary aid. The measures could include, for example, bonus purchase prices which would take into consideration local characteristics. In the final account, effective aid to this group of farms would yield great returns. We believe that the respective state and social organs, both centrally and locally, should undertake the practical solution of this problem in the immediate future.

III

The party's contemporary agrarian policy calls for the extensive development of production mechanization, reclamation and chemization. Naturally, even before the March Plenum a great deal had been accomplished in this direction. In the past, however, land reclamation and chemization in particular had not become significantly widespread. At that time they had no tangible effect on the results of the production of agricultural commodities. Since the March Plenum, together with mechanization, land reclamation and chemization have assumed a most important position in the party's agricultural strategy. Each of these directions became, essentially, an autonomous sector and reached an unparalleled scale of development.

The report by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev submitted at the July 1978 Central Committee Plenum noted that after 1965 the machine-tractor fleet of kolkhozes and sovkhoses was virtually renovated and its quality improved. The power capacities of agricultural enterprises more than doubled, while the power-labor ratio per agricultural worker rose by a 2.5 factor. In 1977 the countryside received 77 million tons of chemical fertilizers, compared with 27 million tons in 1965. Within that time the size of irrigated and drained land nearly doubled.

However, despite all these successes in the field of production mechanization, and land reclamation and chemization, major projects lie ahead. Farm power capacities must be considerably increased so that the comprehensive mechanization of all most-important farm crops may be achieved in the very near future. The level of mechanization in animal husbandry must be upgraded considerably. The party deems it necessary to continue to make major investments in reclamation and considerably expand the size of irrigated and drained lands, which cannot be avoided under the natural conditions of our country. In the field of chemization the task is to satisfy to a greater extent the needs of agriculture for chemical fertilizers, while considerably upgrading their quality, and for a variety of plant protection chemicals. A great role is ascribed to the All-Union Production-Scientific Association for Agro-Chemical Services to Agriculture (Soyuzsel'khozkhimiya), set up last year in accordance with the decision of July CC CPSU Plenum.

In the present circumstances the party ascribes prime importance to the highly effective utilization of the equipment, land reclamation and the totality of chemicals received by agriculture. Unfortunately, in these areas high returns have not been reached as yet. This is largely determined by the cadres, level of responsibility of farm managers, mechanizers' skills, and so on. Meanwhile, the question of improving the existing system of utilization of the material and technical facilities in agriculture becomes ever more urgent. Thus in the area of mechanization the need has been clearly manifested decisively to convert from the separate use of machines by each farm to the creation, on an interfarm basis, of big specialized enterprises which could make systematic and considerably greater use of modern technological possibilities. In accordance with the party's course of agricultural production specialization and concentration, based on interfarm cooperation, a search for new methods for the utilization of machines has been undertaken in many parts of the country and a certain experience has already been acquired. The experience of the Moldavian SSR in particular deserves the closest possible attention in terms of the levels of organization and effectiveness of output. Here, for the past several years, big rayon mechanization associations have been set up in all agricultural rayons by the kolkhozes and sovkhoses and are successfully operating on a cooperative basis.

The problem of production specialization and concentration, based on interfarm cooperation and agro-industrial integration, is of topical importance in all agricultural sectors. The party ascribes tremendous importance to this. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has described this trend as the main way of our agriculture.

The course of agricultural production specialization and concentration on the basis of interfarm cooperation and agro-industrial integration is the most important part of the party's agrarian policy under developed socialist conditions. This is yet another outstanding example of the skillful application, under specific conditions, of the great Marxist-Leninist doctrine, and of the further development of Lenin's cooperative plan. Extensive fruitful practical work is being done to follow the charted course. Currently there are over 19,000 interfarm enterprises and organizations in the various agricultural sectors. This is living proof of the fact that our agriculture has entered a qualitatively new stage of development consisting of the further socialization of socialist production and labor. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out at the July Plenum, this new phenomenon is an adamant requirement of life and one of the decisive foundations for our progress.

The July CC CPSU Plenum reemphasized that the party's course of agricultural production specialization and concentration, based on interfarm cooperation and agro-industrial integration, is of exceptional importance to the further upsurge of agriculture. The plenum demanded of the corresponding organs and all party organizations to work more energetically for the development of interfarm cooperation and to carry it out on a planned and systematic basis, together with other measures aimed at agricultural production intensification.

Let us particularly emphasize the fact that the party documents and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's addresses discuss agricultural production concentration and specialization not in general but specifically on the basis of interfarm cooperation and agro-industrial integration. This is no accident. Under contemporary conditions specialization and concentration based on interfarm cooperation represent the most effective and most accessible method of the further advancement of agricultural production. It makes possible the broad development of the movement and to insure the successful solution of production and major social problems. Narrow specialization, i.e., the specialization of individual farms (the so-called spetskhozes), frequently carried out through general capital investments in the agrarian economic sector, as a rule to the detriment of other farms, cannot even be compared with specialization based on interfarm cooperation. Naturally, it could yield certain production results. However, the specialization of individual farms cannot provide a solution to the national problem of comprehensively strengthening the economics and increasing the production of agricultural commodities in all farms without exception, on the scale of each rayon, oblast, kray and republic. To reduce production improvement to the specialization of individual farms would mean to delay for an indefinite time the conversion of overall agriculture production to an industrial base. Furthermore, as a rule, such specialization does not lead to the elimination, but to the intensified inequality in farm development levels. It does not contribute to the rapprochement between the current forms of socialist ownership in the countryside, and so on.

As experience indicates, when it becomes a question of really extensive specialization and concentration of agricultural production, life itself, common sense, indicate that it must be converted to interfarm cooperation and agro-industrial integration. One could boldly state that whereas in the years of intensive collectivization the party defined the rural cooperative as the basic form of the kolkhoz movement, at the present stage, in the course of the further socialization of production and labor, i.e., of the further development of the Leninist cooperative plan, the party considers interfarm cooperation the basic form of agricultural production specialization and concentration. This applies to all agricultural production sectors!

A long way has been covered since the historical March 1965 Plenum and major successes have been achieved. The strength of the kolkhoz-sovkhoz system has increased comprehensively and more than ever before. This allows today our kolkhozes and sovkhozes to resolve major production and social problems. Naturally, many difficulties arise on the path of agriculture. However, neither changing weather conditions nor other hindrances stop or could stop its progress. The achieved results are quite tangible. In the greatest shock sector--grain production--the upsurge following the March Plenum began with a gross harvest of 130.3 million tons, or 10.2 quintals per hectare (on an average per year in the Seventh Five-Year Plan), reaching 209 million tons gross harvest and 16.3 quintals per hectare (on an annual average between 1976 and 1979). Cotton production

rose from 5.66 million tons in 1965 to 9.16 million in 1979; meat, from 10 million tons (in slaughtered weight) to 15.5 million; milk, from 72.6 million tons to 93.3 million, and so on. There is no type of output whose production in the past years has failed to increase considerably. This is an unquestionable fact. Yet the party realizes that the successes achieved in the further upsurge of agriculture give no right whatever for complacency. The growth of the population's requirements is outstripping the production of the most important food products and raw materials for industry. Even though, in itself, this phenomenon is a most vivid confirmation of the steady growth of the prosperity of the Soviet people, the party is doing, and will continue to do, everything necessary for the production of produce to outstrip, in the final account, the pace of their consumption growth. The CPSU is displaying tremendous concern for the comprehensive development of agriculture. It is seeking new resources to improve its material and technical base and is taking the necessary organizational measures to raise the level of management of this most important sector of the country's economy.

Speaking of the contemporary agrarian policy as the party's strategy and tactic in the field of agriculture under developed socialist conditions, Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev called for "focusing the party's attention on the solution of the most topical problems of agricultural production and the elimination of its bottlenecks, and the more effective utilization of the funds we have invested and are investing in the upsurge of this sector; mobilize the party and the people for the successful fulfillment of the five-year plan in terms of increasing the production and purchases of agricultural commodities and the implementation of the program for strengthening the material and technical base of the countryside." This will be of essential significance in the formulation of the 11th Five-Year Plan and the successful conversion of agriculture into a highly developed economic sector.

The new 1980 year plays a particular role in the implementation of the party's plans for agricultural upsurge. As in a number of other sectors, due to the fact that this is the decisive year of the five-year plan, and taking into consideration the shortages accumulated over the past four years, the annual production assignments of kolkhozes and sovkhoses will be far more stressed. Realizing this, following the party's appeal, the Soviet people are increasing their labor energy. A number of kolkhozes and sovkhoses and entire rayons, oblasts, krays and republics have launched a struggle for the fulfillment and overfulfillment of the plan for the production of agricultural commodities this year, eliminate the shortages of past years and honorably fulfill the 10th Five-Year Plan, entering the 11th on a reliable basis.

To head and convert into a nationwide movement the noble initiative of the leaders in the 1980 socialist competition is the sacred obligation and the party and state duty of all party organizations, soviets of peoples deputies and agricultural organs.

"Lenin's theory of the agrarian problem and the ideas and principles of his cooperative plan," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the July 1978 CC CPSU Plenum, "were, and remain, the tools of our party. The CPSU is invariably guided by them and is developing them further in accordance with specific historical conditions. V. I. Lenin's doctrine and legacy will remain our accurate compass in the elaboration and implementation of the plans for the further development of agriculture."

Armed with a scientifically substantiated agrarian policy, tested over long years of practical economic management, and firmly following the planned strategic line effectiveness and quality, the Leninist party is mobilizing all efforts and means for reaching new and higher levels in all production sectors, new heights in the solution of social problems and the further upsurge of the material and cultural standards of the rural working people. As in the past, the party considers the guarantee for new successes along this way the systematic implementation of the ideas and principles formulated at the historical March 1965 CC CPSU Plenum.

5003

CSO: 1802

INTERFARM COOPERATION: EXPERIENCE, PROBLEMS, QUEST

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 80 pp 40-50

[Article by V. Gvozdev, first deputy chairman, Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers, and Belorussian SSR Gosplan chairman]

[Text] As throughout the country, the broad comprehensive program elaborated at the March 1965 CC CPSU Plenum and further developed in the documents of subsequent Central Committee plenums, the decisions of the 23d, 24th and 25th party congresses, and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's works and addresses, is being adamantly implemented in Belorussia.

Following the March 1965 CC CPSU Plenum, profound quality changes took place in the production forces of the countryside. Within that period our republic invested in agriculture over 13.3 billion rubles in state and kolkhoz funds, as a result of which agricultural productive capital in kolkhozes and sovkhoses rose by 4.2 factor. Power capacities in the countryside rose by a 2.9 factor; the number of tractors doubled, while that of electric motors increased sevenfold. The amounts of chemical and organic fertilizer applied rose considerably. The liming of acid soils is taking place on a broader scale, and general farming standards have risen.

All this has had a favorable influence on the productivity of the main agricultural production tool--the land. Whereas between 1961 and 1965 average grain yields in the kolkhozes, sovkhoses and other state farms in the republic did not exceed 8.3 quintals per hectare, they rose to 22.6 quintals between 1976 and 1979. Within the same period average annual milk production rose by a 2.4 factor; meat production tripled. Within that period labor productivity rose by a factor of nearly 2.5.

The farmers and all working people in the republic consider it their task to utilize the increased economic and material and technical possibilities and intrafarm reserves for increasing agricultural production effectiveness and quality more fully and with the highest possible returns.

A number of factors affect increases in effectiveness and quality. At the present stage, however, one of the most important among them is agricultural production specialization and concentration, based on interfarm cooperation and agro-industrial integration.

As a result of the purposeful work done by party, soviet and economic organs, and scientists and practical workers, a variety of interfarm units were developed in the republic. At the beginning of 1980 we had 277 kolkhozes and sovkhoses performing the production functions of interfarm enterprises, 23 specialized interfarm enterprises, 766 interfarm organizations and services, 23 sectorial associations and rayon associations essentially performing the functions of coordinating joint production activities.

As we know, natural conditions in the Belorussian SSR favor the development of animal husbandry, cattle breeding in particular. Over one-half of the rural manpower resources and about 60 percent of the agricultural productive capital of kolkhozes and sovkhoses are concentrated in this sector. Animal husbandry accounts for 75-80 percent of marketable agricultural output and for over 75 percent of overall farm income. However, the further development of animal husbandry and its conversion to an industrial base are held back, in a number of cases, by the shortage of feed and highly productive cattle, and the low breeding qualities of the livestock. For this reason, today the republic is developing on an accelerated basis specialization, concentration and interfarm cooperation, above all in sectors engaged in the production of feed perennial grass seed and highly productive cattle. A considerable share of capital investments is going into agricultural chemization, reclamation and mechanization.

In recent years the number of farms engaged in the growing of industrial, vegetable and other crops has been reduced. Yet the share of such crops in the structure of the cultivated land has risen. A network of specialized farms has been developed for the production of grain seeds, leguminous crops and perennial grasses insuring intensive seed growing and extensive use in this sector of the elements of industrial technology. In 1978, for example, the spetskhozes supplied the kolkhozes and sovkhoses producing marketable grain a considerable quantity of quality seeds for grain crops and the share of specialized seed-growing farms of the Belsemtravob"yedineniye [Belorussian Grass Seed Growing Association] reached 63 percent of the overall output of perennial grass seeds.

Major shifts related to the intensified specialization and increased level of production concentration occurred in animal husbandry itself. At the beginning of 1980 the republic opened 32 milk production complexes (for 600 or more cows each); 6 cattle raising and feeding complexes (for 5,000 or more head of cattle); 15 for hog breeding (for 12,000, 24,000, 54,000 or 108,000 hogs per year); 7 for pregnant heifers (for 2,500 or more head of cattle). In 1979 the average Belorussian farm had over 2,000 head of cattle, compared with 1,300 in 1970. Today 293 farms are specializing in cattle feeding. In 1978 the average spetskhov sold slightly under 1,750 head of cattle, weighing 675 tons in live weight. Over 70 percent of the republic's kolkhozes and sovkhoses today have dairy farms with 500 or more

cows. Milk production per farm has increased by a factor of 1.5. In 1979 the specialized farms raised 95,000 pregnant heifers, or 25 percent of their overall number in the republic. Successful work is being done by 218 spatskhozoes engaged in the production of pork. Such farms average 3,648 hogs. In 1978 the big mechanized farms and complexes accounted for 28.5 percent of the pork produced in the republic. As to sheep breeding, currently it is essentially focused in 97 specialized farms and interfarm enterprises. Considerable successes have been achieved in production specialization and concentration in poultry breeding. Whereas 10 years ago 203 farms were engaged in poultry breeding, today there are 60 enterprises within the system of the Belorussian SSR Ptitseprom [Poultry Breeding Industry] system, including ten sectorial associations which account for 92.5 percent of the production of eggs and 85.3 percent of the poultry meat.

The big mechanized farms and industrial complexes created in the republic made it possible, in 1978 alone, to save 27.1 million rubles and release about 6,000 workers from the production of milk and the raising of cattle and hogs. Production specialization and concentration, and the use of industrial technology make it possible to increase labor productivity in animal husbandry by a factor of five or six, and lower feed outlays per unit of finished product 25-30 percent.

Practical experience has indicated that the development of interfarm cooperation and the successful joint activities of its participants largely depend on the successful development of the system of economic interrelationships among them. As early as 1972 the republic completed the elaboration of a method for substantiating clearing prices in production associations. At the beginning of the five-year plan "Methodological Recommendations on the Procedure Governing Economic Relations Within Agricultural Production Associations of the Belorussian SSR" were drafted. In addition to clearing prices, they included a procedure for setting up a joint capital investments fund. In order to provide more effect aid to the farms, additional clearing prices for raised pregnant heifers and young offspring were set in 1975.

The creation of big animal husbandry complexes and farms in the individual farms and on an interfarm basis, and their use of industrial technology required essentially new forms of labor organization. Such forms were developed and applied and had a beneficial influence on livestock and labor productivity. For example, today a single operator of the complex at the Mir Sovkhoz-Combine in Baranovichskiy Rayon, Brestskaya Oblast, cares for up to 1,100 head of cattle. At the dairy complex of the Kolkhoz imeni Krasnaya Armiya, Vitebskiy Rayon, Vitebskaya Oblast, five masters of machine milking are handling 800 cows.

The new labor organization principles are being applied in crop growing sectors as well. Here big mechanized brigades are being set up, working on the basis of the assembly line-group method. A number of rayons in the

republic have set up interfarm detachments in charge of feed procurement, crop harvesting and other operations. Practical experience proved that such subunits are making more effective use of the equipment, power equipment in particular. Thus a single detachment in charge of feed procurement in the interfarm irrigation organization in Oktyabr'skiy Rayon, Gomel'skaya Oblast, annually produces 11,000 or more tons of haylage.

As in any new project, difficulties and shortcomings cannot be avoided in pursuing the course of agricultural production specialization and concentration. In particular, the level of concentration of industrial crops, vegetables and potatoes is rising at an unsatisfactory rate. A number of republic kolkhozes and sovkhoses are still engaged in the raising of two labor-intensive crops each (flax and sugar beets). This makes it impossible to consolidate these sectors to the optimum level, base their cultivation on comprehensive mechanization and thus drastically upgrade production effectiveness. The development of specialized feed production is in its initial stage. Nor could we be satisfied with the pace of work in concentrating the raising of cattle, hogs and sheep.

The managers and specialists in interfarm enterprises and agro-industrial associations are feeling ever more acutely the lack of clear scientific recommendations concerning the optimal dimensions of such enterprises in terms of the various sectors and directions of agricultural production, the effective combination of their various services and the regulation of economic relations among the participants in such cooperation. In particular, clearing prices and profit distribution methods must be improved further. So far they have been set and operate in animal husbandry only. There is virtually no methodology for determining clearing prices and prices themselves for crop growing products--seeds, grasses, potatoes, grain and several others. Nor is there any clarity as to conditions under which the participants in interfarm cooperation would find it expedient to apply clearing prices or whenever they should add to this method any profit distribution. In a word, the problems of specialization and concentration of agricultural production must be resolved on a comprehensive basis. Also important here are efforts to insure the further development of the material and technical base and select the most effective methods for specialization and cooperation and for perfecting economic relations among participants. Our rural workers have the right to rely on the interested help of agrarian scientists in the solution of all these problems.

II

The history of the socialist reorganization of the Soviet countryside is rich in economic searches and experiments. The importance of such searches is particularly great today, in the stage of developed socialism, when profound qualitative changes are taking place in the countryside, including those related to the intensification of specialization and upgrading the levels of concentration of agricultural production on the basis of interfarm cooperation and agro-industrial integration.

Our republic's agricultural workers are also making their contribution to the all-union fund of progressive experience. Thus extensive work on intensifying specialization and raising the level of agricultural production concentration was carried in Gomel'skiy Rayon, Gomel'skaya Oblast. Thanks to this, substantial changes were achieved here in the growth of the productivity and marketability of fields and livestock farms and in lowering production costs. Let us take as an example the Gomel' Interfarm Association, which has specialized in beef production. It was organized in 1975 on the basis of the progressive Kolkhoz imeni Uritskiy, which has an extensive area in crops--44,800 hectares, including 24,900 hectares of plow land. This farm cooperated with 16 rayon kolkhozes with the task of raising meat production to a maximum extent and lower production costs, and equalize economic conditions for expanded reproduction and social development. To this effect it was decided to build in the Kolkhoz imeni Uritskiy a highly mechanized livestock breeding complex for the intensive raising of 12,000 head of young cattle offspring supplied by the shareholding farms.

The organizational-legal relations within the association are regulated by a set of rules formulated in accordance with the standard Regulation on the Production Association in Agriculture, approved by the 7 December 1978 USSR Council of Ministers decree. The bylaws of the association were drafted as well.

The basic principles on which cost accounting relations were set up within the association were the material incentive of each shareholding kolkhoz, based on joint work results, and the distribution of profits precisely in accordance with the contribution made by the individual farm to the achievement of such results. It was decided that the size of the share to be invested in the construction of the animal husbandry complex by the participating farms would be proportional to the share of each one of them in the overall amount of farmland assigned to the association (on 100-point basis); the amount of the annual payments would be based on the plan for construction and installation work. The head farm was given the functions of client to whose account the participating farms deposited their funds. Practical experience indicated that concentrating funds, material-technical and manpower resources is one of the main conditions for the normal functioning of the interfarm complex.

The most complex problem to be resolved was that of organizing fodder production. In the final account, all shareholding kolkhozes agreed to assign the main duty of securing fodder for the cattle to the Kolkhoz imeni Uritskiy, for the distant transportation of fodder from other farms in the rayon might result in feed interruptions and put a heavy burden on production costs. Estimates proved that in order to satisfy feed requirements the fertility of the entire farmland of the head farm had to be greatly upgraded within a short time and that the output of feed units per hectare had to be raised from 28 quintals (1974 level) to 60 quintals. The task was carried out as early as 1978.

A great deal was accomplished to improve economic relations among the cooperators. The system of clearing prices, supplemented with a final distribution of profits based on annual results, in accordance with the share of each farm in delivering young offspring and fodder, and in construction and equipping the interfarm project, was considered as the most acceptable system for settling accounts among the association farms.

The members of the cooperative had to make certain amendments, within the association, to the existing system of agricultural procurements, even though they remained unchanged on the rayon level. As we know, the current system of procurements recognizes as the basic supplier the juridically autonomous and, in the majority of cases, multisectorial farm. In other words, as a rule, the plans issued the specific kolkhozes and sovkhoses call for deliveries to the state not of a single, but of several types of farm goods. Therefore, the head farm of the association, specializing in the production of a single commodity, finds itself in a rather complex situation. First of all, no one relieves it from the delivery of other types of agricultural commodities; secondly, depending on the profitability of the sector in which this farm is specializing, it may earn considerable or very low income.

Practical experience suggested a solution. It was clear that in order to meet its plan for milk purchases, for example, it would have been practical for the Kolkhoz imeni Uritskiy to raise a dairy herd, i.e., essentially to rebuild its multisectorial production. The other members of the association which had the necessary conditions to do so could meet the plan for the sale of milk to the state. In 1979 the members of the cooperative sold the state, on behalf of the Kolkhoz imeni Uritskiy, 656 tons of grain, 908 tons of potatoes and 1,307 tons of milk. Assessing that the farm owed the members of the cooperative 362,000 rubles for the goods, in turn, the head enterprise undertook to fulfill the joint plan for cattle sales.

In addition to the basic earnings, based on state purchase prices, the participating kolkhozes earn additional payment from the interfarm enterprise for goods sold on behalf of the head farm. As a result, the profitability of this share of the output supplied for the Kolkhoz imeni Uritskiy, which accumulates substantial profits, rises considerably. Thus in 1979 the shareholding farms earned an additional 220,000 rubles for the milk sold on behalf of the Kolkhoz imeni Uritskiy.

The members of the cooperative are equally interested in delivering to the head enterprise young cattle for raising. In 1979 the Kolkhoz imeni Uritskiy paid the shareholding kolkhozes 400 rubles per two-week-old calf. Naturally, in the past the kolkhozes could not even dream of receiving such high payments.

Despite the fact that the cooperators produce goods of varying profitability, the production and economic relations which have developed in the course of such cooperation and the financial results of enterprises

activities objectively eliminate economic disparities among them. The overall net income averaged per kolkhov rose from 296,000 rubles in 1974 to 502,000 in 1979. Differences in farm profitability levels were reduced considerably.

This is a direct result of the growth of productivity and marketability of the interfarm complex and the lowering of production cost of its basic output. In fact, whereas in the first year of work of this association meat production per 100 hectares of farmland averaged 298 quintals, it rose to 691.2 quintals in 1979. Here approximately 7 quintals of feed units and 7.5 man/hours are spent per quintal of weight increase. This is, respectively, lower by factors of almost 2 and 6 compared with average republic indicators. As a result, over the past 3 years production costs per quintal of increased weight averaged 127 rubles for the association, or below the republic's average by a factor of 1.5. The per capita output of the livestock breeders is 403 quintals of meat--far higher than that of conventional livestock breeding farms. It is no accident that in 1979 beef production profitability here reached 82 percent, compared with about 30 percent for the republic at large (in 1978). All construction and installation outlays of the complex were recovered in two years.

The work of the collective of Gomel' association for the intensification of fodder production and, on this basis, upgrading the productivity and marketability of cattle breeding for beef was approved by the Communist Party of Belorussia Central Committee and recommended for extensive use by other Belorussian rayons. Estimates have indicated that even if only one enterprise is set up per rayon of the Kolkhov imeni Uritskiy-type, with similar production indicators, the republic could additionally produce about 200,000 tons of meat and over 600 million rubles' worth of net profit.

The experience of the Gomel' Beef Production Association also indicated the most effective means for resolving problems related to strengthening the fodder base. The creation of big specialized enterprises for intensive livestock raising has brought about specialization in grass-seed growing as the main prerequisite for the organization of a "green conveyor belt." On the basis of cooperation of available resources, one after another, a number of oblasts in our republic began to build enterprises for feed production and processing, plants for further processing of perennial grass seeds, irrigation organizations, and so on.

The Ola feed enterprise was set up in Zhlobinskiy Rayon, Gomel'skaya Oblast, in 1976, using underproductive floodlands, through the joint efforts of six farms and a reclamation organization. It has done a great deal to upgrade the fertility of this land. As a result, productivity per hectare (there are nearly 2,000 hectares) tripled, averaging 46 quintals of feed units in 1978. In addition to already operating enterprises, 16 similar enterprises are in their organizational stage.

For the past few years the Gomel'skaya Oblast Association for Grass Seed Growing has been successfully working in the republic as part of the Belsemtravoob'yedineniye. The Gomel' association includes the 25 kolkhozes, 9 sovkhoses, 2 experimental bases engaged in the production of choice grass seeds, and 2 enterprises for further seed treatment. Over 15 percent of the arable land of the specialized seed farms is in seed-grass crops. Seed harvests here are higher than the republic's average by a factor of nearly 1.5, while production costs are only one-half those of conventional farms. In 1978 the specialized farms within the association accounted for over 60 percent of the perennial grass seeds grown in the oblast.

The increased volume of output, its increased effectiveness and the equalization of reproduction conditions in kolkhozes and sovkhoses participating in interfarm cooperation are largely determined by the approach to the distribution of capital investments. Most of them are in specialized production sectors as earmarked by the general plan for the development and location of agricultural enterprises, as approved by the republic's Council of Ministers for the 10th and 11th Five-Year plans. The creation of animal husbandry complexes, poultry farms, greenhouse combines, enterprises for further seed processing, and fodder production enterprises, established in accordance with the general plan, will make it possible to locate more efficiently production forces in the republic's territory and to upgrade the effectiveness of capital investments.

III

Developing and strengthening interfarm cooperation, we must not stop half way. We must go further in the way of progressive socioeconomic changes in the villages, toward agro-industrial integration.

Presently our republic has 57 agro-industrial enterprises based on the facilities of alcohol, starch and canning plants. An agro-industrial association based on the facilities of the Bykhov Canning Plant was set up within the system of Belorussian Ministry of Food Industry.

The activities of the Brilevo Agro-Industrial Enterprise, in Gomel'skaya Oblast, offers a convincing example of the advantages of agricultural integration. It includes a cannery with a capacity for 7 million standard cans per year and a wine-making shop. Approximately one-third of the vegetables it sells the state are fresh. The high effectiveness of this enterprise may be judged by the fact alone that its 1979 profit from the production and marketing of truck-gardening products totaled 342,000 rubles, or 35.8 percent of the overall enterprise profits (954,300 rubles). Animal husbandry as well is successfully developing here. In 1979 the enterprise produced 2,460.3 quintals of milk per 100 hectares of farmland and a profit averaging 1,552 rubles per hectare of farmland, whereas the indicator for the republic's sovkhoses averaged 67 rubles (less by a factor of 23).

Currently the party, soviet and agricultural and planning organs in the republic are paying great attention to the formulation of the basic directions, ways and organizational forms for the further development of agro-industrial integration. In particular, in accordance with the instruction of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, together with the agricultural organizations the republic's Gosplan is working on the establishment, on an experimental basis, of seven agro-industrial associations based on enterprises for the processing of flax, vegetables, potatoes and sugar beets. Along with the organizational-economic basis for such enterprises, a draft temporary regulation has been formulated and already approved by the interested departments. Proposals have also been drafted to develop agro-industrial cooperation for 1980-1990 and have been taken into consideration in the formulation of the plans for the development of republic's agriculture in the immediate future.

Yet unresolved problems remain in the efforts to develop agro-industrial integration in the republic. The current financing procedure does not allow agricultural and industrial enterprises to make joint use of material and financial resources for production purposes under cooperated conditions. This procedure substantially hinders the development of the integration process. The interest of the project adamantly calls for making the existing legal norms consistent with the new forms of production organization, and allow agricultural and industrial enterprises and all organizations involved in integration to make joint use of material and financial resources, within the framework of the state plan, in resolving joint production and social problems.

Nor should we tolerate any longer a situation in which procedures for setting up economic incentive and bonus funds in the processing industry are substantially different from those in agriculture. As a result, under intergration conditions, the enterprises have quite unequal opportunities to participate in joint production development. Departmental lack of coordination between agricultural and industrial enterprises is having a particularly adverse effect on the development of agro-industrial integration. Such lack of coordination greatly prevents the already operating agro-industrial enterprises to intensify production specialization. All this, in our view, calls for the creation of a single intersectorial management system for agro-industrial complexes.

"What we need," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the July 1978 CC CPSU Plenum, "are not all sorts of associations, but associations which truly raise to a new level the socialist socialization of production and labor, which are based on the latest scientific and technological achievements, insure the highest possible labor productivity and yield a maximum amount of inexpensive goods."

Presently the sectorial institutes of the republic's Ministry of Agriculture and Belgiprosel'stroy are drafting the regulations for a comprehensive experiment which will involve the participation of 11 farms. We hope that

this experiment will enable us to develop in detail the organizational-production structure and the parameters of the farms with different specializations, substantiate a capital construction program, refine the basic stages for its implementation and determine cost effectiveness or, briefly stated, give us the aspect of the "farms of the future."

IV

Interfarm cooperation plays an active role in resolving not only production-economic but social problems of rural development. Its impact on upgrading the level of production socialization and of bringing closer to each other the two forms of socialist ownership, improving social relations in agriculture and gradually eliminating the major disparities between mental and physical labor and between town and country is unquestionable.

At the Gomel' Meat Production Association we discussed, within a relatively short time—from 1974 to 1979--the capital-labor ratio rose by a 1.8 factor. The electric power-labor ratio rose even more noticeably. The growing flow of equipment which our industry is sending the countryside makes it possible for the members of this association, as for many others, to apply not partial, but comprehensive production automation and mechanization. This radically changes the nature and content of agricultural labor and steadily leads to reducing the share of heavy physical and unqualified labor, and to the growth of professional groups of workers engaged in controlling and tuning semiautomatic and automatic machinery.

The handling of complex machinery and mechanisms called for the retraining of a number of association workers. This led to the appearance of new skills never heard of in the old countryside. Compared with 1974, the number of people without special skills working in the association was reduced by 557 people. Numerous observations convincingly proved the fact that the peasants who have acquired a skill develop a stable interest in the systematic expansion of their politic, economic and technical knowledge.

The changes which have taken place in labor conditions and work system actively influence the fuller satisfaction of the spiritual requirements of the workers in the complex. Currently the workday of a cattle-breeding operator is seven to eight hours. Concerned with improving labor conditions in the public farm and with upgrading its productivity, the association managers pay great attention to the mechanization of labor-intensive processes in the private plots of kolkhoz members, which still play an important role in the production of food products. The harvesting of grain crops and potatoes of the private plots, and fodder procurements and deliveries are done, as a rule, by the farm itself. This makes it possible for the rural workers to have more free time. It strengthens the ties between their private interests with the interests of the collective and society.

Social progress is vividly manifested also in the steady upsurge of the living standards of the rural workers. Here increased wages play the main role. In the Gomel' association it rose 11.7 percent between 1974 and 1978 and man/day earnings rose 30 percent, exceeding 8 rubles. The average monthly wage of a mechanizer in the association's kolkhozes was 192 rubles in 1979 and 200 rubles in the head farm--the Kolkhoz imeni Uritskiy. Social consumption funds, which compared with 1974 have nearly doubled, are playing an ever greater role in upgrading the living standard of the rural workers.

Housing and cultural construction is taking place on a broad scale. Over past five years alone the association's kolkhozes built and commissioned 213 apartment units for kolkhoz member families, 7 children's institutions for 540 children and a house of culture with 325 seats out of funds withheld for the replenishment of the capital fund. Construction in the other republic rayons is intensive as well.

The course toward intensified production specialization and concentration raised new higher requirements concerning the work of cultural-educational institutions in the country. A quest is underway for more effective forms of management of cultural construction. In a number of rayons, together with interested parties, the party organizations experimented with the creation of cultural complexes. This new structural unit makes it possible on the basis of the general plan to insure unity of ideological-political, labor and moral upbringing in accordance with the characteristics of the various population groups and their interests. Voluntary coordination councils were set up to guide the work of the cultural complexes, headed by the secretaries of the party organizations of the base farms.

The party committees and the soviets of people's deputies are attentively studying the influence of social factors on the growth of the labor and sociopolitical activeness of the rural workers. For example, this was the topic of a practical science conference held in Gomel'skiy Rayon by scientists from the Belorussian State University, the republic's agricultural academy, Gomel' University and Mozyr' Pedagogical Institute. The February 1979 republic seminar, held in Minskaya Oblast, was dedicated to the social development of the villages, and the accelerated progress of agricultural production under the conditions of its conversion to an industrial base. The seminar was addressed by Comrade P. M. Masherov, CC CPSU Politburo candidate member and Communist Party of Belorussia Central Committee first secretary.

The solution of problems related to agricultural production specialization and concentration required a certain reorganization of ideological work by the party committees. The purpose of this work, among other things, is to help in the psychological reorientation of agricultural cadres, to surmount the forces of inertia and obsolete stereotypes of economic management, and to develop a new approach to the organization of the socialist competition.

With a view to coordinating the activities of the primary party organizations of farms within the associations and of interfarm enterprises, experimentally, a number of rayons in the republic have set up councils of party organization secretaries. Practical experience has shown that such councils are becoming a reliable means for intensifying the party's influence on the activities of cooperated production facilities. The main feature of the work of such councils is the organizational-political support of assignments facing interfarm enterprises, and the coordination of the actions of party organizations of kolkhozes which are members of one or another association.

The council and its sections work on the basis of long-term plan broken down into annual periods. The council's sessions take place once or twice every quarter directly at the farms on which the solution of the discussed problems depends above all. As a consultative organ, the council of secretaries formulates its recommendations on various problems of party work, studies and sums up the experience of the best party organizations and organizes party aktiv seminars attended by kolkhoz and sovkhos specialists.

At the Ola Feed Production Interfarm Enterprise, in Zhlobinskiy Rayon, such a council was set up by decision of the rayon party committee bureau in September 1977. From its very first days of work the council undertook to study the situation regarding the selection, placement and training of the agricultural specialists who had organized the interfarm enterprise. Following a thorough study and discussion of the problem, the council of secretaries recommended that all party organizations hold party meetings to discuss "The Tasks of Party Organizations in Upgrading the Role of Specialists in the Further Development of Agricultural Production." Specific measures were earmarked at the party meetings, which contributed to the successful solution of the problems. Currently all most-important production sectors have been strengthened by trained specialists.

The council steadily supervises yet another most important work sector: the study and dissemination of leading experience in the collectives. Thus the council studied the practical experience of the party organization at the Kolkhoz imeni Kalinin on party-political support of plans and socialist pledges related to fodder procurements. The council approached the rayon party committee with the suggestion to hold a rayon seminar at the Kolkhoz imeni Kalinin on the subject of fodder production with a view to the dissemination of this experience. The seminar was held. Currently this experience is being successfully used by all rayon farms.

Life convincingly proves the high effectiveness and great transforming power of the party's course toward the intensification of specialization and upgrading the level of agricultural production concentration on the basis of interfarm cooperation and agro-industrial integration. The Leninist agrarian policy of the CPSU has given a broad scale and scope and high pace of economic and social development to the countryside. This comprehensive process is of tremendous importance in the successful progress of our country in the building of communism.

KUBAN'S RICE VIRGIN LAND

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 80 pp 51-61

[Article by Hero of Socialist Labor S. Medunov, first secretary of the Krasnodarskiy Kray CPSU Committee]

[Text] I recall an unusual landscape: the airplane made a broad turn and under it opened a cup of blue-green world of mosquito-infested swamps and marshes, a channel in the twilight, glimmering little lakes and stretches of water. Reeds were whispering and the free wind of the steppe was making waves on this endless area. This virgin world in the lower reaches of the Kuban' covers over 400,000 hectares.

For ages these lands had remained outside the realm of human activities. Tempestuous river floods hindered the development of farming. In 1974, however, by decision of our party's Central Committee, the reorganization of the flats surrounding the Sea of Azov into the rice granary of the country was undertaken. As early as March 1979, in the meeting with his electorate, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, said: "The development of the 'rice virgin land'--the famous flats in the lower reaches of the Kuban'--is nearing completion." Today the bold plan of developing a major base for the production of this white grain on an industrial basis in Krasnodarskiy Kray has been successfully implemented thanks to the constant concern of the CPSU Central Committee, the Soviet Government and, personally, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev. A tremendous volume of reclamation and construction work was carried out. Tremendous efforts were invested in the agro-technical development of the new irrigated areas. The water-resources complex includes 12 water reservoirs, one of which is the biggest in the Northern Caucasus--the Krasnodarskiy Reservoir with a 3.1 billion cubic meters capacity, 34,000 km of canals, 185,000 hydroengineering installations, 1,235 pumping stations and 1,355 km of technological communications lines. This makes it possible to grow guaranteed crop yields on an area in excess of 600,000 hectares. The outstanding traditions of the conquerers of the Virgin Lands of the 1950's are being increased in the Kuban'.

Rice growing in the kray already has a long history. The initial attempts to grow this "Saracen oats" in the lower reaches of the swampy areas were

undertaken by the cossacks who had returned from the Turkish campaign in the mid-19th century. However, they did not know how to care for the rice and harvest it. The grain crumbled, wild species developed and the plants degenerated. The present development of this crop began only under the Soviet system. In 1929 the Labor and Defense Council passed the decision on the agricultural development of the Kuban' flats. Even though at that time the state was unable to allocate considerable funds for this purpose, work was begun, recalling the name of D. P. Zhloba, the hero of the civil war and former commander of the Steel Division. As the head of "Plavstroy" and of the Azov-Black Sea Rice Trust, at the beginning of the 1930's, together with a group of enthusiasts he laid the foundations of Kuban' rice growing. Professors P. A. Vitte and B. A. Shumakov contributed a great deal to the development of this sector.

The war and the German-fascist occupation caused tremendous damage to the hydraulic reclamation facilities of the kray. Hydroengineering installations were totally destroyed. The rice systems were made inoperative. In the first postwar years rice growing was restored at a slow pace. There was a shortage of funds for the reconstruction of the irrigated areas and the repair of hydroengineering systems. Between 1946 and 1955 only 10,000 hectares of new areas were developed. In the 1956-1966 decade, however, already 50,000 hectares were commissioned. At that time there were three rice irrigation systems covering a total of 70,000 hectares in the Kuban' flats.

The April 1966 visit which L. I. Brezhnev and A. N. Kosygin paid to the construction projects for irrigation systems and the leading farms, and their talks with land reclamation workers and rice growers were an outstanding event in the life of the kray's party organization and an important landmark in the development of rice growing as a national economic sector. At the end of May 1966 the party's Central Committee Plenum passed the decree "On the Extensive Development of Land Reclamation for Obtaining High and Stable Grain and Other Farm Crop Yields." The decree called for the creation in the country, on the basis of irrigated areas, guaranteed grain and other crops in the Northern Caucasus, along the Volga, in the south of the Ukraine, in Moldavia, in the lower reaches of the Amudar'ya and in some areas of Kazakhstan.

Addressing the plenum, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out that, "One of the primary and important measures within the complex of measures aimed at increasing grain production on irrigated land . . . is the extensive development of rice growing." He reemphasized the priority of the task set at the March 1965 CC CPSU Plenum of "developing major engineering rice growing systems and fully insuring the country's rice needs in the forthcoming years."

The party members in the Kuban' warmly approved the decisions of the May 1966 CC CPSU Plenum. After their discussion, the party's kray committee plenum adopted a broad plan for the draining of flooded and swamped areas,

controlling Kuban' flows, building water reservoirs, protecting the soil from wind and water erosion, building new irrigation systems, strengthening the production and technical base of design and water resource construction organizations, and training skilled cadres for irrigated farming.

The Main Administration for Water Resources Construction and Sovkhoz Building--Glavkuban'ristroy--was set up on the initiative of the kray party organization within the system of the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources. Today it combines four construction-installation trusts, a construction administration, the Promstroymaterialy Trust, an automotive transport trust, an information-computer center and other organizations. The overall number of its personnel has reached 30,000 and the annual volume of contracting projects has risen by a factor of 10. The Main Administration has become the biggest water projects construction organization in the country.

In the Eighth Five-Year Plan the pace of reclamation rose by a 2.5 factor. At the beginning of the Ninth Five-Year Plan the area of irrigated land in the kray totaled about 190,000 hectares, 116,000 of which were engineering systems. Whereas previously rice growing was concentrated primarily in Slavyanskiy and Krasnoarmeyskiy rayons, now it was expanded with the addition of Abinskiy, Krymskiy, Severskiy and Temryukskiy rayons and Adygeyskaya Autonomous Oblast. The Fedorovskiy Hydraulic Center became the biggest hydroengineering project built in the Eighth Five-Year Plan. It collects water from the Kuban' to supply the rice growing systems.

The high pace of reclamation construction adamantly called for the creation of the necessary water stocks for the simultaneous watering of the expanded plantations. It was also necessary to resolve the age-old problem of protecting the vast territories of the lower reaches of the rivers from floods. All this had to be accomplished without ignoring the interests of riverine transportation, fishing, other national economic sectors and environmental protection. A big water reservoir was the only possible solution to this problem. In May 1970 the USSR Council of Ministers passed the special decree "On Accelerating the Construction of the Krasnodar Water Reservoir and of the Rice Irrigation Systems in Krasnodarskiy Kray."

In the light of this decree, the kray party committee formulated a number of comprehensive practical measures which were discussed and approved by the primary party organizations and labor collectives, and at zonal seminars-conferences of rice growers and hydraulic system construction workers. The construction project was proclaimed an all-union Komsomol project and rapidly gathered good speed. Virtually all rayons in the kray participated in the work. Tens of enterprises throughout the country supplied materials and equipment and fulfilled the Kuban' orders ahead of schedule. The building of the Krasnodar Water Reservoir, with a capacity of over three billion cubic meters, was under the control of the party's Central Committee and, personally, of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev.

The water reservoir, covering an area of 440 square kilometers, 46 km long and 9.5 km wide, was completed ahead of schedule. In their congratulatory telegram to the participants in the construction project and to all the people of the Kuban', the party's Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers highly rated this labor victory and expressed their confidence in the further successful development of reclamation in the kray.

However, major possibilities for increasing rice growing remained in the Kuban'. The beginning of the storming of the Virgin Lands in its flats was marked by the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Accelerating the Work for the Development of the Sea of Azov Flats in Order to Further Increase Rice Production in Krasnodarskiy Kray," passed on Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's initiative. This document called for raising the gross rice harvest of the kray's kolkhozes and sovkhozes to one million tons by 1980, organizing rice growing systems on the flats covering 100,000 hectares and implementing measures aimed at considerably increasing the production of vegetables to be delivered to the cities and industrial centers in the country, and of grass meal and other types of fodder to meet the needs of the mixed fodder industry and the kray's kolkhoz and sovkhoz animal husbandry.

The party's kraykom plenum formulated specific measures aimed at implementing the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree for 1974-1980 and a work program for the creation of modern rice growing systems, along with the agricultural development of the land, and the construction of industrial and cultural-residential projects. The plenum's decisions were discussed by all city and rayon CPSU committees and primary party organizations of kolkhozes, sovkhozes and construction and exploitation organizations, and at labor collective meetings which defined their share in the development of the Azov Virgin Lands.

Designers and land reclamation workers mounted a decisive offensive against the Virgin Lands, moving ever deeper within it, under the hard conditions of roadlessness and Kuban' floods. Within a short time designers from the Kuban'giprovodkhoz Institute developed a new rice system for the Kuban' with advantages compared with the previous system. The construction workers mastered the windbreak leveling of the border strips which preserves the upper fertile soil stratum. This had a positive effect on yields with the very first crops. The recycling of sewage waters for irrigation was applied on an area of almost 40,000 hectares; preassembled structures of a number of hydroengineering systems and pumping stations were used. Comprehensive planning made it possible to develop, together with the irrigation systems, settlements, roads, mechanized threshing floors, take-off strips for agricultural aviation, consumer projects, and so on. The 1,500 members of the design institute fully equipped the construction workers with the technical documents needed for the development of the flats by 1980.

The very first year of work proved that the development of the rice virgin land was even more difficult than assumed. The autumn, winter and spring

thaws became impassible even with the most up-to-date swamp machinery. Helicopters were used to transport mechanizers, repair brigades and equipment to inaccessible sectors. In the hot summer days, when the sun dried out the soil, clouds of most fine peat dust rose from the wheels and tracks of the reclamation machinery. Peat marshes caught on fire frequently and dust and smoke irritated the eyes.

Obstacles of a different nature were encountered as well. In the last war flats had been the arena of fierce battles with the occupation forces. The "Blue Line" passed here and the echo of the war, over 30 years later, could be heard. In many sectors of the construction canals, leveling off the flats, the mechanizers came across substantial quantities of shells and mines. Sappers who disarmed the dangerous piles came to help. All this took precious time. Remains of combat equipment, buried in the swamps, were found as well.

The flats yielded unwillingly. The land reclamation workers seemed to have to fight for every cluster of land. Based on the then existing technology, rice planting on the flatlands could be possible only two to three years following their draining. However, we did not find this technology adequate. The kray party committee instructed Kuban'giprovodkhoz and the scientists from the All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Rice and the agricultural specialists to develop qualitatively new methods which would make it possible to harvest a rice crop no later than one year following the development of the area by the construction workers. The assignment was fulfilled within a short time. The new technology made it possible to build systems immediately following the draining and immediately to deliver them for exploitation. This reduced by at least two years the period of the development of the rice paddies. Thanks to the use of modern equipment, including lasers, the quality of the work sharply improved in the leveling of the flatlands and labor productivity rose.

In order to develop the Virgin Land, as we pointed out, industrial buildings and systems, housing, schools, roads and many other items are necessary. Taking this into consideration, the party kraykom and the Glavkuban'ristroy took energetic measures to build a plant for large-panel house construction within a short time. For the first time the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources mastered the production of modern housing with improved layout. Proper roads and power transmission lines reached once inaccessible areas.

In the final year of the Ninth Five-Year Plan the area in rice reached 137,400 hectares and, for the first time, a crop averaging 50 quintals per hectare was harvested. The gross grain harvest reached 687,000 tons. The Kuban' delegation reported to the 25th CPSU Congress that the task set by the Central Committee on the creation of a domestic industrial base for rice growing had been carried out. It was being further expanded and was undergoing scientific and technical development. However, once again the Kuban' land reclamation workers and rice growers had to blaze virgin paths.

No practical experience existed domestically or abroad to be used as a model and applied in our paddies. We did not find suitable the technology of growing rice on small flats, using minor mechanization facilities and expensive manual labor. The kray party committee faced the kray scientists with the task of developing the type of agricultural equipment for rice growing which would be consistent with the present level of technical facilities and the requirements of the socialist economy. Working closely together, the collectives of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Rice, the Kuban'giprovodkhoz Institute and sovkhoz and kolkhoz rice growing specialists successfully resolved a number of complex scientific and technical and organizational-economic problems of growing rice on an industrial basis.

Scientists and designers of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Rice developed for the Kuban' technology and tried under industrial conditions a number of most interesting machines, which unfortunately have been awaiting their series production for the past several years. They include the 3.6 cultivator-cutter-seeding machine and the 3.6 cultivator-cutter-deep plowing machine, which, used in the fields, would result in a literal transformation of the preparation of the soil for planting: in one run a tractor with such a unit would carry out as many soil cultivation processes as are now accomplished in 7 to 10 runs with a variety of different machines. Yet the USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building is delaying the production of the equipment awaited by the rice growers, even though the corresponding decisions have long been passed by the proper state organs.

The Kuban' rice growing technology is based on extensive mechanization, remote control mechanization and automation of all basic production processes, and in the immediate future the programming of rice crops over large areas.

The process of water distribution based on a single dispatcher service in the kray has been centralized through automation, telemechanics and radio communications. The application of an automated control system to direct the basic activities of water resource projects is nearing completion; 35 big pumping stations and 120 water centers of inter-rayon and intra-rayon importance have been converted to remote control with the help of 353 radio stations and remote control panels, and so on.

Over 600 people have been awarded USSR orders and medals, and 3 leading workers were awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labor for successes in reclamation construction and the application of the Kuban' rice growing system. A big group of specialists and scientists were awarded the 1977 USSR State Prize.

Today the kray has 14 rice irrigation systems, 7 of which are still under construction. The overall irrigated area has reach 400,000 hectares, 227,000 of which are in rice. The kray has become one of the most

important areas in the country for the production of the white grain. We have trained outstanding cadres of land reclamation workers and rice growers. Thanks to this the time for systems repairs, preparation of the soil, sowing and flooding the rice, weeding with chemicals and harvesting has been reduced and a number of such operations have come closer to their optimum level. Agro-technology has been enhanced noticeably. The operational leveling of flats has been improved. The development of crop rotation is nearing completion. Areas planted in clover and other crops suitable for crop rotation have been expanded.

Yet a number of unresolved problems remain in the sector. Disparity is still noted the harvests. Some farms and production subunits obtain less grain per irrigated hectare than the kray's average. A number of farms are slow in applying the most effective crop rotation systems and progressive experience. That is why the kray committee and party raykoms and primary party organizations are strictly supervising the basic field operations and their quality and, above all, the harvest.

We harvest the rice at full ripeness. Ten to 12 days prior to the ripening of the grain the water is released from the flats so that the soil may dry and allow the work of harvesters and combines. As a rule, the separate method is used in harvesting. Standard Kolos or Sibiryak grain combines are used for threshing, retooled by the mechanizers to move on tracks. Unfortunately, these tractors cannot cope with the Kuban' rice, particularly the high yields, and result in great losses. In order to reduce them, the mechanizers are forced to thresh over three times the same windrow, thus losing a great deal of time and excess fuel. Nevertheless, grain losses remain high. The designers have frequently given promises to the rice growers to resolve this problem, but have not kept their word. Yet the development and use of special productive rice harvesting combines would enable us to increase the harvest by a minimum of one ton per hectare in the Kuban' paddies, i.e., give the state additionally about 200,000 tons of rice.

The party, soviet, agricultural and water resource organs, and the kolkhozes and sovkhoses are trying to make effective use of the irrigated land and are achieving positive results with maximum returns. Despite the fact that two out of the four years of the 10th Five-Year Plan had complex weather conditions for rice growing (in the vegetation period the plants were deprived of the necessary amount of positive temperatures), compared with the Ninth Five-Year Plan the average annual output rose 126,000 tons.

The rice growers are working in close contact with the scientists. The collective of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Rice is not only working on major problems of upgrading yields, agro-technology and plant biology, but is giving the production workers substantial practical assistance.

Most farms prepared the soil, seeds and equipment on time for the 1979 harvest. The sowing and flooding of the rice was carried out on an

organized basis. The presowing leveling of the flats was carried out on the entire area. Leveling instruments were used on over half the area. Extensive work was done by the fliers of the Krasnodar Joint Aviation Detachment in fertilizing and chemical weeding of the crops. The entire campaign was completed within scientific and practically confirmed deadlines: sowing by 10 May and harvesting in 10 to 12 calendar days. Thanks to double and, here and there, even triple threshing, the harvested determined on the basis of preliminary control threshing was reached in all flats.

Despite the difficult weather conditions, all this made it possible to average 43.7 quintals of grain per hectare, or an overall harvest of 774,000 tons, and to sell to the state 529,000 tons of rice. Collectives maintaining high farming standards harvested considerably bigger crops. For example, the rice farms in Krasnodar averaged 62.1 quintals per hectare per round; those of Krasnoarmeyskiy Rayon, 50.1; and Kalininskiy Rayon, 46.2 quintals per hectare. On a total area of 7,500 hectares in rice, the rice growers of the Krasnoarmeyskiy Sovkhoz threshed an average of 57.2 quintals per hectare; Ordynskiy Sovkhoz threshed an average of 59 quintals on an area of 4,900 hectares, while Kuban' Training Farm averaged 62.1 quintals on an area of 1,482 hectares.

The best indicators were reached by the initiators of the competition for high yields. All of them, a total of 980 collectives and individual mechanizers and watering workers, achieved outstanding results. Here are some of them: The team headed by A. G. Churikov, from the Kolkhoz imeni XXII S'yezda KPSS, Krasnogvardeysaya Rayon, the team headed by N. A. Shariy from the Put' k Kommunizmu Kolkhoz, Slavyanskiy Rayon; the team headed by L. N. Sinyuk from the Sovetskaya Rossiya, Krasnoarmeyskiy Rayon, and many others averaged 71-76 quintals of rice per hectare. The highest yields of 100 or more quintals of rice per hectare from their assigned flats were achieved by 17 watering workers. They include F. P. Pushkar' from the Svetlyy Put' Sovkhoz, Temrukskiy Rayon, A. A. Kadyrov from the Kolkhoz imeni Michurin, Krasnoarmeyskiy Rayon, L. N. Kholodnyy from the Krasnoye Znamya Kolkhoz, Kalininskiy Rayon, and other masters-rice growers.

The movement for highest yields is spreading and strengthening.

The task of developing the Virgin Land and reaching a rice production of one million tons by the end of the five-year plan will require improvements in the style and methods of party leadership and in the activities of the primary party organizations of kolkhozes, sovkhoses, construction subunits, operational administrations and repair and other organizations.

The implementation of CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree is steadily supervised by the party's kray committee. It bureau and secretariat regularly consider problems of development of land reclamation and rice growing. Among others, reports were submitted by the party committees and boards of the Rossiya Kolkhoz and Krasnoarmeyskiy Rayon and Put' k Kommunizmu Kolkhoz in Slavyanskiy Rayon, the kray agricultural production

administration, the reclamation and water resources administration, the rice sovkhoses trust and the Slavyanskiy, KrasnoarmeySKIY, Krymskiy and Severskiy rayon party committees.

The kray party committee directs the work of the party organizations of soviet and economic organs so that the task of increasing rice production become their personal concern. We organize annual meetings with the initiators of the competition for highest rice crops. The leaders in the movement share their "secrets" for their mastery and their ideas, and submit requests to the kray and rayon organizations. Secretaries, members of the party kraykom bureau and heads of kray departments and organizations attend seminars-conferences of rice growers and reclamation workers. The critical remarks and suggestions expressed at such meetings are summed up and considered by the party kraykom bureau. The party apparatus strictly supervises the course of the implementation of decrees.

We are trying to make all working people realize that the development of the Virgin Land and increasing rice production is the concern of the entire kray party organization and of all kray workers, kolkhoz members, employees and members of the intelligentsia. Every resident of the Kuban' must make his contribution to reaching the million level in rice production. Slogans, stands and posters call for this. This is the topic of the permanent sections in the local press and radio and television transmissions. The slogan "One Million Tons of Kuban' Rice to the State!" is being popularized through all possible means: even textile workers and the personnel of the porcelain plant and of the factory for souvenirs have not remained apart from this project. Land reclamation workers and rice growers have become the most respected people in the Kuban'. Concerts and many of the writings of writers and artists are addressed to them and songs are being composed for them by poets and composers.

The party kraykom pays particular attention to the work of the primary party organizations in the production subunits engaged in the construction and operation of irrigation systems. It pays great attention to improving their structure and to the choice and upbringing of their secretaries and the deployment of party members in such a way as to insure an effective party influence in decisive production sectors.

The kolkhozes and sovkhoses of rice growing rayons number over 2,000 party members, 75 percent of whom are directly engaged in production and 80 percent of whom are mechanizers. Today there is no sector or team without party members or candidate members. Party members head 222 out of 533 teams. One rice grower out of six is a party member. The party members are rallied in 78 primary and 203 shop party organizations and 142 party groups; 66 primary party organization secretaries have higher or unfinished higher education and about one-half of them have good practical experience, having been at work for three or more years. The party organizations are being steadily reinforced by leading sovkhos workers, kolkhoz members and specialists in the national economy.

The CPSU kraykom held a plenum in May 1979 with the following agenda: "On Upgrading the Role of the Primary Party Organizations in Mobilizing the Party Members and All Working People in the Kray for the Implementation of the 1979 Plan and the Five-Year Plan as a Whole." The plenum's decisions are helping to upgrade the level of organizational and political work and the role of the party organizations in the implementation of the tasks set at the 25th CPSU Congress.

The level of party leadership depends not only on the initiative of the primary party organizations, but the extent to which their structure is consistent with the problems resolved by the production collectives. We have acquired positive experience in developing within the primary party organizations temporary party groups based on production characteristics. The creation of such groups strengthens the party's influence in sectors which assume leading importance at specific times.

The mobile and energetic detachments of party members head the socialist competition and are models of organization, discipline and industriousness with which they lead the masses. The effectiveness of the temporary party groups becomes particularly clear in the rice sowing and harvesting. That is why, last year, over 280 additional party groups were set up during the spring and fall seasons.

Practical experience has indicated that wherever CPSU gorkoms and raykoms steadily supervise matters of improving organizational-party work end results become considerably better. Here is a convincing example: Krasnoarmeyskiy Rayon is the leading rice growing rayon in the Kuban'.

The committees are steadily upgrading the vanguard role of the party members. Party members head the socialist competition for raising 75-100 quintals of rice per hectare. The raykom bureau regularly hears reports submitted by primary organizations and party committees on the organizational and political work in the rice growing collectives.

Thanks to the high level of organizational and mass-political work, the CPSU raykom and primary organizations have been able to spread the party influence over all rice growers and to create an atmosphere of universal interest in increasing rice production. That is why the rayon kolkhozes and sovkhoses grow stable high yields. The CPSU kraykom has summed up the positive experience of the raykom and the party organizations and has taken measures to insure its dissemination in the kray.

Last December measures guaranteeing the production of one million tons of rice in 1980 were formulated and approved by decision of the party kraykom bureau at a kray seminar-conference of rice growers, who discussed the specific assignments based on the stipulations of the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum.

Briefly stated the essence of these measures is the following:

To raise by 1980 the area in rice in the Kuban' to 255,000 hectares. This is considered the optimum level for the utilization of available water resources.

Complete by the spring the construction of six major centers and water channeling systems and reconstruct 10 operational systems; commission 10 permanent spraying and training pumping stations in order to improve water supplies and drainage in the flats.

Reconstruct irrigation systems on an area no less than 3,000 hectares to be ready for the 1980 flood; carry out post-sowing repairs of systems covering 40,000 hectares in rice; clear irrigation and drainage canals totaling over 5,000 km; repair all hydroengineering installations and pumping stations.

In the autumn-winter and spring periods the rice growers and reclamation workers supervise the condition of the flats, maintain the proper level of surface water and drain on time the flow from atmospheric precipitation. Such work creates the necessary conditions for the preparation of the soil for sowing and the sowing itself in optimal times.

The need for irrigation water rises sharply in connection with the increased area sown in rice. Taking this into consideration, the party kraykom called upon the kray production administration for land reclamation and water resources, Glavkuban'risstroy, and the Kuban'giprovodkhoz Design Institute to insure a maximum amount of water storage in the Krasnodar and other water reservoirs.

Radical measures are being formulated and implemented to insure the considerable expansion of the recycling of irrigation water. To this effect, prior to the beginning of the rice planting campaign, 220 new pumping stations must be set up.

According to practical experience, the entire area will be subjected to presowing leveling and, as recommended by the specialists, half of the area will be leveled with the help of instruments. This is an extensive amount of work which cannot be carried out within optimum time with the forces and facilities of the kolkhozes and sovkhoses alone. That is why mechanizers with heavy tractors, graders and other equipment are sent to the area from other rayons and cities to help the rice growers.

Great attention is paid to the preparation of the seed. The work is organized in such a way that one month before the sowing their processing and weeding has been completed.

This year, more than ever before, the rice growing kolkhozes and sovkhoses have been properly supplied with chemical fertilizers, which will average up to 18 quintals per planted hectare.

In this connection, and since this year the area in rice be considerably expanded, agricultural aviation has a major task in applying the

fertilizers. The command of the Krasnodar Joint Aviation Detachment organized on time the training of the flight personnel and the material facilities for spring operations. The kolkhozes and sovkhoses are doing everything possible to repair on time the take-off and landing strips and the loading equipment, and to have the fertilizer ready for dusting from the air.

The plan for the 1980 harvest called for the application of 800,000 tons of local fertilizer. The task was carried out. However, the rice growing farms are continuing this work. Compost is being applied, above all, to underproductive sectors on the basis of no less than 40 tons per hectare.

Great attention is being paid as well to the preparation of herbicides.

Our plan to produce one million tons of Kuban' rice in the final year of the five-year plan is also based on the plan to promptly, making use of the best previous experience, organize the sowing and complete it before 10 May and harvest the crop in 10 to 12 calendar days. It is important not to lose a single kilogram of the harvested grain. For this reason we are already concerned with the preparations for the delivery of the rice to the elevators and to the rice processing plants of the kray grain product production administration. Their collectives have formulated plans for the uninterrupted acceptance, storage and processing of the rice. They have recruited and training cadres. Schedules for 24-hour grain deliveries have been coordinated with the kolkhozes and sovkhoses. The drying facilities are being increased in order to insure the delivery of the rice with no restrictions as to moisture.

Therefore, in order to resolve the most important state task of increasing rice production, we must accomplish a tremendous amount of reclamation, hydroengineering, agro-technical and organizational operations, higher by a factor of 1.5-2 compared with an average year. The completion deadlines must be exclusively optimal. The party committees and organizations well understand that we shall implement this task only if the place and role of every working person are properly defined, and if the experience of innovators and the achievements of science and progressive practice are used. That is why as of December 1979 each rayon and farm began to implement detailed work plans for preparations for the growing, harvesting and procurement of the rice. A total of 541 mechanized teams and 197 harvesting-transportation complexes have been fully staffed with experienced cadres and supplied with the proper equipment.

The need for spraying workers and mechanizers has been increased sharply in connection with the expansion of the planted areas in 1980. In order to eliminate such cadre shortcomings, totaling 4,500 people, the party committees and economic managers have assigned to agricultural vocational schools and training course combines, and courses in the farms the necessary number of people, most of them young men and women.

In a word, the CPSU kraykom, the Adygeyskaya Oblast and city and rayon party committees, the executive committees of soviets and their economic organs, managers and specialists in land reclamation service, kolkhozes, sovkhoses and party members are now intensively working to keep their word to the homeland--harvest one million tons of white grain.

The building of new rice growing systems will be virtually completed this year. However, extensive work remains to be done for the reconstruction of the obsolete systems, increasing the area of each flat and raising to the required technical standard the automation and remote control regulation of water and temperature regimes. A great deal remains to be done for the installation of agricultural systems and the building of new Virgin Land sovkhoses.

However, already now, at the concluding stage in the expansion of the Kuban' rice field, some economic results of the development of the flats may be drawn. Outlays for the building of the irrigation systems and the creation of new sovkhoses are repaid essentially during the construction period itself--in five to seven years--since rice is planted on the flats as they become ready, rather than waiting for entire sectors. By the time that the last areas of a system have been completed, the first have already yielded four to five harvests. The net average annual profit per hectare in rice is 420 rubles compared with 95 rubles, which is the average yield per hectare planted in other crops. This has made it possible to recover the outlays for the building of all irrigation systems three years ahead of the stipulated deadline, with the exception of the areas of the flats around the Sea of Azov, which are still under construction.

Over 400 million rubles from the overall amount of capital investments were appropriated for the development of the flatlands for rice sowing. Thanks to the selfless work of the construction and sovkhos worker and kolkhoz members, these Virgin Land areas have already produced about two million tons of rice, the net income from which totaled 330 million rubles. This means that 75 percent of the developed rice systems have already paid for themselves. The outlays for the development of the Azov flats will be fully recovered by 1981 instead of 1985 as planned.

This five-year plan rice production profitability has exceeded 184 percent. We are confident that this indicator will grow with the reconstruction of the old areas in rice and the delivery of new productive equipment. This is guaranteed by the great aspiration of the party members and all working people of the Kuban' to meet their pledge to their homeland--by 1980 raise rice production to one million tons, and thus make a proper contribution to the implementation of the decisions of the 25th party congress and the July 1978 and November 1979 CC CPSU plenums.

The kray party organization is aware of the entire importance and significance of this task and will do everything possible to implement it and to make its contribution to the creation of the material foundations for communism.

EINSTEIN AND CONTEMPORARY NATURAL SCIENCE THINKING

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 80 pp 62-73

[Article by V. Barashenkov, doctor of physical-mathematical sciences]

[Text] 1

We justifiably consider A. Einstein as one of the natural scientists of the 20th century who most strongly influenced the development of a scientific outlook. V. I. Lenin described him as one of the great transformers of the natural sciences (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 45, p 29). Einstein's ideas became the foundations for three areas of contemporary science which study "the biggest things": galactic formations, metagalaxies and entire cosmic worlds, as well as "the smallest things": atoms, molecules and elementary and subelementary particles. Theoretical hypotheses and experimental discoveries which strike the imagination, such as changes in the space and time characteristics of moving objects, the expanding universe, "black holes [traces]," twisted space-time and worlds compressed to the size of elementary particles, and parts--quarks--heavier than the particles themselves--are all related to his work. Yet Einstein was not only a brilliant physicist. His studies and views had a substantial influence on the style of natural scientific thinking in the 20th century.

Einstein's scientific activities began at a time when the science of physics was in a state of profound crisis. By the turn of the 20th century it had become clear that many ideas which seemed to represent the inviolable foundation established once and for all by classical physics were conflicting with new experimental facts. One of the most striking conclusions was that the mass of bodies depends on their velocity and that at least some of this mass is of electromagnetic origin, i.e., it is related not to mass, but to a field. In the eyes of many scientists this appeared to violate one of the fundamental laws of physics--the law of preservation of mass, as it meant the transformation of mass into energy. The basic concepts themselves were being confused and mixed up. From this viewpoint the entire world surrounding us became something unrealistic, ghostly, depending on the motion of the observer himself, on his subjective position.

This was a time when the philosophical knowledge of most scientists proved to be unsuitable for the realization of the new physical laws. The new physics called for abandoning the framework of a traditional outlook. In Lenin's words, at that time physics was giving birth to dialectical materialism (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 18, p 332).

Einstein's studies dealt with the reconstruction of the foundations of the knowledge of physics, for which reason methodological problems literally imbue all his work. The philosophical aspects of Einstein's scientific activities have a significance far exceeding the frameworks of the science of physics. These aspects immediately became the center of sharp methodological discussions.

The conversion from elemental metaphysical materialism, which was the methodological foundation of 19th century physics, to dialectical materialism, without which the entire complexity of contemporary science cannot be understood, represented, for many scientists, a very difficult and lengthy process involving not only successes but errors. All this is applicable to Einstein's work itself, in whose outlook the weaknesses of natural historical materialism were reflected: inconsistency and concessions to idealism, clearly shown by Lenin in "Materialism and Emiriocriticism."

The authors of some biographic and historical-scientific works on Einstein frequently draw attention to his philosophical views of a latter period of activity. Consciously or subconsciously the conflicting nature of his conceptual positions becomes dampened, along with the fact of their development throughout his life. Yet in his early works, to one or another extent Einstein paid dues to the philosophical ideas of Kant, Hume, Mach and Poincare, whom he studied at length in his student years and initial period of research. This philosophical baggage was hardly a lucky acquisition in terms of his creative destiny. Even though Mach's criticism of the classical concept of time, space and motion played a positive role, particularly in the first stage of the creation of the theory of relativity, the gnosiological concept of positivism did not contribute in the least to Einstein's scientific achievements. It was rather the opposite that happened: his failures, particularly in interpreting the correlation of indeterminisms and the attempt to develop a unified field theory, were largely determined precisely by the conflicting nature of his methodological concepts.

Therefore, an evaluation of Einstein's achievements and of their contribution to the development of a contemporary outlook must be both historically and logically specific. On the one hand are his discoveries, which laid the beginning of a new age in the study of physics; on the other there are the instability of philosophical convictions and the borrowing of some theoretical-cognitive ideas alien to science. There is a deep confidence in the objective existence of a world, clearly expressed in subsequent works and . . . obvious concessions to empiricism, on the one hand, and to a priorism, on the other, in the early period of scientific activities;

there is a profoundly dialectical approach to the problem of interconnection among space, time and motion and, conversely, an adamant resistance to the dialectical interpretation of the problem of the correlation among necessity, accident and probability.

Despite the contradictions in Einstein's philosophical views, we cannot ignore the main thing: The fact that, as a study shows, the results of his scientific activities unquestionably strengthen the positions of a dialectical-materialistic outlook in the natural sciences. "Faith in the existence of the outside world, regardless of the perceiving subject," he wrote, "is the base of all natural science" (A. Einstein, "Sobraniye Nauchnykh Trudov" [Collected Scientific Works], Vol IV, Moscow, 1967, p 136). In his creative autobiography, published in 1949, positively assessing Mach's critique of Newton's concept of absolute space, Einstein also opposed his empiricism and underestimation of the constructive possibilities of theoretical thinking. ". . . In my young years," he pointed out, "I was greatly impressed also by Mach's gnosiological concept, which today seems to me groundless in its essential aspects." In 1922, in a discussion with Meyerson, Einstein stated that he considered Mach a "pitiful philosopher."

It is not individual philosophical views expressed by Einstein but his natural scientific discoveries that are of the greatest value from the viewpoint of the development of a contemporary outlook. His scientific ideas, which inevitably express the spontaneous gravitation of the natural sciences toward materialism and dialectics, offer rich data for a serious methodological analysis from the positions of Marxist-Leninist theory, which from its very origins relied on the latest data of the natural sciences, drawing from them material for broad philosophical summations and studies. As his life developed, the methodological and theoretical possibilities of dialectical-materialistic philosophy remained unknown to Einstein. However, the logic of science itself and the objective laws of development of physical knowledge inevitably led his outstanding mind to revolutionary natural scientific and philosophical ideas which were profoundly dialectical by their very nature.

2

The conviction that all processes in nature take place gradually and uninterruptedly, without leaps and breaks, through infinitely small steps, was one of the cornerstones of the 19th century outlook. This conviction was based on tremendous data acquired with the help of Newton's mechanics and confirmed by the theory of the electromagnetic field developed by Maxwell in the second half of the century. Nevertheless, by the end of the 19th century phenomena had become known which were difficult to understand and explain from such positions. In 1901 M. Planck was the first to formulate the hypothesis that bodies release and absorb light along with other electromagnetic emanations, not continuously, but discretely, in strictly defined packets--quanta. This factually marked the birth of the new,

quantum physics. However, most physicists considered Planck's hypothesis merely a paradox lacking adequate clear and convincing experimental foundations. This view did not change even after the work of the then totally unknown young physicist Einstein was published in 1905. Using the quantum hypothesis, he was able not only to explain the puzzling results of experiments with a photographic effect, discovered shortly before that, but to predict new and still unknown characteristics of this phenomenon--the rather daring and controversial wave nature of light--expressed the basic idea of the author, who considered discreteness a characteristic of light itself, which under some circumstances behaves like a wave process and in the other as a flow of particles. An object with such complex characteristics could simply not fit within the framework of the generally accepted metaphysical picture of the world. Nearly 10 years of experimentation were required to prove the accuracy of Einstein's formulas and to acknowledge that physics was on the threshold of an area of entirely new, quantum phenomena in which the contradictory characteristics of the continuous and the discrete proved to be inseparably interconnected. Yet another breach was made in the old outlook and the idea of the dialectical connection among phenomena gradually entered the natural scientific picture of the world.

Three-quarters of a century have passed since. The idea of the internal contradiction, of a dialectically changing world, became one of the basic aspects of a scientific outlook. The idea of the dialectical nature of all change occurring in nature imbues the entire contemporary picture of the world, and without it we can understand neither the characteristics of microphenomena nor the nature of cosmic processes. The substantiation and development of this idea in the works of Einstein and other pioneers in the modern natural sciences confirmed the Marxist analysis of the ways of scientific development made by Lenin at the turn of the 20th century.

The strict theory of quantum phenomena was not created by Einstein but by other physicists. However, Einstein retained a tremendous lifelong interest in the foundations of quantum physics. Even absorbed in the creation of the grand canvas of the general theory of relativity (which shall be discussed later), he said that he would like to dedicate the rest of his life to thoughts as to the nature of light.

The paradoxical nature of the quantum laws from the viewpoint of common practical experience, and their seeming contradiction of "common sense" and the impossibility to understand them from the positions of metaphysical materialism, were all reasons for which quantum physics became the object of a variety of idealistic speculations and the arena of a sharp ideological struggle. The probability nature of the processes occurring in the microworld was frequently interpreted as a result of the immanent indeterminism; the lack of causality in natural phenomena was interpreted as an indication of the basic inseparability of the objective from the subjective and, in the final account, as the "experimental" refutation of materialism. Einstein assumed a clearly materialistic position in this struggle. He considered the concept of indeterminism a nonsense to be opposed in all possible ways.

There is a rather widespread view that, as was the case with Planck, Einstein was unable to realize the entire depth and qualitative novelty of the ideas he formulated himself and that, essentially, throughout his lifetime he remained under the influence of the classical concepts of macroscopic physics. We cannot agree with this. Einstein perfectly realized the specific nature of quantum laws and objected in his works only to the absolutizing of contemporary quantum theory which does not provide any description whatever of what happens to the particles between the two observations of their movement. In his view, the quantum theory is formulated in such a way that all its stipulations are closely linked to the process of measurement in the course of which the objective course of the process is disturbed. He believed that since the quantum theory does not provide a description of the phenomena "per se," regardless of all measurements, but operates only on the basis of probabilities, the task of the physicist had not been implemented and that the true reality had to be found lying at the foundation of the quantum description, "purged" from any influence of measurement procedures.

For many years, arguing with Bohr and other creators of the quantum theory, Einstein formulated ever new considerations in an attempt to prove the restricted, the approximate nature of contemporary quantum theory. Even though he was unable to find a single example which could not be described in the language of the quantum theory, the question he raised as to whether the picture of microphenomena provided by this theory covers the full space-time picture, draws to this day the close attention of physicists and philosophers.

We cannot agree with Einstein's claim of the existence of rigidly determined laws of the classical type on which the probability laws are founded on a deeper "transquantum" level. In such a case quantum mechanics would be merely a kind of diluted and foggy depiction of the true picture of phenomena. A number of attempts have been made to provide a quantum description of phenomena by a kind of averaging of familiar laws of dynamics. However all such attempts failed and, above all, such an approach would be hard to harmonize with the experimentally observed increased role of the laws of probability in converting to ultra-small space-time intervals. We have all the necessary reasons to assume that this trend is doomed to failure: the quantum theory cannot be refined on this basis. The statistical form of the quantum theory is not a removable building frame. It expresses the nature of the specifics of microphenomena, the essential feature which, precisely, distinguishes them from phenomena on the macroscopic level.

Naturally, it is almost always impossible to prove the unpromising nature of any given direction with "mathematical strictness." In science, however, only a theory which contains something new and which makes it possible to better predict or explain the facts is acknowledged. It is no accident that the many quests for "elementary nonstatistical laws" have so far failed to provide a single prediction which was experimentally confirmed.

The physical reason for the basically unavoidable statistical nature of our macroscopic descriptions of microphenomena is, obviously, based on the fact that each microparticle is inseparably linked with particles created in vacuum fluctuations and forming, with the entire incredibly complex set of particles, its "macroenvironment." Bearing this connection in mind, we could say that the movement of each individual particle is causally determined. However, the reason is of a probability nature. In other words, if we want to find the reason why the atom breaks up precisely at a given moment, obviously, we must be familiar with the macroscopic condition of the entire world to which we belong. This is obviously impossible. In order to compute a considerable part of the relations among microparticles we would obviously require an amount of time substantially exceeding the age of the universe as we know it.

Currently physicists sharing Einstein's belief in the possibility for a detailed space-time depiction of microphenomena, regardless of the means of observation, consider this possibility not in the rejection of statistical laws, but the formulation of a more general theory which, based on the study of the functions of distribution of the various values determined experimentally, would provide a description of the probable movement of each individual microparticle along a certain random, yet, in any case, entirely defined trajectory. The fact that any given phenomenon are characteristic is not directly observed does not mean in the least that it cannot be studied and should not constitute a sufficient reason for rejecting its existence.¹

We see that Einstein's viewpoint on the completeness of the contemporary quantum theory is far from being groundless. It is shared by a number of scientists, even though a considerable percentage of physicists and philosophers (if not their majority) support at present the opposite view. They consider that the specific quantum phenomena is such that the concept of the trajectory of the individual microparticle is, in general, meaningless. It simply cannot be defined because, whatever any future theory may be developed, it, as well as the quantum mechanics as we know it, would be unable to trace the space-time evolution of an individual microevent.

Obviously, it will take a long time before a single viewpoint has been achieved on the subject of the complex physical and methodological problem of the interpretation of quantum theory. In the final account, practical experience will resolve the problem.

3

The beginning of the 20th century was marked by yet another important scientific event requiring serious philosophical and conceptual interpretation: the theory of relativity was created: the science of the motion of bodies at very high speeds, close the speed of light.² The section of physics was initiated with the study of the outstanding Dutch theoretician Lorentz and obtained its logical completion in the almost simultaneously

published works of Poincare and Einstein. Poincare's study was presented in a mathematical language which was quite difficult for the physicists of that time. Conversely, Einstein's work was distinguished by the exceptional clarity of presentation of ideas and a profound physical analysis of the starting points of the new theory. It was precisely on this work that the physicists focused their attention and which had a tremendous influence on all subsequent scientific progress.

The theory of relativity appeared on the border between Newton's mechanics and Maxwell's electromagnetic theory, as a result of Einstein's persistent attempts to eliminate the profound logical contradiction which had developed in the 19th century between these two basic scientific concepts. The theory of relativity combined these sections of physical knowledge whose approaches seemed so different. To Einstein this was a natural consequence of his conviction of the unity of the material world and his faith in the deep inner interrelationship and determination of all phenomena of our reality. The idea of the unity of the material world remained a powerful incentive for Einstein's scientific research throughout his life.

One of the most important and impressive conceptual conclusions based on the theory of relativity was the stipulation that space and time have a single physical nature--a four-dimensional space-time. In opposition to classical physics and metaphysical natural philosophy, there are no space and time which are absolute, totally unrelated to anything and totally independent. The geometric dimensions of bodies, the duration of events occurring within them and all space and time characteristics of the real world depend on the motion of bodies and are, in this sense, relative. "Synthesized" within a single picture, space and time do not lose their quality specifics and, at the same time, prove to be interrelated, and changeable in relation to each other. This is no simple mechanical combination but a profound dialectical unity of qualitatively heterogeneous yet, at the same time, closely interlinked forms of existence of matter.

The discovery of the contradictory nature of motion within which the discrete is organically combined with the continuous, and the realization of the interrelationship between space and time meant a transition to a qualitatively new vision of the world. This was one of the most important aspects of the scientific revolution at the beginning of the 20th century and one of the obvious symptoms that the old, metaphysical outlook was breaking down and of the need to replace it with a new, a dialectical-materialistic outlook.

Steadily dialectical-materialistic ideas penetrated the awareness of the scientists. However, the elimination of the old conceptual positions is a rather complex and contradictory process. To this day numerous attempts are being made abroad to interpret relativistic physics from metaphysical and subjectivistic positions. Sharp discussions on the philosophical problems of the theory of relativity took place in our country as well. Some scientists, erroneously identifying the Marxist-Leninist materialistic

theory with the mechanistic variety of materialism, opposed Einstein's theory. Let us point out that some conflicting statements made by Einstein himself did not contribute to the dialectical understanding of its philosophical significance. In recent decades extensive work has been done in the Soviet Union on the study of the methodological problems of contemporary physics and, particularly, in the philosophical interpretation of Einstein's scientific legacy. A consistent Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the work of the great scientist has been provided.

The special theory of relativity agrees, with a high level of accuracy, with experimental proof. So far, no single experiment has shown even a hint of discrepancy with this theory, even though, in some cases, a level of literally astronomical accuracy was reached. Yet it is not excluded, as in many other scientific concepts, sooner or later, its ideas will be developed further within the framework of some deeper concepts. In particular, one of the basic concepts on with the special theory of relativity is founded is the assumption that the velocity of light in a vacuum is the maximum possible speed of physical processes. No single body can move faster than light. However, how absolute is this limit? Could we truly assert, with full confidence, that super light-speeds inevitably should result in conflicting, physically meaningless consequences, or could we still indicate some conditions under which there could be interaction among and existence of particles super light-speeds in nature?

It was long believed that this would be entirely impossible, for according to the theory of relativity if any physical object reaches the speed of light an infinite amount of energy should be expended; that is precisely why no single object could cross the "light barrier." These considerations were expressed by Poincare himself, and even by Einstein, in his initial work on the theory of relativity. It could be assumed, however, that pre-light and super-light particles (should the latter exist) would represent entirely different types of particles, one of which could not be converted into another through the gradual change in their velocities. In other words, hypothetical super-light particles would not need to break the light barrier: they would appear and disappear always at a speed higher than the speed of light, the way the light quanta (photons) or the neutrinos exist possessing always a constant speed equaling that of light. It turns out here that the hypothesis of the existence of such particles (tachyons) not only does not contradict the special theory of relativity, but conversely makes the theory more symmetrical, depicting uniformly the areas of pre-light and super-light phenomena.

The tachyons should possess many characteristics entirely strange to us. The laws of mechanics might prove to be "turned upside down" in their case. Thus we consider it entirely natural that the loss of energy particles is accompanied by their slowdown. Conversely, losing energy, the tachyons would gain speed (under the effect of the resistance of the air a super-light bullet would disperse). A number of other amazing characteristics of a "super-light substance" could be named. However, in recent years

experimental physics has offered us a number of surprises which have radically influenced many of our seemingly most inviolable and "basic" concepts of surrounding nature. Therefore, the paradoxical nature of the properties of theoretically conceivable tachyons, from the viewpoint of our habitual concepts, cannot as yet be considered a ground for concluding that such particles cannot exist in nature. What is important is that one of these characteristics would contradict the basic laws on which modern physics rests.

Experimental quests for super-light effects have not as yet been successful. However, so far a study has been made of distances considerably greater than those where intensive processes could be expected with an unfixed and non-invariant direction of motion. Therefore, the negative results of such experiments should not be considered discouraging. Today we cannot impose any kind of absolute ban on particles with super-light velocities. Whether or not such particles exist in nature should be considered an open question. For the time being, we could note the great "stability" of the foundations of the theory of relativity laid down three-quarters of a century ago.

The general theory of relativity--one of the most fundamental natural scientific concepts of the 20th century--was created in 1915. Einstein's basic idea, expressed in this theory, was proof of the organic interconnection between the properties, time and moving material objects. It was established that the four-dimensional space-time surrounding us had a curve similar a bent sheet of paper, and that this curve was related to the field of gravitation. A single value determines in the theory the "force" of the gravitational field, indicating the extent to which, at a given place, the factual geometry of space and time is distinguished from the concepts based on Euclidean geometry. Like a metal ball on an elastic fabric, a gravitational material object seems to crush, to bend space-time, the more so the bigger the mass of the object. The same effect is created by radiations spreading in space. The general theory of relativity describes the geometry of the world and is, at the same time, a theory of the gravitational field.

Following the discoveries of Copernicus, who metaphorically speaking switched the positions of the earth and the sun, there had not been such a radical transformation of the physical picture of the world.

The need for a new theory of gravitational phenomena which would sum up Newton's law of universal gravitation became obvious following the introduction of the physical postulate of the impossibility of a speed exceeding that of light, for Newton's law presumed instantaneous dissemination of the effect of the force of gravity and this could not be coordinated in the least with the formulas of the theory of relativity. This was an exceptionally difficult task and a great deal was unclear even as to how to approach its solution. This is precisely the main reason for which, despite its essential importance, the problem of gravitation remained aside from the research done by most physicists at that time.

Throughout a virtually entire decade Einstein's studies determined the development of this direction and were concluded with a theory whose consequences are still being studied in many branches of physics and astronomy. Furthermore, it is only now, 60 years after its creation, that the theory of relativity is beginning to "operate" at full strength. This theory is needed to explain a number of observed astrophysical phenomena and, as we shall see further, substantial grounds exist to belief that the structure of the elementary particles cannot be penetrated without quantum summations of the laws of the general theory of relativity.

The theory of the gravitational field created by Einstein is related to the most fundamental aspects of surrounding reality. Therefore, soon after its creation, attempts were made to extend its principles to other types of physical fields with a view to obtaining a unified theory of fields which could depict, initially, gravitational and electromagnetic and, subsequently, with improvements, all other physical processes occurring in the world. All such attempts were based on the idea that not only gravitational, but in general all fields without exception are manifestations of specific characteristics of space and time. It was presumed, therefore, that the elaboration of a sufficiently complete space-time theory would make it possible to understand all material processes occurring within them. In this overinflated aspect the idea became the base for an entire methodological program for further studies, clearly doomed to failure. In one of his addresses, Einstein formulated the essence of this program as follows: "We reach the following strange conclusion: It now begins to seem to us that space plays the primary role; matter should be derived from space, so to speak, at the following stage. Space absorbs matter" (A. Einstein, op cit, Vol II, Moscow, 1966, p 243). This statement briefly formulates the task to which Einstein dedicated the last 40 years of his life.

However, all attempts on the part of Einstein himself and of many other physicists sharing his convictions to expand the physical possibilities of the general theory of relativity through a variety of geometric summations yielded no results. Attempts to develop a unified all-embracing geometrodynamical picture of the world failed. Purely geometric values proved to be inadequate even for the description of electromagnetic phenomena, not to speak of the other types of various fields familiar to contemporary physics. The more the geometrodynamical program was being developed in detail, the greater the number of fundamental difficulties were revealed along this way.

The program of building a totally geometrized picture of the world, in which matter is reduced to space and physics to geometry, was groundless not only physically but methodologically. The factual physical situation and the factual correlation of things were here inverted. Essentially, characteristics of the material prime matter, of the substance, were ascribed to the space form.

Einstein's conviction that there is something common, a binding link, based on the variety of fields describing elementary particles and interactions,

has been confirmed today, but through a way essentially different from the one suggested by Einstein himself. Over the past 20 years, characteristics of symmetry were discovered and studied in the vast and ever expanding family familiar micro-objects, enabling us to consider seemingly entirely heterogeneous particles as different conditions of one and the same basic particle.

Such groups of particles have been named multiplets. Such multiplets combine in other formations (super multiplets) which bring together even more heterogeneous groups of particles. It has proved possible to standardize even various types of interactions, considering them as manifestations under specific conditions (splitting) of one or, perhaps, two basic interactions. A theory has been developed according to which two types of interactions--electromagnetic and weak--act as two aspects of the single "weak electro-interaction" the way an electromagnetic field itself is a combination of electric with magnetic forces. The electromagnetic aspect of the phenomenon prevails at distances exceeding 10^{-17} centimeters, while at shorter distances both aspects--the electromagnetic and the weak--assume equal importance. In the 19th century Faraday-Maxwell electrodynamics combined three different phenomena: electricity, light and magnetism. Now the phenomenon of weak interaction has been added to this.

The splitting of the multiplets and the universal interactions appear as a result of the fact that in the real world, because of the large number of various operating factors, symmetry is not full. Consequently, a mass of particles within a single state are distinguished, occasionally quite significantly, from the mass in another condition. The same occurs with the specific charges which determine the interaction among particles in different states.

So far, all the models of the unified theory are quite heterogeneous: there exist a number of variants distinguished by the choice of initial symmetries, the number and type of basic particles-multiplets, and so on. Very difficult questions arise in linking these models with the overall theory of relativity. This will require extensive further experimental and theoretical work, even though, essentially, what is important is the very possibility for the elaboration of such models (which would agree with a large number of experimental data and would predict new effects).

However, would the creation of a unified theory of particles and interaction mean the end of physics as a basic science, leaving it only to develop applications for natural laws studied to the very end? Unquestionably, no. The world is infinite in its variety. In Lenin's words, "The electron is as inexhaustible as the atom" (V. I. Lenin, op cit, Vol 18, p 277). The creation of a unified theory will be merely a stage on the way to the structuring of the infinitely refined and intensified physical picture of the world. The limited nature of any scientific theory can be clearly seen in the example of the general theory of relativity. Even though this theory is distinguished by the high degree of unity, beauty and

completeness of its mathematical formulation and, in that sense, is a model for the elaboration of other theories, nevertheless, we can see as of now the need for its further summation. Basic characteristics of our world, such as the unidirectional nature of time and the three-dimensional nature of space in Einstein's theory are simply postulated and taken as given. The origin of these characteristics and their material base remain to us as mysterious and puzzling as they were to the ancient Greeks. Are they based on some kind of subelement quark level, or would their clarification demand the creation of some kind of theory of "super relativity"? One could only guess as yet. As Einstein himself emphasized in an article on the centennial of Maxwell's birth, "Our concepts of physical reality can never be definitive."

4

In 1922 the Leningrad physicist A. A. Fridman noticed that the equations in the general theory of relativity had solutions describing a world in which distance, angles and other metric correlations changed in the course of time. The solutions indicated that, depending on the distribution of the mass and other conditions, the universe³ may be expanding steadily, "draining out" of a local space-time area or even a pulsating one. These conclusions sharply conflicted with the universally accepted view at that time of the steady-state nature of the universe. Initially, Einstein considered them doubtful. Soon afterwards, however, after a more careful study of Fridman's computations, he acknowledged them as accurate. In 1929 the American astronomer Hubble noticed the effect of the "recession of galaxies," thus obtaining experimental indications to the effect that the universe was expanding. Using the velocity of this expansion, measured by Hubble, it was possible to establish that the space surrounding us had begun to expand 10 to 20 billion years ago from a small volume filled with clusters of superdense matter. Another important experimental proof of the theory of the expanding universe was the discovery of the "relict radiation"--a weak radio emanation filling space around us, whose characteristics turned out to be precisely what they should have been from the time of the "hot" explosive evolution of the universe.

The unusual properties of matter in the "primal cluster" and the laws governing its movement, along with many other problems, are still to be resolved by science. Important information on the early phases of development of the universe was gained by the study of the characteristics of relict radio waves. Information concerning an even earlier stage could be obtained by observations of material objects most distant from us, located at the borders of the universe visible to us. It is possible that some such objects are "fragments" of the tremendous cataclysm which occurred 10 to 20 billion years ago and carry traces of the "prehistory" of our world. True, we could speak of a finite lifetime of the universe only quite arbitrarily, since we use, in this case, contemporary space-time concepts, which are applicable only to great distances and lengths. The use of such concepts for the earliest stage of development of the universe, when

quantum or, possibly, other specific laws predominated, may turn out to be simply wrong.

Yet another important conclusion followed from Fridman's computations. They proved that under the effect of gravitational masses, space in our universe is distorted in such a way that, like the surface of a ball, it would fold within itself. Such enclosed worlds could exist, to a certain extent, independent of each other. Each of them is a self-enclosed space in terms of the other. In other words, the general theory of relativity predicts the existence of a number of three-dimensional worlds "living" in their own time rhythm.

Subsequent studies indicated that fully self-contained worlds could be formed only under exceptional circumstances. The formation of "semi-enclosed worlds" was more frequent. In terms of inner characteristics they would be almost identical to the self-enclosed world, but would be linked with "outer" space through a small "hatch" within which the gravitational field would be so high that not even light could overcome its effect and escape. The enclosed volume of the semi-enclosed world would look like a "black hole"--an object which absorbs everything which falls into it without letting anything come back out.

The radius of the "black hole," i.e., the extent of the world within it depends on a number of factors. In all cases, however, the smaller the radius, the greater the mass of the "tucked in" world. Basically, this world may turn out to be so similar to the closed world that its volume, externally visible in outside processes, would be as small as elementary particles. Computations indicate that the electric charge and other characteristics of such an object could be the same as those of elementary particles. Academician M. A. Markov, who is working on the theory of micro-objects containing cosmic worlds, has described these objects as Fridmons.

Science is still unable to provide a definitive answer to the question of whether or not Fridmons are similar to elementary particles familiar to us, such as, for example, protons or neutrons, or else represent an entirely new type of particle which are as yet to be discovered experimentally. Furthermore, we should bear in mind that, strictly speaking, all conclusions concerning Fridmons are in the nature of hypotheses, for here we are entering the area of microphysics for which Einstein's theory requires quantum summations, which are only beginning to be developed. It is also to be determined as yet the extent to which such summations change the conclusions of the "classical" theory of relativity. Initial steps in this direction have yielded rather unexpected results. It has turned out that thanks to the quantum effect very small "black holes," with the dimensions of an elementary particle or even smaller, are unstable and try to reduce their mass by releasing flows of fast particles. Their internal "world" thus becomes ever more self-enclosed. It is as yet unclear how far the process could reach--to the level of the total "collapse" of space or,

perhaps, somewhere, on the level of an exceptionally small scale the "black hole" would stabilize as stable Fridmons. M. A. Markov's computations indicate that this could be a rather likely solution.

Thinking of the infinity of the material world, we frequently conceive it as a straight line going to the area of disappearing small intervals, on the one hand, and the area of unlimited high scales, on the other. Accepting the Fridmon hypothesis, the infinite nature of the world becomes rather like a circle in which infinitely small values "close in" as infinitely big ones and in which the correlation between the extra big and the microscopically small becomes relative. The concepts convert into their opposites.

The idea that our universe is merely one of the infinite number of worlds of similar yet different characteristics, developing in time and, from one point of view, appearing cosmically immense yet, on the other, microscopically small, is an important conceptual consequence of Einstein's general theory of relativity. Regardless of its specific model implementation, the conceptual value of this idea and its tremendous heuristic charge would be difficult to overestimate. Following the idea of the multiplicity of planetary worlds, expressed by J. Bruno, Galileo and other philosophers, Einstein's theory eliminates the final vestiges of anthropocentrism in the cosmological picture of the world.

Einstein was an outstanding scientist whose studies dealt with most abstract and difficult scientific problems. At the same, however, he was a person who warmly responded to all events of social life affecting his contemporaries. He was not always consistent in his actions and statements and sometimes erred, giving their due to political currents and views disseminated in the West. The main motive force of his actions, however, always remained the sincere desire to improve the world in which we live and the desire to make it freer and more just.

FOOTNOTES

1. It is frequently heard that such hopes will not be justified, since, in accordance with Neuman's familiar theorem, it is impossible to introduce within the apparatus of contemporary quantum mechanics any concealed parameter with whose help it would be possible somehow to identify and distinguish among random trajectories. However, Neuman's proof is essentially based on the stipulations of the modern quantum theory, whereas the concealed parameters, should they indeed exist, are not described by this theory.
2. The special theory of relativity, developed in 1905, made it possible to describe physical phenomena only of systems of coordinates which move in a straight line and evenly. This was a very important yet special case. Einstein's gravitational theory, created about 1915,

makes it possible to use systems of coordinates moving along curvilinear trajectories and at all types of acceleration. For this reason Einstein described it as the general theory of relativity. The basic equations of this theory were reached almost simultaneously by Einstein and the outstanding German mathematician Guilbert.

3. In contemporary cosmology the concept of the universe is not identified with that of matter. As an object of cosmology the universe is part of the material world accessible to scientific research.

5003

CSO: 1802

PORTRAIT OF AN ARTIST

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 80 pp 74-84

[Article by Yu. Melent'yev on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the birth of A. G. Venetsianov]

[Text] Historical merits are judged not on the basis of what historical leaders failed to provide in accordance with contemporary requirements, but on the basis of the new which they provided compared with their predecessors.
V. I. Lenin

Few are the painters in the history of Russian culture and domestic graphic art whose creativity and personality, both in their lifetime and posthumously, have triggered unabated interest, a variety of interpretations and evaluations, and a sharp struggle on the subject of their legacy. Aleksey Gavrilovich Venetsianov is precisely one of those.

1831 The son of the provincial ikon painter G. G. Chernetsov, after brilliantly graduating from the Academy of Fine Arts, received an honorable commission from the czarist court—to paint a big canvas on "Parade on Tsaritsyn Meadow" The talented painter worked hard to create a one-thousand-figure composition. His tremendous efforts would have been forgotten and the huge canvas would have been gathering dust in storage had the painter, blindly obeying the demands of the czar, who loved trivia, had painted only what was described by the great Pushkin as:

"I love the martial liveliness of the amusing Field of Mars, infantry and horses, monotonous beauty"

However, the five years of work which Chernetsov put in were spent not only in painting the brilliant emperor's retinue or the frightening square formation of the troops on the Field of Mars, but in the creation of a collective portrait of outstanding leaders of Russian culture of the period, whom he depicted as the oldians on the foreground of the now-famous canvas. Chernetsov left his descendants 233 factual portraits! The moral-emotional center of this part of the composition of Pushkin's Petersburg was a group

of men of culture surrounding the great poet. Next to Pushkin were writers I. A. Krylov, V. A. Zhukovskiy and N. I. Gnedich and painter A. G. Venetsianov. Bearing in mind that academy painters F. A. Bruni, I. P. Martos and F. P. Tolstoy, and A. N. Olenin, president of the Academy of Fine Arts, are clustered in another group, it is entirely obvious that the painter deliberately included A. G. Venetsianov, member of the Academy of Fine Arts, in the immediate vicinity of Aleksandr Sergeevich. Well familiar with and highly appreciating Venetsianov, Chernetsov, the Raznochinets, considered him a person belonging to Pushkin's circle, which is what he tells us in his painting.

Russian literature of the 1820's-1830's has been sanctified by Pushkin. Pushkin's genius was the tremendous constructive power, the foundation not only for the new Russian literature but the new Russian national culture as a whole.

At that time Russia faced the powerful need for change, marking the beginning of the decline of the power of feudalism. According to N. I. Nadezhdin, the progressive professor at Moscow University, at that time there was a "powerful trend of the contemporary genius toward nationality." In literature these new democratic trends were noted above all by the names of A. S. Pushkin; in music, by M. I. Glinka, and in painting, by A. G. Venetsianov.

Chernetsov was far from alone among his contemporaries to note the specific significance of Venetsianov's personality and creativity as an artist. In his "Domestic Notes" the famous critic, painter and journalist P. P. Svin'in (incidentally, painted in the canvas not far from Pushkin's group), wrote soon after the first exhibit of Venetsianov's works, in 1824, that "finally we have come across a painter who has addressed his splendid talent to the depiction of domestic scenes, the painting of objects around him, close to his heart and to ours, and has been entirely successful in accomplishing this." He further stated that, "The paintings by Mr Venetsianov captivate by their truthfulness. They are entertaining and curious not only for the Russian but . . . the foreign lover of the arts, and we are entirely confident that Mr Venetsianov, pleasing the taste of his compatriots with his works, will also satisfy the curiosity of foreigners . . ." In conclusion, Svin'in perspicaciously claimed that such trend of work could and should create a following. "What makes Venetsianov's exploit even more significant is that, unquestionably, it will encourage many painters to follow him"

What were Venetsianov's works rated so highly by the critic? They were "Cleaning Beets," the famous "Morning of the Landowner," "Threshing Floor," "Here is Father's Lunch," "Sleeping Shepherd," "Girl with Beet Roots," "Reaper," "Pelageya" and others.

One cannot but be amazed by the accuracy and historical farsightedness displayed by Svin'in, who saw in Venetsianov's initial works on popular topics

the theme of labor and way of life of the Russian peasantry, a radical turn in Russian graphic art toward truth and true nationality, originality and, at the same time, international significance. It is precisely these works along with several later works by Venetsianov, that are still decorations and objects of pride of the Russian Museum and Tret'ykov Gallery.

Aleksey Gavrilovich Venetsianov has long become part of the spiritual world of the Soviet people. Even those who have not had the opportunity to see his masterpieces in the original are well familiar with them from the numerous reproductions and copies. No single monograph or album dealing with the history of Russian art of the first half of the 19th century would be conceivable without Venetsianov. As a rule, history and literature textbooks as well unfailingly mention his works.

Let us point out that, occasionally, the closeness of Venetsianov's aesthetic program to the innovative trends of Pushkin's creativity is so obvious that it could be detected not only by students of works of this painter, but by any curious high school senior. In a literature class the teacher asked for a composition based on Venetsianov's painting "Morning of the Landowner." Some students looked at this canvas as just about an illustration to a chapter of "Eugene Onegin," describing the rural life of the Larin family. Let us recall the way Onegin described them to Lenskiy:

"A simple Russian family, eager to please the guests,
preserves, and never-ending conversation about the rain,
the flax, the cattleyard . . ."

Venetsianov's character who orders the girls around the yard is clearly related to the older Larina, who, according to the poet,

". . . Went about her business, salted mushrooms for the
winter, did the accounts, cut hair, took a bath Saturdays,
scolded the maids, all this without bothering her husband."

Let us not blame the high school students for this analogy. It is entirely justified, for the intent of the "Morning of the Landowner" and the first chapters of "Eugene Onegin" were born that same year, 1823. The difference is that Venetsianov depicted Safonkovo Village, Tverskaya Guberniya, while Pushkin of Kishinev and Mikhaylovskoye, in the Pskov area. At the time that Venetsianov opened his first exhibition in the Petersburg Academy, in 1824, the third chapter of the novel in verse was merely being completed by the poet, exiled in a forgotten countryside.

The praise of the exhibition was still heard while Venetsianov was already experiencing an ideological conflict with the official academy and a considerable number of critics. . . . Even the temporary patronage of some highly placed court personages could not reduce the ripening enmity caused by the rejection of Venetsianov's method itself, and his new artistic credo which could be described as the beginning of the way of Russian art toward

realism. The defenders of the old academism were quite disturbed by the bold adoption by the innovative artist of topics whose main characters were the people: the Russian serf and women and men, full of dignity and spiritual beauty, in homespun clothing.

In 1825 the famous art critic V. I. Grigorovich wrote in ZHURNAL IZYASHCHNYKH ISKUSSTV the following on Venetsianov's works: Style, colors, lights, everything is captivating. The model alone, if I dare say so, is not captivating. It seems to me that, in any case, the painter should have made a better choice. Everything could be painted superbly. However, it is better to paint superbly that which is beautiful, particularly when the choice of the topic depends on the painter." This quite delicately yet quite clearly expressed reproach which subsequently developed into a persecution of truly national realistic art, when, for example, Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka was openly told, on the subject of his brilliant opera "Ivan Susanin" that the theater was smelling of dirty socks and that he had composed "coachman's music."

However, the Petersburg malevolence notwithstanding, the truly beautiful, innovative and realistic was supported by progressive and freedom-thinking Russia. Pushkin, Zhukovskiy, Vyazemskiy and Gogol' sought ways and means to support Venetsianov, Tropinin, Glinka, Shevchenko, Kol'tsov and other guardians of nationality.

In 1827 the journal OTECHESTVENNYYE ZAPISKI drew the attention of its readers to "the works of Mr Venetsianov, consisting, as usual, of small canvases which captivate the Russian patriot with the true depiction of objects close to his heart. These faces, this sky, these objects, are everything that is Russian, real, borrowed from nature itself."

Venetsianov deserves credit not only for taking the path of realism itself, trying to blend nature with man, and being one of those who are justifiably considered the initiators of the domestic genre and landscape in art, but also because he led along this virgin path a big detachment of followers and created a school with its original development within Russian graphic art.

One of his students--the very successful academician, yet very small painter, A. N. Mokritskiy--tried after Venetsianov's death to interpret quite primitively the role of his teacher, reducing his heroic thrust to realistic art to petty naturalism and the simple copying of people and things around him. Mokritskiy deliberately vulgarized the views of his teacher, distorting the ideological meaning of his works for the sake of supporting the declining possibilities of orthodox academism, whose supporter and defender he had become after being the unsuccessful student of two great painters--A. G. Venetsianov and K. P. Bryullov.

At the end of the 1870's there was a new outbreak of interest in Venetsianov's work, or, essentially, in what we describe as his school in

Russian art. The famous critic P. N. Petrov described Aleksey Gavrillovich as the father of Russian life painting, a person who "by choosing scenes taken directly from the life of the simple people" took "his students to the national-Russian road."

Venetsianov's work was the subject of fierce arguments at the turn of the 20th century. The theoreticians of the MIR ISKUSSTVA paid great attention to him. Whereas Aleksandr Benua, who found in the artist an exceptionally great quantity of valuable and noteworthy features, particularly "an amazingly fine understanding of the tasks of painting," was concerned with preventing the painting from "wasting itself," his "colleague"--the critic N. N. Vranghel' was drawn by Venetsianov's works for other reasons. Yearning for the pre-Decembrist past, Baron Vranghel' saw in the works of the painter the picture of the "Peaceful of Landowning Russia." Clearly afraid of the revolutionizing art of progressives and their followers, he "deprived" Venetsianov's canvases "even of the shadow of any premeditation or prejudicial idea." Incidentally, he tried to dethrone the painter as the initiator of genre painting and as the leader of the developing national realistic art. In the view of this abuser of domestic culture, love for the truth of life in Russian art was promoted not by Shibanov, Argunov, Venetsianov, Tropinin or Fedotov, but exclusively by foreign painters. He ascribed the initiative to depict "the beauty of simplicity" to Heisler, Leprince, Barbier and other court-oriented painters who had come to the country.

Vranghel''s articles in ZOLOTYE RUNO (1907) and the journal STARYYE GODY (1911) are something between open landmark concepts of Russian culture and attempts to return to the aesthetic positions of "pure art." In his view, "Venetsianov as a painter-landowner and Venetsianov as the leader of a school are two entirely different artistic personalities." Here the painter was "lost by the topic." The critic "consoles" the reader by stating that the realistic view of nature and man shown by Venetsianov and his best students "sneaked in unnoticed," unlike the case of the realistic painters whose idea "would spell the end of art in half a century." In this entire confused concept this statement is the most interesting, for here, consciously or subconsciously, the thought is expressed that the democratization of Russian art and its subsequent evolution toward realism, which Vranghel' hated, would be, one way or another, linked with Venetsianov.

Soviet art experts have done extensive research on Venetsianov and his school. True, in the 1920's and 1930's vulgar sociological concepts appeared. The uncritical repetition of the assessments made by Mokritskiy and Vranghel' helped to disseminate erroneous views on the work of this great Russian painter. He was charged with lifeless naturalism or petty attachment to the world of objects and the comfort of the estates of the nobility. Other proclaimed the turning to the peasant topic and respect for the types and characters of the people "a peasant masquerade." Even A. V. Lunacharskiy, who as a whole highly rated Venetsianov's work, was the victim of the errors of that period.

The collection and publication of the writings of the painter, documents and memoirs on his life were of great importance in achieving a deeper understanding of Venetsianov's works and personality, and in acquiring a proper understanding of his role in the development of Russian art. On the basis of such new data, Soviet art experts, among whose works we should particularly note the monographs and articles by A. N. Savinov, T. V. Alekseyeva, N. G. Mashkovtsev, E. I. Golubeva and others, showed the permanent significance of Venetsianov as one of the initiators of Russian democratic realistic art.

Venetsianov's works and school are depicted in these works in a new light. The teaching talent of the great painter and the realistic "method" he discovered contributed to the birth of a number of talented painters. Under his vivifying influence, yesterday's serfs or needy ikon-daubers such as A. V. Tyranov, A. A. Alekseyev, N. S. Krylov, K. A. Zelentsov, Ye. F. Krendovskiy, L. K. Plakhov and G. V. Soroka reached the peaks of mastery and left their original marks in Russian art.

Today Venetsianov--the painter, teacher and man--appears to us not as a landowning painter who successfully structured pastoral canvases, not as a timid person of unstable character, but as someone steadily searching, someone who set himself and was able to resolve professional problems skillfully, convincingly, and skillfully defending his convictions and belief in the social purpose of art, and a major personality of domestic culture.

On 18 February 1780 a son, Aleksey, was born to the merchant family of Gavriilo Yur'yevich and Anna Lukinichna Venetsianov. The father of the future painter not only sold fruit, vegetables, seedlings and flowers in Taganka, but, according to ads in MOSKOVSKIYE VEDOMOSTY of 1794 and 1795, offered "a variety of very good paintings . . . in gold frames," "painted in pastels, at a very good price."

Gavriilo Yur'yevich was a progressive man in Moscow's commerical world. He tried to give his children the best possible education. Thus Aleksey was sent to a private boarding house where drawing was taught among other subjects. Venetsianov showed his artistic talent early. He "painted a great deal and loved to draw his comrades." We find in the memoirs of his nephew a very important thought subsequently proved by the painter himself: "I boldly conquered my favorite occupation." It is likely that, at first, the father did not intend in the least to allow his son to take the shaky path of a Russian painter. The gifted youngster mastered the secrets of this complex craft only by "loving art," and working tirelessly.

The Moscow period in Venetsianov's life came to an end when he was about 22 and, as a petty official, a still-unknown painter showed up, for the first time, along the banks of the Neva. Between 30 May and 6 June 1802 IZVESTIYAKH K S.-PETERBURGU IZ VEDOMOSTYAM carried three times a somewhat unusual ad: "A recently arrived painter . . . paints objects from nature, in pastels, in three hours, at the Riga coffee house, Kamenny Bridge."

Venetsianov began his life in Severnaya Pal'mira quite familiar with the techniques of drawing and having mastered the secret of transparent and fine pastels. It soon became apparent that he was equally familiar with etching.

Biographers and researchers have not traced Venetsianov's teachers in Moscow. However, there are reasons to claim that both the painters of the "czar and the nobility" were interested in him and his work. The "nobility" painters famous throughout Moscow were the Argunovs, serfs of Count Sheremet'yev. It is quite likely that the young Venetsianov not only carried tulips or other of his father's goods to Ivan Petrovich Argunov, who was the manager of the count's estates, and attended rehearsals or eve performances with the participation of the outstanding serf actress Parash Zhemchugova, but also visited Nikolay Ivanovich Argunov's studio. He was able to see the portrait of Annushka, the Kalmyk, and the portrait of an unknown woman wearing a Russian costume, by the younger Argunov, and peasant portraits and portraits of serf actresses by Argunov the younger.

It is not excluded in the least that the budding painter was received by Fedor Stepanovich Rokotov, whose house was on the same street where the Venetsianov family lived. Naturally, the famous academician, fully classified as a "czarist" painter, may not have been the "equal" of the modest Moscow merchant. However, bearing in mind that he himself came from the "black" serf class, our assumption may turn out to be entirely realistic.

The general spiritual atmosphere of Moscow at that time must be taken into consideration as well. The "royal widow" was quite different from Petersburg, imbued with regimentation and servility. Here the mores were far looser. Moscow University was democratizing society. The ideas of enlightenment were sinking roots. For a while, here N. I. Novikov and his fellow workers could act.

Venetsianov was not alien to the progressive ideas of the new century. He had gone to Petersburg with the intent to improve his art, beginning to realize that a career as an official would contribute less to the public good than a career in art.

He was encouraged in this even further by his acquaintanceship with one of the biggest Russian painters, Vladimir Lukich Borovikovskiy. The young painter was lucky: the great portrait painter became his teacher in Petersburg. Under the attentive and sympathetic eye of his teacher, Venetsianov's blind aspirations (for example, in painting the portrait of his mother or his first attempts in Petersburg) became a confident skill. One century later, I. E. Grabar' was to say about Borovikovskiy: ". . . A painter of unusual diversity, resembling no one in the West, highly Russian." Venetsianov absorbed like a sponge these qualities of his instructor so that, in the new round of domestic history, he could put in his own original substantial mark on Russian art.

Meanwhile, the postal record keeper spent all his free time studying the complex compositions in the halls of the Hermitage, making endless copies in which, occasionally, there would appear not a slavish repetition, but the daring of an independent interpretation.

Democratic leanings and an original freedom of creativity were displayed in Venetsianov quite clearly and far earlier than he was able to realize them intellectually. From the very beginning of his stay in Petersburg the artist felt the urgency to work with nature. A series of outstanding city drawings has been preserved: "Going for a Walk," "At the Hay Market," "At the Horse Market" and "At the Petersburg Exchange." The character of these "sketches from life" are the people, the urban petit bourgeois, the peasant, merchant, artisan, hawker, the carrier. It is interesting that in one of his drawings Venetsianov placed a working painter in the street, consciously or subconsciously expressing his credo as the describer of life and chronicler of the people.

Once again we recall the lines from "Eugene Onegin," as though seen through Venetsianov's sharp eyes fifteen years before they were put down on paper by the great poet:

"Irrepressible Petersburg has been awakened by the drum.
The merchant rises, the hawker comes, the cabby drives
to the exchange, a woman with a pitcher hurries, the
morning snow crisp under her feet. The pleasant noises
of the morning. The shutters open; blue smoke is
rising"

Venetsianov welcomed the year 1808 full of pleasant hopes. Glazunov, the bookseller, had agreed to the daring suggestion of the young artist to publish, for the first time in Russia, ZHURNAL KARIKATUR. The response of the public was good and the famous censor Timkovskiy had approved the first notebook containing four Venetsianov engravings: "Allegorical Depiction of the 12 Months," "Sled Driving," "Grandee" and "Debut of a Young M. n." Subscribers had as yet to be found for this first artistic satirical journal whose epigraph "Ridendo castigam mores" ("Laughter Corrects Mores") was rather daring. Suddenly, catastrophe! At the end of January Venetsianov was summoned by the censorship committee where he was presented documents in which Emperor Aleskandr I himself personally "deigned to state that the publication of a journal of caricatures would no longer be permitted, noting that: 1. The publisher himself could address his talents to far better subjects and use his time more profitably in adapting himself to his job; 2. the censorship should be more discriminating in allowing such publications."

The severe warning issued by the autocrat had been triggered by the drawing "The Grandee," in which through engravings Venetsianov was interpreting the familiar satirical ode to Derzhavin. The aim of the artist was so accurate and the disgusting dwarf-grandee, drawn in the style of a cheap popular

print, was so vile that the czar decided to nip sedition in the bud. That is how the first Russian illustrated journal of satire and humor was still-born in Russia and that is how Venetsianov took his first practical step in his desire openly to put his talent and art at the service of society.

However, Venetsianov's daring attempts in the field of artistic satire did not stop. During the national war waged against Napoleon's hordes, once again, together with painter I. I. Terebenev he awakened the interest of society in political drawings, which became a powerful means of agitation among the people. He made extensive use of both international experience in satirical drawing and popular prints. Malicious drawings by Venetsianov, full of patriotic pathos, mocking the groveling Francomania of the rich classes became popular. We see the true artist-citizen in the sketches "French Hairdresser," "French Education" and "Ladies Thrown out of Moscow," and others.

During that period Venetsianov did extensive portrait painting. The skill of the employee-painter became so great that he dared to submit his work to the judgment of the imperial Academy of Fine Arts. In February 1811, by then land recorder of the Forestry Department, Aleksey Gavrilov Venetsianov presented to the academy council a picturesque self-portrait. Small, lacking the usual accessories and effects, it showed the intensive quest of the artist closely looking at nature, and trying to present it accurately and truthfully. The work showed such great artistic maturity and skill that its author was immediately "appointed" (something like becoming an academy candidate). Six months later Venetsianov was made academy member for the portrait of Inspector Golovachevskiy with young students. Such a headlong promotion of a modest painter to the peak of the Russian artistic Mount Olympus could be explained by the tempestuous blossoming of his talent, guided by Borovikovskiy, exceptional industriousness and the potential artistic power which the experts, looking at the submitted works and at what the petitioner had not as yet expressed, could not fail to experience.

Meanwhile, Venetsianov pursued his adamant efforts, taking new steps in drawings and portraits, form, content, composition and techniques.

The fact that in the 1820's and 1830's Venetsianov's civic maturing and social aspiration were related to the steady advancement of his professional skill was of exceptional importance to the entire subsequent development of Russian art. In those years the ethical and aesthetic currents of the Decembrist circle had noticeable influence on the molding of his aesthetic views. The brothers Bestuzhev, Fonvizin, F. Tolstoy, N. Murav'yev and Kyukhel'beker were the Decembrists toward whom fate led the painter in the Society of Lancaster schools, whose aim was to promote literacy among the people, or the Society for the Encouragement of Painters, one of whose founders and constant activist was Academician Venetsianov. It is of interest to note that the "Green Book"--the bylaws of the "Alliance for Prosperity"--stated that a member of the alliance "shall try to seek means

for the fine arts to be directed properly and consist not of pampering feelings but strengthening, ennobling and enhancing our moral being." It was precisely in that direction that Venetsianov conducted his professional and civic quest.

Since the painter himself related his turn toward the development of a new realistic "method" with the painting by Francois Granet "Inside of a Capuchin Monastery in Rome" (incidentally, the painting was exhibited in the Hermitage after the painter had resigned and moved to Safonkovo Village), to this day there is an inaccurate notion of the extent to which the famous French perspective painter influenced Venetsianov's creative career. Naturally, no one could deny the very fact of such an influence. However, Granet had only emotionally convinced Venetsianov of the need to make bolder use of the laws of perspective as the base for any truthful depiction. Aleksy Gavrilovich himself was subsequently to emphasize that "perspective plays in painting the role of grammar in literature." Thus Granet's influence was merely a catalyzer for Venetsianov's professional growth. However, the fact that he turned to the topic of the peasantry, the radical renovation of the content of his works, are entirely and fully ascribed the spiritual-moral problems dictated by Russian reality. In the final account, Venetsianov could have become an effective perspective painter in the halls of the Winter Palace as well. However, he preferred the rural solitude, so that blending with the life of the Russian countryside, he carried out his artistic exploit of profoundly depicting through art the life of the people and the people's types and characters.

Occasionally Venetsianov and his school are blamed for having been unable to reflect the difficult life of the Russian peasantry, the suffering of the people and the acute social problems of their period. Yet the great merit--the display of truly civic daring--was, in itself, a possibility to depict the life of the people, which until then had remained practically beyond the pale of the graphic arts. In literature as well, with the exception of the banned and disgraced Radishchev, at that time Karamzin alone had come to the belated and timid discovery that "peasant women as well can experience love"

Lenin said that even the best people among the nobility were terribly distant from the people. Progressive Russia felt and found it difficult to live with such a monstrous gap. This is how, for example, A. S. Griboyedov described a meeting between his Petersburg friends with rural singers: "Leaning against a tree, I unwittingly looked away from the singers and at the listeners-observers, that damaged class of semi-Europeans to which I too belong. Everything they heard or saw seemed to them wild: Their hearts could not understand these sounds, they found these dresses strange Had a foreigner somehow been brought here, unfamiliar with Russian history over the past century, naturally, he would have concluded, based on the sharp contrast in mores, that in our country gentlemen and peasants belong to two separate tribes whose customs and mores have not yet blended."

Venetsianov felt something similar to this. Close acquaintanceship with the life of the toiling peasantry, after he acquired a modest estate deep in Tverakaya Guberniya, forced him to think a great deal. An entire world of moral and physical beauty was opened to the artist. He became acquainted with the Russian person in his daily affairs and concerns, work, and natural coexistence with nature.

Suddenly, this 40-year-old successful man, recognized by the Academy of Fine Arts and among his numerous customers in the upper classes, decided to make a drastic change in his life. Abandoning his official career and the worn-out tracks of a Petersburg portrait painter, he settled in Safonkovo Village, with its peaceful little rivers, meagre fields, closer to the life of the peasantry, which henceforth was to become the subject of his work, love and pain.

Simplicity, quest for truth and for his own vocation as an artistic and "continuing attention to nature and man" resulted in the triumph of Venetsianov's first serious works on the topic of popular life. This included "Cleaning Beets," "Threshing Floor" and "Morning of the Landowner". . . . Here the author brilliantly dealt with purely painting techniques. This was noted by both his contemporaries and subsequent art historians. Comparing "Threshing Floor" with Granet's sensation-stirring work, Aleksandr Benua wrote: ". . . Let us note, to Venetsianov's honor, that his painting is far more tender and noble than the somewhat coarsely effective and sharply drawn work by the famous perspective painter."

Boldly crossing the gap separating academic art from the realistic understanding of nature and the arrogance of the nobility from the healthy toiling life of the people, Venetsianov began to make one discovery after another as a painter and as a person. He understood the humaneness and significance of the people's morality and the tranquil beauty and dignity of the serf, particularly the Russian working woman. Hence his permanent successes, such as "Kapitoshka," "Pelageya," "Reapers," "Beet Grower," "Peasant Woman with Cornflower" and "Bathing Women." For the first time in Russian art he made the toiling man the truly positive character of his work.

All this could be found with an inordinate power of concentration and an amazing feeling of proportion in Venetsianov's two masterpieces painted at the end of the 1830's: "Plowed Field. Spring," and "Harvesting. Summer." Both canvases are nobly poetic, yet not idyllic in the least.

Early spring. There is fresh green grass and the first leaf of a young birch has opened to the sun. A rocky shallowly plowed field spreads all the way to the horizon, waiting to be harrowed. As the verse of Aleksey Kol'tsov states,

"The moment it dawns in the field everyone starts walking
friend after friend Plowing with a twisted plow,
scratching with the harrows."

Workhorses are moving in a circle, harrowing. One pair is being driven by a young peasant woman as though gliding on the ground. She loves the spring and is good at her work. However, she is also concerned. Her little child is sitting at the edge of the field. She can see the crawling infant playing on the grass only by slowing down the even pace of the horses, as she passes by. . . .

That is all. Simple, nothing garish, as though our huge Russia with the beauty of its earth and eternal labor have been encompassed in this small heartaching canvas.

"Harvest. Summer." Everyone is familiar with this painting by Venetsianov. The young mother has put down her sickle for a minute to nurse the child brought to her by the older children. What is this Madonna serf thinking about: the unfinished work, the hard lot of the woman or the fate of those to whom she has gifted this world, this grain field? . . . Again we hear Kol'tsov's verse:

"The wheat is waist high and under the wind the ears
bend almost down to the earth and the golden wave
rushes on"

Incidentally, occasionally we ignore the reciprocal influence of art, poetry and literature. The critics of the democratic trends of the realists blame the painters for the literary and illustrative aspects of their work and other such "sins." Venetsianov gives us an example of the opposite influence. His concept in art, skillfully defended in his literary-publicistic works and his paintings, have, themselves, a certain influence on the literary process. Without this influence it would be difficult to imagine not only Kol'tsov but Nekrasov as well, particularly in depicted the Russian peasant woman. Furthermore, Venetsianov and Kol'tsov knew one another well, as confirmed by letters, diaries and other documents.

The 1840's were a period of reciprocal acquaintanceship and development of interest in each other between Venetsianov and Gogol'. The painter has given us one of the best graphic portraits of the young writer. On his instructions, Venetsianov's students painted a group portrait of the leading lights of Russian literature: Pushkin, Krylov, Gogol', Odoyevskiy and Zhukovskiy, welcoming Kol'tsov to Petersburg. However, in turn, Gogol' was influenced by his contact with Venetsianov. According to the authoritative view of researchers, N. G. Mashkovtsev, in particular, who wrote "Gogol' in the Circle of Painters," Venetsianov greatly influenced the views and works of the great singer of "Rusitroyka." It is quite well known that the theme of the "Inspector General" was prompted by Pushkin. However, few are those who know that Gogol''s brilliant depiction of the problems of artistic life in his "Portrait" and "Nevskiy Prospekt" were based on Venetsianov's aesthetic ideas and principles.

Tens of talented painters owe their human fate and destiny of art to Venetsianov's concern and efforts. He not only charged no fee of his students but even gave them financial support. Both in Petersburg and Safonkovo, many of them lived in his house. This was a principle which Aleksey Gavrillovich never abandoned, even if he himself or his family had material difficulties.

The Academy of Fine Arts, whose leadership, to say the least, far from always shared the creative positions held by Academician Venetsianov, looked at his realistic teaching efforts with respectful amazement. "I cannot ignore the inordinate zeal of Mr Venetsianov, who organized here a school for various genres of painting and, despite his difficulties in private life, shares everything with his totally impoverished students . . ." reported Olenin, president of the academy, to court minister Volkonskiy.

A. G. Venetsianov hated serfdom and considered it a degrading condition, particularly fatal to the talented. Many of his serf students were freed thanks to his concern, and he paid for the freedom of some of them out of his own funds. Others, such as, for example, his most talented student, Grigoriy Sorok, could not be extracted from the clutches of serfdom. Aleksey Gavrillovich participated most actively in the liberation of Taras Grigor'yevich Shevchenko. The appeal addressed by Zhukovskiy and Bryullov to Shevchenko's master, retired Colonel Engel'gardt, remained ineffective for quite a long time. Then, as certified by the Ukrainian painter Soshenko, and by Shevchenko himself, Venetsianov became involved. He was able to persuade the petty tyrant-landowner and Shevchenko was bought from the serf owner. In his autobiographical novel "Artist," the great Taras tenderly describes Venetsianov as a "man-loving painter," emphasizing "the generosity of his exploits in the field of art."

Yes, everything he accomplished could be truly described with the lofty word of exploit.

These days our public is extensively celebrating the 200th anniversary of the birth of the great Russian painter Aleksey Gavrillovich Venetsianov. Exhibits of his works may be found in the Russian Museum, Tret'yakov Gallery, and Kalinin Paintings Gallery. The works of painters of the now famous Venetsianov school are on exhibit. Scientific conferences are taking place in Moscow and Leningrad at the Academy of Fine Arts and the USSR and RSFSR unions of painters. Albums and reproductions are being printed. A bronze statue of Venetsianov has been erected in the ancient Russian city of Vyshniy Volochek, which is the subject of a chapter in the fiery "Travel" by Radishchev, a city which played a major role in the life of Aleksey Gavrillovich and, at the end of the 19th century and in our time as well, in the lives of many generations of domestic painters.

Here one of the most fruitful traditions of Soviet art--close ties with the life of the people--has found a convincing confirmation. A people's

paintings gallery was opened in the land where the famous Russian painter lived and worked. The working people of the Proletariy Sovkhoz in Vyshnevolotskiy Rayon received a splendid gift: an art collection based on the works of famous Russian and Soviet painters.

The direct offspring of those memorialized in the famous Venetsianov canvases come these these days to see his monument and visit the new paintings gallery as the legitimate owners of this high art.

The nationwide honoring of Aleksey Gavrilovich Venetsianov is a natural manifestation of the respect which the Soviet people, who know how to value what is truly beautiful, feel for one of the sources of the great Russian river of realistic art.

5003
CSO; 1802

IN THE STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL AND SOCIAL LIBERATION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 80 pp 85-97

[Article by Le Duan, general secretary, Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee]

[Text] The founding of the Communist Party of Vietnam, on 3 February 1930, marked a decisive turn in the Vietnamese revolutionary movement. The Vietnamese working class, represented by its vanguard party, assumed the historical mission of guiding the cause of national and social liberation.

In 50 years, headed by the communist party, the Vietnamese people covered the distance from leaflets calling for the struggle to powerful armed uprisings and wars for liberation and defense of the homeland, which ended in a brilliant victory. They thus recorded heroic pages in the great history of the homeland and opened a new era for the country--the era of independent and united Vietnam, firmly marching toward socialism.

The deep changes which took place over the past half century in Vietnam are linked with the historical events in the homeland of the great Lenin, events which shook up the entire world and were consistent with the basic changes in the international arena.

In the 1920's the Vietnamese working class emerged in the political arena and launched a comprehensive active struggle in mines, enterprises and plantations in the north, center and south of the country for giving the people basic living freedoms and democratic rights, and against imperialism. The struggle waged by the working class and the tempestuous actions mounted by the peasantry against taxation, high land lease payments and cruel oppression, and the revolutionary activities of the patriotic intelligentsia formed the powerful wave of the national-democratic movement for a new life and for new ideals.

At that time world capitalism had fully revealed its reactionary nature and the age of bourgeois revolutions was a thing of the past. Conversely, the great victory of the October Revolution in Russia, the first successes proletarian revolution in the world, illuminated, like a bright sun, the

five continents and showed the way for the struggle of the working class and all oppressed peoples on earth.

Comrade Nguyen Ai Quoc (the future President Ho Chi Minh), the great Vietnamese patriot, immediately realized the significance of the October Revolution. He properly understood the nature of Marxism-Leninism and saw that the true way to national salvation was that of the proletarian revolution. On a cold winter night in 1921, in Paris, studying V. I. Lenin's thesis on the national problem, Comrade Nguyen Ai Quoc turned his eyes to the fatherland and exclaimed with deep emotion: "Fellow compatriots suffering in oppression! That is what we need! This is our way to liberation!" He emphasized that, ". . . Socialism and communism alone can liberate oppressed peoples and the working people of the world from slavery." Comrade Nguyen Ai Quoc founded the "Association of Vietnamese Revolutionary Youth," introduced the ideas of Marxism-Leninism in the Vietnamese workers' and patriotic movements, and undertook the ideological, political and organizational preparations for the creation of a vanguard party of the Vietnamese working class.

Immediately after its foundation, in the political theses of 1930, drafted by its first general secretary, Comrade Tran Phu, the Communist Party of Vietnam stipulated that the Vietnamese revolution is a national-democratic revolution, headed by the working class, a revolution which will lead directly to the establishment of socialism, bypassing the capitalist stage of development. As of that moment the Vietnamese revolution entered the Marxist-Leninist path. Inseparably linking the cause of national liberation with the liberation of the working class and all working people, and national independence with socialism, the Vietnamese revolution became a structural component of the world proletarian revolution.

Steadily following this basic strategic course, with every passing day the party was tempered in the adamant struggle against the most cruel colonial domination, establishing ever deeper ties with the various popular strata, mastering the art of their mobilization, organization and leadership. The party initiated the three revolutionary upsurges: the revolutionary actions of 1930-1931, whose greatest achievement was the creation of the Nghe Tinh Soviets; the 1936-1939 movement for the organization of the Democratic Front of Indochina in the Struggle Against Fascism and Imperialist War; and the 1939-1945 movement for the creation of the Viet Minh front which expelled the Japanese fascists and French colonizers and brought about the victory of the August 1945 revolution.

Winning a great victory over fascism in World War II, the Soviet Union defeated the most powerful and reactionary capitalist power and created conditions for the headlong development of the global revolution. Under those favorable conditions, the Communist Party of Vietnam chose the proper time to lead the entire people to uprising and deliver decisive blows at the enemy centers in Hanoi, the capital, and in other cities and provincial centers. It totally eliminated the system of colonial rule in the rural areas and assumed the power throughout the country.

The victory of the August revolution brought about radical changes in the life of the entire nation and of each individual Vietnamese. The revolution in Vietnam was a model of national people's democratic revolution carried out under the leadership of the working class and the first to win in a colonial semifeudal country.

Immediately following the founding of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the French colonizers launched provocative actions in South Vietnam. Uniting, the domestic and foreign enemies were planning to eliminate the young revolutionary power in a country surrounded by imperialism and international reaction. Headed by President Ho Chi Minh, the Communist Party of Vietnam skillfully used the tactic of dividing the enemy, fighting either one enemy or another, thus defeating enemy intrigues. At the end of 1946 a nationwide war of resistance broke out throughout the country against the French colonizers. The entire Vietnamese people fought with inflexible resolve for national salvation, "ready to gain independence and freedom even if it became necessary to level the Truong Son mountains." After nine years of a heroic struggle, full of privation, the army and people of Vietnam defeated the regular troops of the French colonizers operating with the support of the American imperialists. The sacred war of resistance waged by the Vietnamese people was gloriously crowned by the major successes of the strategic 1953-1954 offensive and the victory in the great battle of Dien Bien Phu. This victory opened for North Vietnam the path to socialism, put an end to the colonial rule in Vietnam, and laid the beginning of the breakdown of colonialism in the Indochinese Peninsula and throughout the world. Hardly emerging from the bloodshedding resistance war against the French colonizers, the Vietnamese people entered into a new, lengthier and fiercer struggle against the American imperialists, who headed the imperialist camp and were playing the role of global policeman. They made use of their military power and latest tactical and strategic methods of warfare to the maximum in an effort to suppress the Vietnamese revolution, defeat the cause of national independence and socialism in Vietnam, and thus strike at the entire global revolutionary movement.

Adopting the call of President Ho Chi Minh that "Nothing is More Precious than Independence and Freedom!" the Vietnamese people gave to the sacred cause of the salvation and defense of the homeland everything it had, everything that was most valuable and precious of every Vietnamese family or individual. The aggression lasted over 20 years, during the tenure of 5 U.S. presidents. Within that time the United States launched, on four occasions, a strategic war in the south and twice resumed the destructive war in the north, dropping over 7.8 million tons of bombs, all this accompanied by floods of slanders and threats. Despite everything, however, the U.S. imperialists were unable to weaken the firmness and resistance of the Vietnamese people and suffered total defeat.

Winning a great victory in the general offensive and in the uprising of the spring of 1975, whose high point was the historic "Ho Chi Minh" operation, the Vietnamese people carried out their sacred mission and gained their

freedom forever and achieved the unification of their homeland and the possibility to follow the path of socialism. At the same time, they fulfilled their noble international duty toward the fraternal peoples of Laos and Kampuchea and made a worthy contribution to the revolutionary cause of the peoples the world over.

The heroic war of resistance waged by the Vietnamese people against the American aggressors represented a fierce confrontation between revolutionary and counterrevolutionary forces in the world. The victory in Vietnam represents the victory of the new forces embodying the new world, the forces of national independence and socialism, which cannot be defeated by any aggressor. Along with the fast and comprehensive development of the Soviet Union and the entire global socialist system and the world national-liberation and workers' movements, the victory in Vietnam marked a new stage in the development of international events.

The positions of the reactionary forces and imperialism, American above all, became even weaker. Neocolonialism is facing the threat of total elimination; the power and offensive thrust of all three revolutionary currents of our time have increased noticeably.

The Fourth Congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam, held at the end of 1976, summed up the results of the national people's democratic revolution and confirmed the course to a socialist revolution on the scale of the entire country as a new stage in the development of the Vietnamese revolution.

After 30 years of war, the Vietnamese people have the sole aspiration of rebuilding the country, strengthening and developing the economy, upgrading their living standard and strengthening their ties of peace and friendship with the neighboring countries and peoples the world over. However, the hostile policy and aggressive actions of the Beijing ruling circles have placed the Vietnamese state and people in an exceptionally complex situation.

Concealed behind Marxist-Leninist and socialist ideas, the Chinese ruling circles are, in fact, pursuing through their foreign policy a most reactionary strategy aimed at establishing an alliance with imperialism and the other sinister forces, undermining socialism, national independence and peace, and implementing their hegemonistic and expansionistic policy in their aspiration toward global domination and, above all, domination of Southeast Asia. The Chinese reactionaries have directed the wedge of their policy against the Soviet Union--the bulwark of peace and revolution--which they consider the main obstacle on the path of their plans for global domination. They consider Vietnam as well, a socialist country promoting an independent and autonomous course and a clear policy of international solidarity, and an important factor of peace and national independence in Southeast Asia, as the biggest obstacle to their expansionistic and hegemonistic plans in this area. Therefore, immediately after the end of the

war waged by the Vietnamese people against U.S. aggression, the Chinese leadership, exposing its truly counterrevolutionary nature, engaged in an open conspiracy with the imperialist forces, the United States above all, fiercely undermining the building of Vietnam, launching a campaign of slander, and trying to blockade, isolate, weaken and capture Vietnam and split the combat solidarity among Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea, with a view to the annexation of the entire Indochinese Peninsula.

The Chinese reactionaries became the direct enemies of the people of Vietnam, seriously undermining the revolutionary cause of the peoples of the world. The struggle against imperialism, the main enemy of the revolution, is inseparable from the struggle against the great-power expansionism and hegemonism of China. The struggle for the defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism requires the decisive exposure of all reactionary doctrines of Beijing's ruling circles.

Despite the total failure of the plans to use the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique to pursue a policy of genocide in Kampuchea and promote a war on the border between Kampuchea and Vietnam, and despite the failure of the open aggression launched against Vietnam in the northern border provinces, as in the past, the Chinese reactionaries have not abandoned their course hostile toward Vietnam. Currently our country is in a state of peace. However, a new war may break out at any moment. The historical mission of the entire people of Vietnam and of their armed forces is decisively to defeat the aggressive intents of the Chinese expansionists and hegemonists, protect the independence and territorial integrity of the homeland, contribute to strengthening the forces of socialism and the national-liberation movement and defend the peace the world over.

Thirty years of violent warfare brought about tremendous destruction and social upheavals in our country, where small-scale production is widespread. Under conditions in which difficulties remain the aggressive war launched by the Chinese expansionists and the natural disasters considerably complicated the situation. In the face of such severe trials, guided by the CPV, and with the aid of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries, brimming with the spirit of proletarian internationalism, the Vietnamese people achieved important successes in healing the wounds of the war and eliminating the consequences of the natural disasters. They rebuilt production facilities and undertook their development and the reorganization of the economy and social relations in the south, the creation of a new material and technical base throughout the country, the enhancement of the educational and cultural standards of the people, and the strengthening of security and public order.

In a land subjected to numerous bombing raids, the people, three generations of which were forced to bear arms, having paid for their independence and freedom with incalculable sacrifices, are now in a state of war and must constantly counter the threat of the outbreak of a new war with their enemies. Tightening its belt further, they must lay the foundations of

socialism, train a large detachment of scientific and technical personnel and workers, see to it that everyone has enough to eat and clothe himself and a job, see to it that young people go to school, and care for children and the sick. The severe legacy of the past is being eliminated in the recently liberated southern part of the country. New relations are developing among people. All this is the profound cause of the Vietnamese people and a priceless capital, linked with a most profound faith in the correctness of the chosen course, allowing us to go on building a bright future.

The conclusion of the Friendship and Cooperation Treaty between Vietnam and the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries, and Vietnam's affiliation with COMRA, effectively contributed to strengthening relations of solidarity and cooperation between our country and the world's socialist comity, providing the Vietnamese people with a solid foundation for the all-round development of the homeland and the defense of its territorial integrity.

The elapsed half a century was saturated with a difficult revolutionary struggle, full of heroism and self-sacrifice. Waging it, the Vietnamese people dedicated incredible efforts to surmount numerous difficulties and defeat strong and cruel enemies. They protected and defended their native land and are now laying the foundations for socialism, the most progressive system in the history of mankind.

These achievements are the victory of Vietnam's revolutionary heroism and of the immortal Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

The main conclusion of the half-a-century victorious path followed by the Communist Party of Vietnam and the Vietnamese people may be reduced to the need to carry high the banner of national independence and socialism. This is the base of revolutionary strategy and tactic. Firmly following this course, our party defeated bourgeois reformism and petit bourgeois adventurism. It eliminated the harmful influence of the Trotskyites. It blocked opportunistic "left" and right currents, mobilized and rallied all national and democratic forces, created, above all, an alliance between the working class and the peasantry, on the basis of which the revolutionary army was raised, and formed a single national front and state system. All these are most important factors which determined the victory of the revolution.

Today, after the full liberation of the country, the concepts of national independence and socialism blend. Democracy and socialism are one. Socialism alone can reliably guarantee the people their independence, happiness and full discovery of all possibilities and best traditions of the people. At the same time, however, the building of socialism could be successful only by strictly observing the common laws and taking into consideration the economic, social and historical characteristics of the country.

Bearing high the banner of national independence and socialism, the Communist Party of Vietnam is implementing Lenin's appeal: "Proletarians of all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!"

The victories won by the Vietnamese revolution over the past 50 years are victories of the proper military line pursued for over 30 years by the Communist Party of Vietnam in two national-liberation wars and two wars for the defense of the fatherland. This line reflects the general political line and revolutionary methods developed by the party. It is based on waging war based on the principle of "for the sake of the people and with the forces of the people," everywhere, and by the entire people. It means the mobilization and organization of the entire people in the struggle with the enemy and for defense, the combining of mass political forces with armed forces, and coordinating in all fronts of the struggle, services and strategic districts, the ways, means and scales of conduct of combat operations. This forms a tremendous single combat power which makes it possible for small forces to win major victories over a strong enemy. The concept of offensive strategy is the consistent strategic concept which is defined by our revolutionary and military line. In both their liberation wars and wars waged to defend the homeland, our army and people have always been guided by the desire to retain the initiative for offensive operations. This made it possible to control the situation and to strike steadily, preparing decisive offensive, i.e., achieving total victory through partial victories.

Throughout its semi-centennial existence, the Communist Party of Vietnam has always been a truly internationalist party. From the moment of its founding it considered the cause of the Vietnamese revolution part of the overall revolutionary struggle of the three nations on the Indochinese Peninsula. Guided by the spirit of internationalism, the peoples of the three fraternal countries steadily strengthened and developed their traditional solidarity and special relations of cooperation. Sharing joys and sadness, they jointly struggled against the common enemy in the course of several generations, always helping one another and supporting one another from a grain of salt or cup of rice to their own lives. Over the past decades these friendship ties have become unbreakable. This doomed all aggressive intrigues to failure.

The Communist Party of Vietnam has always closely linked the revolutionary cause of the working class and people of Vietnam with the broad revolutionary movement of the working class and of the peoples of other countries fighting for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism. Vietnam has made an active contribution to the defense and strengthening of the global revolutionary forces. At the same time, it received exceptionally valuable help from its combat friends.

The heroic Soviet people--a powerful friend brimming with the spirit of proletarian internationalism--has always taken the side of the Vietnamese people, at all stages of its combat road. In all the wars for liberation

and defense of the country waged by the Vietnamese people, the Soviet Union gave Vietnam generous, comprehensive and effective aid, contributing to upgrading Vietnam's combat capability in the battlefields, supporting the life of the population in the rear, and at the same time providing powerful support for the just position of Vietnam in the international arena. The USSR helped in the construction of important economic and cultural projects and in laying the foundations of socialism in our country. It trained for Vietnam thousands of scientific and technical specialists and skilled workers. This is a valuable capital in the building and the defense of our country. In periods of particular difficulties created by the consequences of the war and the uninterrupted natural disasters, the Soviet Union generously helped Vietnam with supplies of prime necessity goods and valuable materials for the rebuilding and development of production facilities. Despite all difficulties and privations, Soviet specialists are sincerely helping Vietnamese cadre personnel and workers in building their homeland. Generation after generation, the party members and the entire people of Vietnam will always be profoundly grateful to the party, government and people of the fraternal Soviet Union.

We are sincerely grateful also to the other fraternal socialist countries, communist and workers' parties, liberated countries and the national-liberation movement and all progressive forces in the world who gave Vietnam substantial support and great aid. We have always considered international solidarity and aid one of the factors which insured the victory of the Vietnamese revolution.

Following the liberation of the south and the reunification of the homeland, the Vietnamese people undertook the building of socialism, which is consistent with the deep expectations of the nation and is a source for the happiness of the people and an invincible force guarding independence and freedom.

Today, when socialism, whose bulwark the Soviet Union is, has become a global system with tremendous modern industrial potential and progressive science and technology, capitalism has sunk in a state of general crisis. The scientific and technical revolution is rapidly developing and bringing mankind unparalleled opportunities. The direct conversion to socialism has become an objective law not only for countries with a highly developed economy, but for backward countries who gained their national independence. The rich experience of the republics of the Soviet Union, Mongolia and a number of other countries, eloquently proves the accuracy of the familiar Leninist concept that "with the help of the proletariat of the leading countries, the backward countries will be able to adopt the soviet system and, after covering certain steps of development, reach communism while bypassing the capitalist stage of development" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 41, p 246).

A direct transition from small-scale and backward production to socialism is an exceptionally difficult matter, for the new system not only inherits

from the old society production forces, science, technology, cadre personnel, workers, labor discipline and labor methods, but must recreate all the necessary prerequisites for socialism. The most difficult task is the creation of a large-scale industry, without which, as Lenin pointed out, "there could not even be a question of socialism in general, and even less so in the case of a peasant country". . . ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 43, pp 305-306).

In Vietnam this is particularly difficult, for, on the way to socialism, we must resolve not only the two basic and urgent problems--the retention and enhancement of the living standards of the people and the creation of the material and technical foundations for socialism, but carry out another, no less important and urgent task--increasing the combat capability and combat readiness to defend the homeland.

Summing up the practice of the socialist revolution in Vietnam and after a thorough study of the experience of the Soviet Union and the fraternal countries, the Fourth CPV Congress earmarked a course of building socialism on the scale of the entire Vietnam: firmly implementing the dictatorship of the proletariat, it engaged in the simultaneous making of three revolutions: production relations, scientific and technical, and ideological and cultural. The scientific and technical revolution is the key one. It calls for the creation of a system of socialist collective economic management, large-scale socialist production, a new culture and a new, socialist person. The course adopted at the congress is comprehensive. It has a complete target and contains two points of particular importance: the establishment of a system of collective economic management by the working people and the accomplishment of socialist industrialization.

The right to collective economic management by the working people in all fields is the essence of the socialist system. It is incompatible with the capitalist system, where private ownership holds dominating positions while the proletariat is forced to hire out its manpower. As the first to formulate the idea of collective economic management, Marx and Engels believed that socialism is a social system in which the concept of "public" and "collective" are the basic factors, and that the transition to socialism is a transition from the "kingdom of necessity" to the "kingdom of freedom" in which man becomes the master of society, nature and himself.

The creation of a socialist collective economic management system means the creation of a system of political, economic, cultural and social relations within which the working people will feel themselves as the true masters and, organized in collectives, will exercise their right to run the country essentially through the state organs under the party's guidance. These relations include the organic structure and system of activities based on objective laws in accordance with the will of society and the individual, streamlining the governmental laws guaranteeing the steady enhancement of the conscientiousness and capabilities of all organizations and citizens to fulfill their ownership role, promoting the unity of interests of the

individual, the collective and society at large, and using all opportunities to insure the ever fuller satisfaction of the material and cultural requirements of the toiling people. The creation of such a system of relations is a process of growth carried out through three revolutions: in production relations, science and technology, and ideology and culture.

The various units within the state apparatus are the main organizational form through which the working people exercise their rights as collective owners. Therefore, we must dedicate all our efforts to the building of the state, establishing, on the political level, the right of the working people to be the master, and making the socialist state, in the true meaning of the word, a state "of the people, by the people, and for the people," guaranteeing the entire population the full exercise of civil rights and individual freedoms consistent with the party line and governmental laws.

In the initial stages of the transitional period to socialism collective economic management in the economic field is both a new form of production relations and new production forces, for, as long as no large-scale machine industry has been created, the organized and redistributed collective labor is the biggest productive force. Combined with productive capital, it forms an efficient economic structure which enables us to upgrade public labor productivity and increase the production of material values.

Collective economic management in the field of culture means insuring for all people a meaningful spiritual life, making cultural values accessible to all, and creating for the people conditions in which they will directly engage in the recreation of cultural values and founding a new culture, socialist in content and national in nature, gradually converting their homeland into a country with a highly developed culture.

The system of collective economic management is created on three different scales: for the entire country, on the district level, and on the enterprise level. Through the central organs of the state system the collectives of working people exercise their ownership right on the national scale. This is manifested in the nationwide program and development plan, and the common rights and obligations of all citizens. In the districts, the ownership right of the working people is exercised in the economic, cultural and social life of the given area. On the basis of the economic programs and plans and the stipulations and policies of the central governmental organs, each district has the right and obligation to develop the creative forces of the population with a view to the fastest possible strengthening and development of the economy, culture, education, health care, physical culture and sports, improve the material and spiritual life of the people, and make a steadily growing contribution to the building of the country. The working people's collectives at enterprises, cooperatives and so on are the direct owners of the enterprise or cooperative. This is expressed in their active efforts to improve production efficiency and make the best possible use of all production possibilities for achieving the highest possible output at the lowest possible cost, and successfully

fulfilling the state plan and duty to society, improving their lives and accumulating funds for expanded reproduction.

With a sensibly organized structure, the system of collective socialist economic management makes it possible to implement more completely the principle of collective economic management on the scale of the entire society and, at the same time, to comprehensively develop the true freedom and creative efforts of the individual, harmoniously combining private with collective and social interests. Thus the implementation of the principle of collective economic management is both the all-embracing objective of the building of socialism, as well as the main motive force for industrialization and for the further development of the entire society. Applying Lenin's familiar formula that "communism is the soviet system plus the electrification of the entire country," the Communist Party of Vietnam believes that under Vietnamese conditions, in an economy in which small-scale and backward production is still widespread, "socialism is a system of collective economic management plus socialist industrialization."

In the case of a backward country converting directly to socialism the need for socialist industrialization is legitimate and its successful implementation during this transitional period determines the victory in the "who-whom?" struggle. Therefore, the acceleration of the process of socialist industrialization is the central task of the Vietnamese state. The creation of an industrial structure whose pivot is heavy industry means equipping all economic sectors with new technology, agriculture above all, replacing manual with mechanized labor, and converting from small-scale and backward production to large-scale modern production.

However, successful industrialization and conversion of small-scale production into big socialist production calls for establishing proper ratios between production relations and production forces, between industry and agriculture, between large-scale and small-scale production and between the development of the country's national economy and the expansion of foreign economic relations. Such are the basic problems of the process of economic construction in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Because of the insufficient economic development of Vietnam, the creation of a modern economy in our country largely depends on the process of developing new production relations, combined with the development of production forces. The establishment of new, socialist production relations is aimed not only at the elimination of exploitation and of the reasons for exploitation, but at insuring conditions for the development of production forces. In turn, the development of production forces is needed for the creation of the material base and the strengthening of new production relations. In order to achieve this we must link the reorganization of production relations with the reorganization of the production process, the redistribution of social labor, and the accelerated installation of new equipment. Strengthening and improving new production relations, we must not only link changes in ownership rights with changes in the management

and distribution system, but comprehensively develop a material and technical base, accelerate production development and enhance labor productivity and the economic effectiveness and income of the working people, thus contributing to the ever greater involvement of the people in public production. On the other hand, the development of production forces requires not only the expansion of capital construction, the improvement of the tools of labor, the application of the achievements of scientific and technical progress, and the enhancement of the professional standards of the working people, but the steady improvement of management and distribution with a view to insuring the full implementation of the rights of the people's masses to be their own masters, and to encourage them to engage in inspired labor and the proper utilization of equipment and material and financial facilities.

The process of conversion from small-scale to large-scale socialist production dictates the need for a mixed economic structure which includes the state, cooperative, state-private, private and petty marketing sectors. This makes it possible to make the fullest possible use of the production, labor and technical possibilities of the society. Within this structure the socialist sector (state and cooperative) holds a leading position and is the main source for public production.

Clearly realizing the important role of agriculture in the life of the people and socialist industrialization, we are trying to reach, within a certain period of time, the highest possible utilization of all possibilities for increasing agricultural production with a view to securing food supplies for society and manpower resources and raw material for industry, and to create export possibilities. At the same time, we well realize that without industry, heavy industry above all, there can be not only no socialism, but that agriculture itself cannot be developed. For this reason, we must make full use of all the possibilities within the country and the help of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries for the efficient development of heavy industry on a priority basis. A proper structure, volumes and pace of development of heavy industry must be determined to insure its greatest influence on the development of agricultural production and light industry. We must link industry with agriculture and develop a single structure on a national scale as well as within each district and enterprise for interaction between industry and agriculture and for their joint development in the course of the organization of large-scale socialist production. We must steadily insure the balanced development of heavy and light industry and agriculture in accordance with economic requirements and possibilities.

The country's national economy is a double system consisting of economy under central jurisdiction¹ and a local economy,² with a clear functional division, closely interacting under the leading role of the former. That is how we focus some types of production facilities on a national scale, while expanding democracy and developing the initiative of the local power organs and primary units. We must accelerate the nationwide creation of

single industrial sectors controlled by the central organs. This will contribute to the acceleration of production specialization, cooperation and unification, and the accelerated application of scientific and technical achievements in modern large-scale output. We must comprehensively develop the local economy of each province and district in order to encourage the division of labor, the fullest possible utilization of natural resources, the increase of output, the rational distribution of material funds and improvements in the life of the population in accordance with the process of the transition from small-scale production to large-scale socialist output.

The economy under central control and the local economy consist of certain economic cells--the primary units: industrial enterprises, cooperatives, etc. The comprehensive strengthening, their good utilization of material and labor resources, equipment and machines, and increasing labor productivity and lowering production costs are the main tasks of the economic management organs.

In order to develop large-scale socialist production within a relatively short time, we must try to expand foreign economic relations, particularly with the Soviet Union and the other CEMA-member countries, and consider this a structural part of our strategic economic course, exceptionally important in the creation of a new national economic structure and an effective means for rapid industrial construction and powerful development of agriculture. We must actively participate in the international division of labor and cooperation among the members of the socialist comity, using some of its methods, such as the creation of mixed enterprises, production on a cooperated basis, exchange of goods, manufacturing of goods with raw materials provided by the customer, and so on.

Taking into consideration the requirements of socialist industrialization, we must extensively engage in the training of scientific and technical and management cadres and highly skilled workers, observing the necessary ratios consistent with the vital needs of the economy, and planning for the future. Science and technology must be extensively applied in production and a mass movement to master scientific and technical thinking must be developed.

The process of building a new economy is also a process of developing a strong nationwide defense, of combining economic progress with strengthening defense capability and building socialism while protecting the socialist homeland.

The development of a proper management system with a view to developing the collective economic management of the working people and insuring the fuller utilization of progressive scientific and technological achievements is a decisive factor in the successful reorganization and development of the economy. Management must combine planning with extensive utilization of marketplace relations. We must insure the production of the greatest

possible volume of consumer goods with the lowest possible outlays. The law of production cost and, particularly, the basic economic law of socialism, the law of planned proportional development, must be properly applied within the system of socialist economic laws. We must insure distribution according to labor and, at the same time, gradually raise the public prosperity and guarantee the combination of public, collective and private interests. We must accurately establish a ratio between consumption and accumulation, pursue an efficient policy in the consumption area and engage in strict conservation.

The building of a new social system and the new economy must go hand in hand with the molding of the new, socialist person. The new person is the collective owner, worker, raised in the spirit of socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism. The new person is a person with proper ideology and outstanding feelings, intellect and energy, enabling him to become the master of society, nature and himself. The new person is a person showing great love for the working people, characterized by feelings of solidarity, cooperation and mutual aid in the work, struggle and building of a new life. The new person is a person who considers the building of a free and happy life for all people the supreme ideal and great happiness. The molding of the new person, therefore, is the molding of a comprehensively developed person, harmoniously combining the individual with the social. As the product of society, the new person is molded through practical activities, labor and social struggle. The molding of the new person must be undertaken the moment he is born and throughout his life, by all mass organizations, enterprises and cultural and educational institutions, in the course of social activities and in each urban district, village or family.

After half a century of struggle, the Communist Party of Vietnam has gained comprehensive training and is now a tempered and experienced vanguard of the working class and people of Vietnam. The new stage in the Vietnamese revolution demanded of the CPV to master even more profoundly the revolutionary and scientific nature of Marxism-Leninism, raise higher the banner of national independence and socialism, and struggle for the full implementation of the behests of President Ho Chi Minh and the historical decisions of the fourth party congress.

In order to implement the revolutionary tasks at the new stage, our party is comprehensively struggling for raising its theoretical level in all fields of knowledge, strengthening unity within its ranks, creating firm party organizations, primary in particular, training and retraining cadres and upgrading the quality structure of the party's membership. The party must strengthen even further its close relations with the masses. It must promote the right of the working people to be the collective masters and create conditions for the participation of the masses in party construction. The party must be concerned with creating state power organs capable of administering the economy and society. It must energize the activities of the public organizations, turning them into a real school of socialism for the people.

Developing the tradition of the Vietnamese people's infinite loyalty to the principle of proletarian internationalism, our party will dedicate all its efforts to the development of comprehensive cooperation between Vietnam and the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity, and close solidarity with the revolutionary forces throughout the world.

The Vietnamese people firmly believe that, implementing the decisions of the Fourth CPV Congress, and with the tremendous and effective aid of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries, they will mandatorily surmount their difficulties, successfully build socialism and create a new life on Vietnamese soil, wrecking all plans of the aggressor, reliably protecting the sacred soil of the homeland, fully implementing their international duty and making a worthy contribution to the revolutionary cause of the peoples on earth.

The dark future of imperialism and Chinese expansionism are in sharp contrast with the current favorable conditions and excellent prospects facing the revolutionary and progressive forces. The steady strengthening of the power of the Soviet Union in the course of the building of communism, the total victory of socialism in a number of countries, the appearance of a number of countries with a socialist orientation, the tempestuous development of the movement for national independence and the confident struggle waged by the workers and working people in the capitalist countries are all tremendous historical victories which accelerate the triumph of Marxism-Leninism and scientific socialism the world over.

U.S. imperialism, invariably reactionary in nature, is restructuring its global strategy. It is trying to unify its forces and to strengthen the U.S.-Western Europe-Japan alliance with a comprehensive conspiracy with the reactionary ruling group in China, promoting a policy of deviousness accompanied by military threats and provocations. It is doing all this in an attempt to counterattack the revolutionary and progressive forces, delay the fall of the capitalist system and defend its remaining positions. Along with this, the leading trend in the world today is the powerful strategic offensive of the three revolutionary currents flowing in a single direction, step by step restricting and defeating separately the imperialist forces for the sake of achieving the overall objective of peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

Under circumstances in which imperialism and world reaction are urging on the arms race, poisoning the international climate and increasing tension, the defense of peace throughout the world is the urgent task of all nations and the common objective of the revolutionary and progressive forces. The revolutionary struggle waged by the peoples on earth create additional opportunities for the preservation and strengthening of the peace. In turn, the peace creates favorable circumstances for the development of the revolution.

Decisively and consistently pursuing a peaceful foreign policy, the socialist countries are tirelessly struggling for disarmament, restricting

strategic offensive armaments, peaceful coexistence and detente. The conclusion of the SALT II treaty was an important victory for peace. The unilateral reduction by the Soviet Union of forces in accordance with the peaceful initiative formulated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in Berlin last October, as well as the constructive proposals submitted by the Warsaw Pact members met with the warm approval and support of the world's public opinion. All the intentions of imperialist militaristic forces and of the ruling Beijing group, pursuing the arms race and strengthening their military alliance, are doomed to failure.

The principled policy of our party and state is that of unity and comprehensive cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity. We have scrupulously implemented and are implementing the treaties and agreements concluded with the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries, and our obligations toward CEMA.

As in the past half century, we shall continue systematically to implement a policy of solidarity with Laos and Kampuchea, and steadily strengthen the special alliance among the peoples of the three countries of Indochina. Any attempt on the part of the reactionary forces and their interference in the domestic affairs of Kampuchea and of support of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique, aimed at eliminating the gains of the revolution and destroying the independence of the Kampuchean people, are doomed to total failure. The course of events in Kampuchea is irreversible.

We firmly protest the actions of the American imperialists and international reactionary forces who are heating up the tension in the Middle East and Central Asia, supplying arms to counterrevolutionary elements fighting the independence and freedom of the nations of the area. We warmly support the revolutionary cause of the Afghan people, carried out under the leadership of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, headed by Comrade Babrak Karmal. The noble support offered by the Soviet Union to the Afghan people defending their revolutionary gains from foreign intervention is fully consistent with the expectations of the revolutionary peoples, international law and the interests of the peace. A revolutionary is tested according to whether or not he tries, with all his heart, to help a revolutionary nation, or else leaves to be harrowed by the forces of imperialism and reaction.

We firmly support the policy of friendship and good-neighborly relations with the countries of Southeast Asia and are making our contribution to the transformation of this area into an area of peace, independence, neutrality and prosperity. We firmly oppose the plans of imperialism and international reaction to divide and promote hatred among the countries in the area. We welcome the foreign policy of peace and friendship pursued by the Republic of India and are strengthening our solidarity with it. We support the struggle for national independence and social progress of all the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. We are doing everything possible to assist in strengthening the movement of nonaligned countries.

The Vietnamese people have always valued the old friendship with the Chinese people. They have always been grateful for the aid and support of the Chinese people in the liberation of the people of Vietnam. In the interest of our nations we would like to resolve all problems in relations between our two countries through peaceful talks. However, the Beijing authorities are pursuing their own aggressive plans and feverishly preparing for new military adventures. They will have to bear the entire responsibility for subsequent serious consequences.

Clearly aware of the tasks of the contemporary age, together with the world revolutionary and progressive forces, the socialist countries will unquestionably wreck all the plans of imperialism and the international reactionaries. Progressive mankind is entering the new decade ever stronger and with ever more promising prospects. It will be gaining ever greater successes in the struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

FOOTNOTES

1. The economy under central administration consists of sectors and enterprises directly controlled by the central power organs and of national importance.
2. The local economy consists of enterprises directly controlled by the local power organs with a view to the full utilization of local manpower and raw material resources, satisfying specific regional requirements and creating accumulations for central capital investments.

5003
CSO: 1802

COEVAL WITH THE CENTURY

Moscow **KOMMUNIST** in Russian No 4, Mar 80 pp 98-107

[Article by T. Timofeyev, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers' Movement, on the occasion of the 80th birthday of Luigi Longo]

[Text] The revolutionary age creates fighters worthy of their time. It was such people who have "entirely dedicated themselves to the struggle for the liberation of the working class," acting "persistently and steadfastly among the proletarian masses, and helping to develop their awareness, organization and revolutionary activity" that V. I. Lenin wrote about, describing them as "people's heroes" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 20, p 82).

Our age, inaugurated by the October Revolution, has been unequalled in world history in this gain as well. The revolutionary fighters of the post-October age are people armed with a Marxist-Leninist outlook, possessing inflexible confidence in the triumph of the ideas of communism and, therefore, the tremendous power of their convictions. These are leaders of the masses stemming from the people, their leaders and organizers, tempered in the flames of class battles and the political and military storms of our century. They are people with outstanding, difficult and heroic lives. . . .

Comrade Luigi Longo belongs to this great galaxy of noted leaders of the world's communist movement. He was born on 15 March 1900 in a settlement in northern Italy. In his adolescence he became a professional revolutionary, an irreconcilable and active fighter against reaction. For many years he headed the clandestine activities of the communists in fascist Italy. He was a delegate of the Italian Communist Party at Comintern congresses and participated in the work of the Communist Youth International. He has behind him about three-quarters of a century of difficult clandestine work, police persecution and forced movement from one place to another, usually with false identification as an Italian, Frenchman, Spaniard, Swiss or Finn. He became widely known as Gallo among the participants in the national-revolutionary war in Spain. As inspector general of the

International Brigades, in 1936-1939 he made a great contribution to the organization of international aid to the Spanish anti-fascists. Longo personally participated in many battles. He was wounded in the battles for Madrid and left Spain only with the last subunits of the International Brigades. This was followed by more detentions and exiles. . . .

Luigi Longo is a fighter. In World War II he assumed the leadership of the partisan struggle behind the Hitlerite forces in Italy. He was the commander in chief of the Garibaldi shock brigades created by the communists; he represented the Italian Communist Party in the National Liberation Committee of Northern Italy and was deputy army commander of the entire Italian resistance--the Free Volunteers Corps. Finally, he headed the mass anti-fascist uprising of April 1945.

Following the liberation of Italy from fascism he was elected member of the constituent assembly. In January 1946 Luigi Longo became deputy secretary general of the ICP. Following Palmiro Togliatti's death, in the summer of 1964, he became secretary general and, since 1972, chairman of the Italian Communist Party.

All of Luigi Longo's activities have been dedicated to the struggle for the proletarian cause and for the interests of the broad popular masses. He attended his political "universities" initially in industrial Turin. Here as early as the summer of 1917, a general anti-war strike broke out with fighting at the barricades, developing into a workers' uprising. It was precisely in Turin that at the time the left-wing socialists, Antonio Gramsci and Palmiro Togliatti among them, enjoyed the greatest influence. L. Longo joined the ranks of the socialist party and actively involved himself in the activities of its left wing. Here, in the period of the founding of the communist party, he worked within the secretariat of its Piedmont Committee. When the sallies of fascist gangs became more frequent, following a party assignment, Longo headed in Turin and the Piedmont area the work on organizing armed "Red Guard" detachments which included members of the communist party and the progressive youth.

As in other countries, the Italian labor movement experienced the tremendous impact of the Great October Revolution and the powerful upsurge it triggered in the world's revolutionary movement. Looking back at these initial, starting times, L. Longo said that the main lesson which the October Revolution gave the Italian and the international revolutionary movement was that in addition to everything possible it proved that socialism could be transformed from a dream into reality.

One of these lessons was also the realization on the part of the proletarian revolutionaries of the truth that a proper political line is needed and that it can neither be formulated nor implemented without eliminating reformist illusions.

. . . Exactly 60 years ago, in 1920, Lenin was talking with a group of Italian socialists in the Kremlin. At that time, under circumstances

governed by the revolutionary upsurge, a mass movement of working people for the seizure of enterprises was developing in a number of Italian cities. Vladimir Il'ich asked his visitors their opinion of the movement. Answering Lenin, Enrico Dugoni, a parliament deputy, stated that the Italian socialists are not in a hurry to make a revolution. They, the Italian guest went on to say, run the Labor Chambers with the help of which they control, he claimed, industry and agriculture. They enjoy a majority in all or virtually all municipalities in the country, controlled through the League of Socialist Communes. They have a dense network of cooperatives which are a lever for influencing the economy. In a word, E. Dugoni said, "we enjoy all the advantages of the power without burdening ourselves with the responsibility of power." He had hardly finished when Lenin said, firmly and sharply: "Your Labor Chambers will be burned down. You will be expelled from your socialist municipalities and your cooperatives will be broken up!" Lenin explained, as subsequently told by one of the participants in the conversation, that one cannot harm the power of the owners of the wealth while, at the same time, refusing to seize the power, however great the responsibility and efforts this might entail (see "Vospominaniya o V. I. Lenine" [Recollections of V. I. Lenin], Vol V, Recollections of Foreign Contemporaries, Politizdat, Moscow, 1969, pp 306-307).

Only a few months later the violent breakup of the left-wing municipality in Bologna in fact proclaimed the beginning of the campaign of the fascist-leaning reaction against all progressive forces in the country. The Italian communists, including Luigi Longo, frequently recalled Lenin's warning to the effect that "the bourgeoisie in Italy and throughout the world will do everything possible, engaging in crimes and atrocities, to block the proletariat from assuming power and to overthrow its power" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 41, p 423).

Starting with the end of 1920, the revolutionary wave in Italy began to abate. The reaction became brazen and launched a counteroffensive. Fierce reprisals were undertaken against the working people and their organizations at the enterprises. At that time, the lack of a revolutionary proletarian party in the country was felt particularly greatly, for the communist movement, in Lenin's view, did not as yet exist in Italy (see *ibid*, Vol 44, p 19).

Subsequently Luigi Longo noted that at that time a most violent discussion was taking place within the ranks of the proletariat and, generally, the democratic movement, on who would bear responsibility for the fact that the major battles waged by the proletarian masses, which had indeed shaken up Italy and, in 1920, led to the seizure by the workers of a number of enterprises, had not developed into a powerful influence for the revolutionary power seizure?

The revolutionaries-Leninists provided a principled answer to this question. Even though the movement of the working class, L. Longo writes, was quite broad and widespread, it was at that still "uncertain basically,

since it had no battle revolutionary party." This was followed by the irrefutable conclusion that it was necessary "to create in our country a party of a new type which could lead the working class and peoples' mass to a seizure of power. This path was indicated by the October Revolution and Lenin" (L. Longo and C. Salinari, "Mezhdru Reaktseyey i Revolyutsiyey" [Between Reaction and Revolution], Recollections and Thoughts on the First Years of Activities of the ICP, Politizdat, Moscow, 1974, pp 9-10). This need was clearly felt "in Italy, where the gap between the revolutionary feelings of the masses and the ability of their leaders to lead in the struggle for a seizure of power was considerably greater than in other countries" (ibid, p 10). Together with A. Gramsci and other noted leaders noted leaders of the proletarian movement, L. Longo participated in the work of the Livorno Congress of the Italian Socialist Party (1921), in the course of which the socialist party split and the founding of the Italian Communist Party was proclaimed.

Since then, for the past six decades Luigi Longo's life and activities have been inseparably linked with the party, whose historical path was mentioned by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, speaking in Rome, in August 1964. The Italian communists were in the leading ranks of the working class and with all anti-fascists and democrats in Italy waged a long and adamant struggle against fascist dictatorship and for the freedom and independence of their homeland. "Twenty years of clandestine activities under conditions of ferocious repression, long years of exile and forced labor, and thousands of lives lost for the cause of the people, and thousands and thousands of heroes of the resistance," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said then, "was the price paid by the Italian communists for the right to be in the vanguard of their people. This precisely explains the tremendous faith of millions of Italian citizens in the communist party. . . . Under the leadership of Palmiro Togliatti and other tried leaders of the Italian Communist Party, within that time the beloved party of the Italian working people became a powerful social force in contemporary Italian life."

Close ties with the workers, profound knowledge of their needs, feelings and demands, and an understanding of the combat possibilities of the proletariat have always been inherent in Luigi Longo. This is this the real reason for the effectiveness of his long years of work within the ICP and its leading organs. "We never forget," L. Longo emphasized, "that the decisive role in the struggle for each social gain and for each step aimed at the renovation of the country belongs to the working class, the toiling masses." Speaking from the rostrum of a party congress, participating in conferences with activist workers or scientific conferences, visiting federations or sections of the ICP, he paid tireless attention to the specific study of the situation of the toiling masses and the various population strata and, above all, the working class.

Indeed, the problems of effective struggle for unity among the working people and of all progressive and democratic forces in the country has remained for a number of years within the sight of the Italian communists.

The need to strengthen this unity is dictated both by past experience gained in the fierce clashes with fascism, as well as the current tasks of the unification of the working class and of broadening the ranks of its allies. With all this, L. Longo points out, it would be an illusion to believe that it is possible to take the people's masses away from the nefarious influence of the reaction without unity within the working class itself. Proletarian unity of action could and does offer new major opportunities for the unification of all democratic forces within the country. Appealing, on behalf of the communist party, for a broad movement for new unity, Comrade Longo stated that, "The facts prove that no real policy of renovation and progress could be pursued without the unity and autonomy of all workers' and democratic forces. However, this also means that one cannot pursue such a policy without the development of new relations between communists and socialists and, consequently, without establishing, as a result of this, new dialectical relations among all leftist forces" L. Longo, "Izbrannyye Stat'i i Rechi" [Selected Articles and Speeches], Politizdat, Moscow, 1975, pp 414-415). Pursuing this line, despite long years of persecution and uninterrupted anti-communist reactionary campaigns, the Italian Communist Party not only maintained but strengthened and broadened its relations with the people's masses. It is precisely thanks to this policy, L. Longo noted in 1964, that the ICP "became what it is today," the biggest communist party in the countries of the capitalist West.

The influence of the communists in Italy grew because they were in the vanguard of the class struggle waged by the working people and of their general democratic actions. The lengthy path of this struggle is marked by tense battles. Some of them led to major successes, such as, for example, the course of events which brought about the fall of the Tambroni reactionary Cabinet, in the summer of 1960. Luigi Longo as well frequently spoke and wrote in detail on this major anti-fascist victory, clearly and precisely defining it as "the birth of the new resistance." Profoundly linked with this turning in postwar Italian history is the subsequent powerful upsurge of the labor movement, at the end of the 1960's, characterized not only by the growth of mass strikes, but by features such as uninterrupted mass struggle, qualitative upgrading of the level of demands (in particular, priority given to the slogan of the struggle for workers' control) and the intensification of their aggressive nature.

An outstanding aspect which deserves particular attention in this respect is the role of the progressive youth, tirelessly emphasized by L. Longo, a person with long experience in work within the communist movement.

The ICP leadership continues to ascribe the greatest importance to increasing the influence of proletarian organizations in the mass youth and, particularly, university student movements. In the course of numerous meetings with their members, noted party leaders, including L. Longo, have discussed most seriously and frankly the acute problems facing youth as a result of increased antagonisms within bourgeois society, the growth of

state-monopoly violence and the very contradictory and conflicting course of the scientific and technical revolution. L. Longo has frequently gone back in his speeches and reports to such vital problems of the working and student youth. This is natural, for workers under 30 account for over one half of the contemporary working class. Firmly rejecting attempts to depict the contemporary Western youth as a "lost generation," the communists have always called for a struggle against such concepts. On the one hand, L. Longo cautions against underestimating the mass youth movement and directly points out that efforts are needed to expand within it the communist influence. "Many of the problems formulated by this movement," he pointed out, addressing the March 1968 CC ICP Plenum, "must gain, in the realities of our country, a growing weight and importance on the social and political levels. Furthermore, it seems to me that it could be said that they will represent a special and new aspect of the struggle for democracy and socialism in Italy." At the same time, L. Longo emphasized the need to establish and develop more effective relations between the general democratic actions of the youth and the working class and the struggle waged by the conscious proletarian vanguard. We feel the need, he stated in his report at the June 1968 CC ICP Plenum, to establish closer and more open relations between the struggle in the university and the secondary school and the struggle for the reorganization of society in a socialist direction. Both tasks could be formulated and resolved only if they are closely interconnected.

A feature organically typical of L. Longo is a feeling for the new, so emphatically expressed in connection with the fate of the young people, and easily proved through other problems as well. Here is another example: L. Longo has always kept in his sight the dynamic and comprehensive consequences of scientific and technical progress and the related latest forms of capitalist exploitation, and the changes in the structure of the proletariat and in the nature and content of its material and spiritual needs, production and class aspects, and conditions of struggle, triggered by the scientific and technical revolution. While opposing increased exploitation, Longo pointed out, the communists do not oppose new technology. They are defending the real needs and just rights of the working people. "We are far," he explained, "from adopting a hostile attitude toward technical progress or hindering it, as our opponents are claiming. On the contrary, we are in favor of technical progress and support it. It is precisely for the sake of social and technical progress and the development of productive forces that we are fighting capitalism and, even more so, its monopoly forms which hinder or restrict them." Calling upon party and trade union workers to study such problems more profoundly, and on the basis of his "personal experience and the international Marxist experience," he has frequently emphasized that the struggle waged by the workers neither could nor should be considered merely within the framework of their immediate, partial economic demands. "By acting thus," he stated, in particular, at the Ninth ICP Congress, "we would find ourselves in the positions of a hopeless corporativism and petty reformism" (L. Longo, "Izbrannyye Stat'i i Rechi," p 280).

The topical nature of this problem, and of many others, thoroughly studied by Comrade Longo, not only failed to decline in the 1970's, but on the contrary became even more important in the face of the "already-obvious-to-all gravity of the political, economic, social and moral crisis prevailing in our country," L. Longo wrote in the 1 November 1974 issue of UNITA.

During those and subsequent years Comrade Longo continued to actively participate in party life and in the work of its central committee. He chaired a number of meetings of the ICP leadership, addressed party congresses and central committee plenums, met with the party aktiv and rank-and-file communists and participated in the work of the most important commissions drafting party documents. It would be difficult to overestimate his comprehensive political and ideological-theoretical activities related to the study of the lessons and topical problems of the anti-fascist struggle, the assessment of the revolutionary legacy of the communists and the trends and prospects of their work. Luigi Longo regularly speaks on key problems of strategy and tactics of the workers' movement, at times when it is particularly important for the communists and the toiling masses to hear his authoritative words.

. . . A broad discussion of problems related to refining the party's strategic line was undertaken within the ICP between the end of 1974 and the beginning of 1975 (unquestionably, this was a structural component of the intensive work done by the communist movement analyzing the experience of the tragic event in Chile). In this connection a certain discussion developed on the understanding of the term "historical compromise." A considerable percentage of party cadres found a great deal of unclear and controversial aspects in it. In particular, some developed the temptation to consider it almost like a maneuver, a conversion to an agreement with the ruling bourgeois party, and the formulation by the workers' movement of some essentially different problems in the face of the severe consequences of the capitalist crisis.

It was precisely at that time that Luigi Longo published in the Marxist journal RINASCITA (14 February 1975) an article entitled "The State and the Roots of the Danger of Its Subversion by the Fascists." Noting the unquestionable gains of the organized workers' movement in Italy, the author clearly pointed out that the sociopolitical circumstances in the country are extremely grave and cannot fail to concern the communists. Despite certain successes achieved by left-wing and democratic forces, as before, the people's masses remain deprived of the ability to dictate their will to the ruling groups. Furthermore, the Christian Democratic Party, using the widespread system of "nursing" its supporters with state funds, Longo pointed out, "was able, to a certain extent, to gain mass support for its political monopoly," and it is on this basis that the "menace of authoritarian and reactionary variants" is developing, which could, he cautioned, "question Italy's progress toward democracy." Such a turn and, in particular, the support given the fascists by big capital and its powerful groups, L. Longo emphasized, are not excluded in the least. "It may seem to some

that this picture is exceptionally pessimistic," he went on to say. However, the working class and its organizations may not assume this, and this threat could be prevented through "the organization and democratic struggle of the masses." However, Longo pointed out, to achieve this the communists must "steadily test their ability to provide fast and accurate answers to the expectations, doubts and hesitations of the people" and "to find solutions to problems affecting the toiling masses." As to the other parties which accept the constitution adopted following the victory over fascism, alliance and cooperation with their supporters are possible. The creation of such an alliance from below would strengthen the pressure exerted on the leading groups of such parties through which the bourgeois influence is spread among the masses. "In this case we are motivated by the common interests of the people's masses, of the country at large," Longo emphasized, concluding that agreements and alliances should never be considered as "superstructural," not involving the participation of the masses. The toiling masses must have the possibility to effectively influence the course of events, including the behavior of different political leaders.

Soon afterwards, addressing the 14th ICP Congress, Longo linked even more closely the study of such matters with the prospects for the development of the struggle waged by the broadest possible masses under the conditions of the aggravated crisis of capitalism. Addressing the congress, the ICP chairman said, in particular, that "we know that it is precisely at times of the most profound crisis within the capitalist system and of the most severe class contradictions, that the ruling groups begin to doubt the possibility of retaining their privileges unchanged through standard means. This is a sign of their weakness. However, these groups err should they think of changing their fate by conniving with the cruelties and violence of fascist gangs. They could only further aggravate the contradictions through such actions. . . ." Under such circumstances, L. Longo emphasized, the communists are called upon to mobilize the people and create broad alliances in the struggle for surmounting in the interest of the working people the economic and social crisis brought about through the logic of capitalism and imperialism.

Those who have followed the development of the circumstances in Italy in the middle and second half of the 1970's well remember the heated debates which took place everywhere--among the communists and, essentially, throughout the country--on such matters. In the course of these discussions Comrades L. Longo, E. Berlinguer and other party leaders pointed out that frequently a great variety of meanings are ascribed to the expression "historical compromise." Occasionally, L. Longo pointed out, it is interpreted also "simply as a manifestation of our wish to 'join' current cabinet combinations at all cost."

At the same time, however, the ICP leaders saw that the course toward insuring unity and cooperation among all people's and progressive forces, needed, as the communist party believes, for the reaching of a new stage in the anti-fascist and democratic revolution in the country, had become the

target of fierce attacks mounted by the entire anti-communist camp. In this connection, L. Longo emphasized that, "We must note how to effectively struggle against anti-communist propaganda extensively promoted by our enemies. Their target is to divide the people's masses, isolate the communists and surround them with barriers of lies and slanders. Constant and powerful efforts are needed to free the broad popular masses entirely from anti-communist prejudices. It is not enough to struggle for this only through propaganda, explanations and clarifications. This too is necessary. However, we well know that the masses can be convinced only on the basis of their own experience. Therefore, we must draw the masses into participation in direct activities involving problems of specific interest to them."

Continuing to develop these ideas, L. Longo deemed it necessary, with a view to insuring the proper class orientation of the communists, to express his opinion (which was supported, subsequently, by many of his fellow party members) on the equivocal nature which the term "historical compromise"¹ could trigger within the workers' movement. In particular, L. Longo expressed his "doubt as to the pertinence and positive significance of the new formulation related to our clear and traditional policy of agreements and cooperation with all democratic forces, a policy which has always been expressed clearly and precisely . . ." (see L. Longo, C. Salinari, "Dal social-fascismo alla guerra de spagna" [From Social Fascism to the War in Spain], Milan, 1976, pp 163-164).

He frequently pointed out that we must develop, above all, the coordinated actions of the masses and strengthen the ties between the party and the toiling masses. Sensitively reacting to trends which could weaken such relations, Longo expressed his conviction that the party cannot push its objectives to the background for the sake of proving its national responsibility. "Our strength," he emphasized, "lies in the fact that we do not distort the aspect of the communists. . . . We have never rejected our role. Whether part of the government or in opposition, we have always been and remain a party of the working people, whose expectations, ideals and single will to struggle we express" (UNITA, 20 October 1976).

In accordance with these stipulations, like other noted ICP leaders, L. Longo draws attention to the main trends within the labor movement, predicting possible and inevitable periods of intensification of the socio-political confrontation between the working class and its allies, on the one hand, and the conservative and reactionary circles, on the other.

Reality has confirmed the accuracy of this prediction. Starting with the end of the 1970's Italy entered a new complex phase of the class struggle. However, this has not reduced but, on the contrary, given even greater importance to the comprehensive study of the experience of the 1976-1979 workers' movement, when the ICP was part of the parliamentary majority. Why, noted ICP leaders ask, was it that this experience "failed to gain adequate support among the people's masses and provide an impulse and an

impetus expressed through the active participation of the movement of the working people?" A. Minucci, member of the CC ICP Management and Secretariat, points out, in looking for an answer to the question, that the characteristics of the crisis and of the changes needed for its solution had not been explained to the masses, and that a differentiation arose within the leftist forces themselves in assessing the nature and features of the contemporary capitalist crisis, its sociopolitical consequences and above all the conclusions to be drawn on this basis by the workers' movement.²

The short period of time during which the communists were a part of the parliamentary majority, the Italian comrades point out, proved to be unable to change the nature of the interference of the state in the economy and the pursuit of its policy suitable precisely to the power bloc which is concentrated around the present power system created by the Christian Democratic Party. Furthermore, at the turn of the 1980's, the situation in Italy was aggravated and, judging by all available data, as the noted economist and CC ICP member S. Andriani emphasizes, the monopoly circles do not intend in the least to change the direction of their socioeconomic policy. Hence the naturally growing awareness within the labor movement of the fact that more active struggle must be waged for changing the ratio of class forces in the country and factually upgrading the role of the working people and their organizations in resolving the key problems of social progress.

According to L. Longo and other ICP leaders, the course of strengthening the unity among leftist and democratic forces in the country should not mean in the least any concessions to social reformism or the abandonment of the revolutionary heritage of the communist movement and its class policy and ideology. As we know, the opponents of the communist movement have frequently falsified, and continue to distort its true objectives. They disseminate the myth of the "decline of influence" of the communists and of a "crisis" in their revolutionary outlook. Generally speaking, they try to question the historical "justification" of the ICP. Discussing such efforts, slightly less than a quarter of a century ago, L. Longo noted with some irony that, "Those who claim that to engage in deep studies and impartial criticism and rely on the power of methodology and methodological questioning, stated that we were wrong in everything, that everything had to be revised, purged of the entire past and that the labor movement needs a new leadership, could immediately see that they had erred even in their most modest estimates. The true movement paid no attention whatever to their 'discoveries' and 'prophecies' and continued to go forth, renovating and tempering itself in the struggle and the difficulties, as is always the case with healthy and viable social and political movements"³

In subsequent years the reaction frequently resumed its attacks on the scientific outlook of the communists. One could hear in this chorus even the voices of some reformist ideologues (such as B. Craxi), who began, essentially, to "demand" of the ICP that it abandon scientific communism. In this connection some Western authors increased their attempts to "drive

a wedge" between Leninism and the views expressed by A. Gramsci and P. Togliatti. In his talks, interviews, publications and speeches, Luigi Longo has refuted with absolute clarity such attempts to pit Lenin and Leninism against the convictions of the Leninist founders of the ICP. "Some people may amuse themselves," he said, "by trying to find in Gramsci's and Togliatti's political activities traces of Croce's influence. However, these people forget to pay attention to all the elements whose manifestation in the works of these leaders are owed to Lenin, Marxism, Leninism and the Great October Revolution." To develop and pursue a line consistent with the circumstances of each country and of the international conditions at any given specific historical moment, L. Longo goes on to say, "is precisely what Marxism and creative Leninism consist of."

In a talk which took place several years ago, in his home, in the small city of Genzano, near Rome, the conversation turned to ideological-theoretical discussions which had developed within the labor movement and, particularly, the "critical attitude" of some of their participants toward Lenin's legacy. Comrade Longo pointed out that, "I do not understand why, of late, all this has become necessary. Leninism is not simply a term. Therefore, to try to delete or belittle Leninism means to distort modern Marxism." Longo states that the very first issue of the ICP newspaper UNITA (February 1924) discussed "The Duty of the Leninists."

A calm and good person, with a soft sense of humor and gay sparks in his eyes, Luigi Longo noticeably warms up when he speaks of the Land of the Soviets. He loves to describe the way, arriving in Moscow, in the autumn of 1922, as delegate to the Fourth Congress of the Communist International, he saw and heard Lenin, who addressed the congress with the speech, "Five Years of Russian Revolution and Prospects for a World Revolution." He frequently recalls the years between the wars, clandestine work, the activities of the Youth Communist International and the Comintern, Spain, the fact that two of his sons were in the International Children's Home and were educated in the USSR, and many other manifestations of the international fraternity among communists and Leninists. Those who have long known Longo and his family find his words entirely natural: "I cannot understand why one should conceal or weaken the influence of the fact that the ideas of the October Revolution, Lenin's ideas and the instructions of the Comintern had an effect on all of us and influenced us decisively. Should we be ashamed of this? . . ."

As early as the 1950's, calling upon the Italian communists to make a thorough study of the revolutionary experience of the Soviet Union, Luigi Longo wrote that this is "the first country where a socialist revolution was made--a country leading all the rest on the way to communism: hence the need for the constant and attentive study of its experience" ("Izbrannyye Stat'i i Rech'i," p 268). On the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, L. Longo said: "Hardly anyone would deny that these 60 years have been characterized primarily by the political and social processes which arose and intensified as a result of the October

Revolution. . . . These processes occurred as a result of the participation of the broad popular masses; . . . this fact alone would suffice to refute the theses of those who would like to reject the democratic nature of the October Revolution and its influence on a national and international scale. . . . It is doubtful that such processes could be even started had a victorious revolution not taken place 60 years ago, as a result of which a state had not specifically and constantly supported liberation movements throughout the globe" (PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA, No 11, 1977, p 20).

The life and work of Luigi Longo, one of the noted leaders of the revolutionary workers' movement, one of those who have gone through the lengthy and difficult school of anti-fascist battles and fierce class combats, proves that the comprehensive work done by the communists in the interest of the working people in their homeland is inseparably linked with the struggle against international reaction and for the international solidarity of all progressive, peace-loving and anti-imperialist forces. Luigi Longo has frequently emphasized this idea, with full justification, referring to historical experience and the contemporary development of the world's revolutionary process: "We grew up as internationalists and became even greater internationalists by working on the problems of the common struggle."

Luigi Longo has invested all his creative energy in the tense ideological and political struggle still waged by the communist movement. He has always found time and forces for theoretical, propaganda and, finally, historical-political work, to use his words. Books written by him or with his participation are widely known, such as, for example, "The Italian People in Struggle" (1947); "On the Roads of National Uprising" (1954); "The International Brigades in Spain" (1956); "The Solidarity of the Peoples with the Spanish Republic (1936-1939)" (1972); "Between Reaction and Revolution" (1972); "The Leading Centers of the Italian Communist Party in the Resistance" (1974); "Who Betrayed the Resistance" (1975); "Selected Articles and Speeches (1946-1975)"; "Continuity of the Resistance" (1977), and other works, along with numerous addresses, reports and articles.

Many of Luigi Longo's works are well familiar to the Soviet readers. This very spring a new book by Comrade Longo will be published as part of the series "Library of the Workers' Movement" (published by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers' Movement and Izdatel'stvo Mysl'), discussing the most important lessons of the anti-fascist resistance in the light of the contemporary ideological-political confrontation. Obviously, it would be difficult to find in Italy a person who could describe this heroic page in the history of his people and personal chronicle of the revolutionary with greater authority or right. "We, the communists," writes Longo in the book, "have always realized that it is only through the unity of all democratic and anti-fascist forces, the strength of our party, and proper policy, that a scope and prestige could be gained and the proper due given to the leading role of the working class." Exposing those who betrayed the traditions of the anti-fascist resistance, h

calls upon the working people and their organizations to be vigilant. They must watch out as to the strategy of tension and terror, waves of attempts, subversions, murders, extremist violence and reactionary conspiracies encouraged and inspired by the Italian and the international anti-communist centers. They must be vigilant in terms of the dangerous policy of U.S. imperialism and its accomplices, threatening the peace throughout the world. However, the lessons of unity in the struggle against reaction and fascism, Longo points out, have not been ignored. The mass base of anti-monopoly movements is broadening. The influence and political vigilance of the revolutionary and progressive forces, headed by the communists, are growing; their ability to mobilize the broad population strata and doom to failure reactionary intrigues and attempts is strengthening; this is the unquestionable base for his optimism.

As one of the heroes in the struggle against fascism, he has systematically expressed the will of the working people of his country for peace and social progress. Exposing the aggressive intrigues of those who oppose detente, inflame a militaristic psychosis, intensify military preparations and rattle sabers, L. Longo proves the groundlessness and futility of such a "policy of strength." He properly rebuffs the false propaganda of the NATO bosses concerning the "Soviet military threat." L. Longo emphasizes that a fact "which characterizes most vividly the participation and role of the Soviet Union in international life from the October Revolution to the present" is that "the USSR is a great peace-loving force. . . . For this reason I believe it is vitally important to the entire planet that such a great power as the USSR is adamantly aspiring toward peace and cooperation among nations."

Tireless fighter and realistically and creatively thinking person, Luigi Longo--the coeval of the the 20th century--continues his work for his life cause--the interest of the revolutionary workers' movement. Mentally tracing his career, let us recall Lenin's words on how important to the proletarian movement is "the loyalty of the revolutionary to his cause," and the combination within his activities of "practical sobriety and practical skill, full ties with the masses and the ability to guide them" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 38, p 229).

On the occasion of Comrade Luigi Longo's great birthday anniversary, the Soviet people send him their most sincere and warm greetings. They wish him new great successes in the novel struggle for the interests of the working people, for the triumph of the cause of peace, democracy and socialism, and his fruitful activities aimed at strengthening the friendship and cooperation between the Italian and Soviet peoples.

FOOTNOTES

1. As was acknowledged, three years later, by the participants in the July 1979 CC ICP Plenum, to a certain extent, thus presented, this formula

made easier the distortion and misinterpretation of the strategy and tactics of the ICP and triggered a certain confusion. In his plenum report, ICP Secretary General E. Berlinguer noted that the term "historical compromise" is equivocal, for which reason it became the target of different interpretations, including some hostile to the ICP (see UNITA, 4 July 1979).

2. A. Minucci cautions against the dangerous influence of the "trend within the workers' movement to conceive of political and historical processes on the basis of abstract gradualism . . . which entails the danger of being caught unaware--and disarmed--in the face of changes and sharp turns which accompany the transition from one historical phase to another" (UNITA, 22 January 1980).
3. L. Longo formulated this conclusion in his book "New and Old Revisionism" written toward the end of the 1950's, in answer to the pamphlet by right-wing opportunist A. Giolitti "Reform and Revolution." L. Longo's book triggered a deep response within the Italian and international labor movements.

5003

CSO: 1802

SUBVERSION AS A TOOL OF IMPERIALISM

Moscow KOMPUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 80 pp 108-119

[Article by Army General S. Tavigun, first deputy chairman, USSR Committee for State Security]

[Text] The influence of real socialism on the course of world events is becoming stronger and deeper. The Soviet Union, the fraternal members of the socialist comity and all peace-loving forces are systematically pursuing a course of detente and of insuring peace and security on earth.

The historical accomplishments of socialism, the successes of its domestic and foreign policy and the growth of the attractiveness of its ideas are triggering the fierce counteraction of the forces of imperialist reaction. Exposing those who are pursuing a line of subverting detente and aggravating the international situation and trying to dictate its will to the socialist states and other countries, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev stated at an electoral meeting, calmly and confidently, that, "No one can intimidate the Soviet Union. Our forces and possibilities are tremendous. Together with our allies we shall always be able to defend ourselves and rebuff any hostile sally."

Imperialism is unable to eliminate world socialism through military power and is forced to fight it by relying, above all, on nonmilitary ways and means. This does not mean in the least that it has abandoned attempts to subvert the socialist system. On the contrary, the danger of subversive imperialist actions is greater today, first of all because they are taking place under conditions of a spiraling arms race and are being extended to realms of social life such as politics, economics and ideology; secondly because the special services and related ideological centers of subversion are being ascribed an ever greater role in the actions undertaken against socialism. Naturally, neither could we ignore in this case the fact that the Beijing hegemonists are drawing ever closer to the most reactionary imperialist circles.

Of late the U.S. ruling circles have openly charted a course toward changing the existing approximate balance of forces between the USSR and

the United States with a view to gaining military superiority. At the same time, the reactionary forces are energizing their secret subversive activities against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The American and other imperialist special services are trying, above all, to weaken the unity and fraternal cooperation among the members of the socialist comity, to undermine from within the positions of socialism in these countries and to discredit the historical gains of the peoples following the socialist way. The imperialists are trying to cause particularly great damage to the Soviet Union and its high international prestige.

The imperialist circles consider the gathering of intelligence regarding the military, industrial and moral-political potential of the Soviet Union for purposes of planning military operations, making foreign policy decisions and organizing broad anti-Soviet activities one of the important objectives of the special services.

A powerful intelligence-subversion apparatus, various punitive organs and numerous anti-Soviet official and unofficial centers and organizations have been set up by the imperialist states to wage secret warfare. Every year huge funds are spent for their upkeep. Even according to unquestionably deflated data in the American press, the personnel of the various agencies within the U.S. intelligence community is estimated at 155,000 people and its 1980 budget at \$13 billion. Over the past 10 years the CIA budget--the budget of the main center for espionage and subversion--has doubled, while its staff has 17,000 persons.

The changes which have taken place in recent years in the international circumstances have necessitated a reorganization of the work of intelligence and other special services and centers of imperialist ideological diversion with a view to intensifying their role in the struggle against the socialist countries and changing the ways and means of their activities in accordance with the new circumstances. All this has been accompanied by extensive propaganda sensationalism to justify the "rightfulness" of the subversive activities conducted against the socialist countries and draw attention away from the numerous scandalous cases of criminal and dirty operations conducted by U.S. intelligence and its main police-investigative organ--the Federal Bureau of Investigation--which became known the world over thanks to the efforts of a number of progressive journalists or the official announcements of a number of governments and statements issued by various parties and international and national organizations, as well as thanks to exposures made by former associates and agents of the American special services themselves.

Following are merely a few of these facts which have become known to the broad public:

American intelligence is engaged in large-scale espionage and in ideological diversionary actions against the socialist countries;

It took part in organizing and preparations for the military-fascist coup d'etat in Chile and the assassination of Salvador Allende, the president of that republic; it made several attempts to engage in terrorist acts against Fidel Castro and other progressive figures;

The U.S. CIA was involved in the villainous assassination of Nur Muhammed Taraki, by Amin, the hireling of American imperialism, and his assistants;

It actively supported the anti-people's regime in South Vietnam and is just as actively supporting the anti-people's regime in South Korea;

It is trying to prevent the development of the revolutionary and national-liberation movements in Latin American, Asian and African countries by supporting the most reactionary forces and supplying them with weapons and military materiel;

It organized the activities of mercenaries opposing the legal government of people's Angola;

It is providing financial and other forms of assistance to the reactionary organizations in European capitalist countries to expand their struggle against left-wing forces;

It uses its agency and other possibilities to protect abroad the interests of the biggest American monopolies;

Together with the special services of Great Britain and China, American intelligence is using the territory of Pakistan to move gangs of terrorists into democratic Afghanistan and wage undeclared war on the Afghan people;

It is engaged in active espionage against its allies and other countries (the names of a number of American secret service men and agents engaged in gathering confidential information on the economy, military potential and political plans of Great Britain, the FRG, France, Japan, Italy and others have been published). For example, the Indian weekly BLITZ writes that the U.S. Government is less concerned with the fate of the American hostages in Tehran than with the possibility that documents on subversive CIA activities in Iran might be made public.

American intelligence and the FBI are extensively used within the United States itself to strengthen the ruling bourgeois order and engage in comprehensive and daily struggle against progressive organizations and the workers' movement. They have created in the country a secret observation and information system which has imbued all pores of social life. Tens of millions of Americans are being watched by these agencies. There is mass tapping of telephones and inspection of correspondence. Assassinations, kidnappings and the compromising of progressive leaders are organized and citizens' rights are being violated on a mass scale.

Faced with the irrefutable facts of the criminal activities of its special services and with their numerous failures, the U.S. Administration staged an "objective investigation." In 1975-1976 there were seven different Congressional committees at work in the United States. The press published a number of articles to the effect that Congress will finally look into intelligence activities, tighten up control over them, no longer tolerate dirty methods of operation, and so on and so forth. It was clear, however that Congress would do precisely the opposite: it would try to protect intelligence and whitewash its activities.

That is precisely what happened. The report on the results of the "investigation" notes the "positive role of intelligence" and proves the need for its activities, particularly those aimed against the USSR. At the same time the authors of the report were forced to acknowledge through clenched teeth that there had been abuses in CIA and FBI work and that "the CIA had conducted thousands of expensive secret operations of doubtful value, essentially in support of the worldwide network of American agents. In the area of domestic security, the FBI had acted illegally and violated the freedom of thousands of law-abiding Americans."

The administration of the entire U.S. intelligence is in the hands of the National Security Council. A new intelligence committee has been set up, headed by the CIA director. A so-called citizen's "supervisory council" has been set up as well. "The final responsibility for intelligence activities" falls on the president. At the same time, criminal penalties are stipulated for individuals guilty of "leaking" secret information on the activities of the special services. On 24 January 1978, by presidential directive, additional organizational measures were carried out. The rights of the CIA director were increased. The subunits directly engaged in operations against our country were considerably strengthened. Operations conducted by American intelligence agencies against embassies and establishments of foreign countries, international organizations, companies and individual foreigners were legalized. These operations include the tapping of telephone conversations, interception of correspondence and other actions. The measures publicized as a radical reform of the intelligence service, in fact only intensified the secret provocatory methods and work secrecy and broadened the range of presidential authority.

Of late steps are being made to drop even purely formal control measures. According to the American press "the Carter Administration is asking the Congressional leadership to weaken legislative restrictions on secret CIA operations."

Thus while confusing the world's public, the reform in the intelligence community carried out in the United States in recent years does not, in reality, change the objectives and content of the U.S. intelligence doctrine, but is directed at improving the machinery of the special services, whose purpose is to contribute to the implementation of the foreign policy of American imperialism under new international conditions. It is no

accident that a large number of articles, books and even so-called "theoretical studies," whose authors are trying to substantiate the "legality" of the secret war and justify the subversive activities of American special services, have been published.

At the present time the U.S. intelligence community includes the following:

The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), consisting of the director's administration and four functional directorates. The most important among them is the intelligence operations directorate, which includes the subunits of intelligence, foreign counterintelligence and secret active operations;

The National Security Agency (NSA), numbering over 80,000 people, engaged in radio and radio engineering intelligence and the breaking of foreign codes. The NSA maintains thousands of stations and intercept centers in a number of capitalist countries;

The joint military intelligence (DIA) is directly involved in intelligence work and coordinates the activities of the intelligence services of the Army, Air Force and Navy (in recent years the importance of the national aerospace intelligence administration has increased considerably within the Air Force intelligence system. It is in charge of intelligence programs involving the use of satellite systems);

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) is actively used in intelligence operations, suppression of progressive organizations and provocations against establishments and citizens of socialist countries.

Furthermore, intelligence services are operated by the State and Treasury departments.

In recent years the U.S. allies as well have reorganized their intelligence services, strengthened them and adapted them to activities against the USSR under the new conditions. The share of technical facilities used by the intelligence services is being increased. The reorganization of espionage departments is accompanied by the strengthened coordination of their activities and the enhancement of the organizational role of U.S. intelligence, particularly in the NATO Intelligence Coordination Center in London.

The wedge of the activities conducted by all imperialist intelligence services is directed above all against our country. Defining the tasks of American intelligence, CIA Director Turner stated that, "I do not want even a shadow of doubt as to the fact that the Soviet Union is the main target of intelligence and must remain so."

The main directions of the subversive activities of the special services and propaganda centers in the capitalist countries aimed against our country are espionage, provocations directed at Soviet citizens and establishments abroad, and ideological diversions.

Of late the interest of the imperialist special services has greatly increased in the field of information related to the foreign political activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state: the plans and positions of the USSR on topical international problems and relations with other socialist and developing countries; the situation within our country, relations among nations and nationalities, and population living standards.

Intelligence is considered particularly important in the gathering of information on the defense capability of the Soviet Union and on its armed forces; new means for protecting the population and the troops from nuclear, biological and chemical weapons; priority targets set by the command of the U.S. Armed Forces for nuclear strikes; information on the USSR economy and, particularly, the work of the defense industry and the extracting and processing industries; operating and planned enterprises and enterprises under construction; extraction of minerals; status of and prospects for the development of power industry, transportation, communications, agriculture and the trade and credit-financial systems.

The intelligence agencies of the United States and other capitalist countries are trying to gather information on the economies of the republics of Central Asia, the Transcaucasus and the Baltic, Siberia, the Far East and Extreme North.

Imperialist intelligence is also trying to penetrate CEMA.

Increased interest is being shown in the achievements of Soviet science and technology. The target is twofold: On the one hand, to harm the military, economic and scientific potential of our state; on the other, to make maximum use in their own interests of the results of scientific and technical progress achieved by the USSR.

Active intelligence and other subversive work against our country is being done by the special services of the PRC.

The main centers of espionage in the USSR are the intelligence residencies of the capitalist countries, operating under the cover of various official missions. The close coordination of their activities under the aegis of American intelligence, joint planning and intelligence operations, support of reciprocal action and constant exchange of obtained information are their characteristic features.

The special services try to use illegal and legal possibilities for espionage and ideological-diversionist purposes. This includes the recruitment of agents among Soviet citizens, the sending of agents across the border, the gathering of information in contacts with Soviet people, trips around the country for visual observation and photographing of sites, use of technical intelligence facilities and the analysis of Soviet press materials.

In the recruitment of agents the greatest reliance is placed on the "dissidents" (imperialist propaganda finds it more convenient to describe with

this term the few renegades, people who have alienated themselves from our society and have taken the path of anti-Soviet activities) and on politically unstable or morally corrupt individuals with a liking for easy profits and money grubbing. Understandably, in the conditions of the monolithic unity of the Soviet people and the solidarity of the entire nation rallied around the communist party, the social base for enemy intelligence in our country has long been eliminated. Naturally, they are experiencing major difficulties in their search for suitable "materials." In individual cases, however, they may occasionally succeed.

Of late Soviet counterintelligence has exposed a number of imperialist intelligence agents.

The trial on the A. B. Nilov case was concluded on 18 August 1979, in Moscow. Prior to his detention he worked as senior engineer in a laboratory of a higher educational institution. During a long-term assignment to Algeria, he violated the norms of behavior of Soviet citizens abroad, as a result of which he was noticed by American intelligence. Using his political indifference and cupidity, in 1974 CIA agents in Algeria recruited Nilov. Before his return to the USSR he was taught how to communicate secretly. He was given special equipment and was thoroughly instructed as to further espionage work. Back in the USSR Nilov tried to carry out espionage assignments but was exposed and sentenced.

As members of embassies and other missions of the capitalist states, the agents try to broaden legal forms of espionage. They take trips with a view to entering sites of interest and carry equipment for still and motion pictures, overhearing conversations and studying and locating radio emanations of industrial enterprises.

Thus, recently, Andersen and Kramer, members of the apparatus of the U.S. Embassy air attache in Moscow, driving a Volga car, entered a flight-test airfield. Concealing themselves in the edge of a forest and in quarries, they observed the work of the airfield and photographed the parked airplanes. Following the detention of the Americans by workers from the neighboring enterprise passing by, they were found in possession of three photographic cameras, binoculars, a notebook for recording intelligence data and a map showing the location of important sites. The developed shots of the film confiscated from them showed photographs of airplanes in flight tests, while the notebook contained notes on flight schedules and types of aircraft.

Uninterrupted attempts are being made to make active use for subversive purposes of the broadening channels of scientific and technical, cultural, tourist and sports exchanges between the USSR and the capitalist countries. An ever larger number of foreigners are coming into our country. Their absolute majority come with good intentions and are sincerely contributing to the fruitful cooperation between their countries and the USSR. However, occasionally they would include imperialist spies. In their meetings with

Soviet people, using a variety of tactical means, they try to gather the necessary data.

In addition to the gathering of information through direct contacts, the intelligence services have begun to use the method of sending a variety of questionnaires to Soviet institutions and private citizens, allegedly on behalf of scientific organizations and under the pretext of the development of scientific relations, popularization of the achievements of Soviet science and technology, work on dissertations, and so on. The study of such questionnaires has revealed that a number of them are of an intelligence nature.

Technical intelligence facilities are being ever more extensively applied in the gathering of espionage information. Prime importance among them is ascribed to spy satellites, which are constantly flying over the territory of the Soviet Union. Over 13,000 stations and centers of radio and radio-engineering intelligence managed by imperialist special services are operating against the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries.

Engaging in provocations against Soviet citizens and establishments abroad is one of the methods for subversive activities by imperialist intelligence.

As the result of the increased external relations of the USSR, in recent years the number of Soviet people sent abroad on long-term assignments or temporary trips has increased. They are constantly kept under surveillance by intelligence agents. Efforts are made to influence them ideologically to recruit them and to talk them into defecting. Provocations are organized against them with a view to disorganizing the work of Soviet institutions abroad and to creating an atmosphere of uncertainty and concern among their personnel.

Units engaged in work against Soviet citizens are being strengthened for this purpose. Thus, as of 1 October 1977 the counterintelligence units of the FBI have been considerably strengthened. Their personnel was increased by 448 people and their allocations by \$16.5 million per year.

Of late the number of anti-Soviet provocations has increased: bombing, shooting at and burning Soviet institutions, hooliganistic actions and hostile demonstrations at the buildings of our missions, illegal arrests and detentions of Soviet citizens, and attempts to recruit them. Anonymous letters are sent to our missions abroad. Threatening telephone calls are made and Soviet citizens are being attacked. For example, in June 1979, several bandits in New Haven (United States) attacked in broad daylight O. V. Krylov, head of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Physical Chemistry, who was a member of the Soviet delegation to the Sixth Soviet-American Symposium on Chemical Catalysis. As a result of the attack Krylov suffered bodily harm and was hospitalized. The bandits took his briefcase with scientific data for the symposium, passport, camera, airplane ticket and money.

One of the treacherous means used by imperialist intelligence is the effort to indoctrinate Soviet people abroad to encourage them to defect. A special "program for the organization of defection to the West" has even been formulated for this purpose. Thus, in London, a stranger, claiming to be a member of the Soviet Embassy, insistently suggested to D. Sh. Khundadze, dancer in the Georgian ensemble who was recovering in a local hospital following the removal of his appendix, to sign a blank form allegedly for the sake of remaining in England for postoperative treatment. However, Khundadze was vigilant and did not swallow the bait of the provocateur.

Loyal to their great homeland and the cause of communism, the Soviet people are properly rebuffing the intrigues of imperialist special services.

The outlook and class objectives of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and of socialism and capitalism, are conflicting and irreconcilable. Consequently there neither is nor could there be any peaceful coexistence in the field of ideology. Yet, in an open struggle of ideas and their honest comparison, the imperialists are unable to defend their class interests.

At the 25th CPSU Congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized the following:

"There can be no neutrality or compromise in the struggle between the two outlooks. Here high political vigilance, active, operative and convincing propaganda work and prompt rebuff of hostile ideological diversions are needed."

Ideological diversion is one of the main forms of subversive imperialist activities against socialism. As a type of front of hidden aggression against the socialist countries and interference in their domestic affairs, it violates basic norms of international law and universally acknowledged principles of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems.

The objective of ideological diversions is to weaken the sociopolitical foundations of socialism, weaken the leading role of the communist parties and their influence among the masses, trigger the "erosion" of communist ideology, promote a bourgeois outlook and, finally, create disorder in the political and economic life of the socialist countries.

Ideological diversions are aimed at the ideological-political unity of the working people in the socialist countries, the alliance among the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia, the compromising of our national policy, pitting nonparty against party people and the young against the older generations, and dulling the feelings of patriotism, internationalism, class awareness and political vigilance of the working people. The energizing of hostile activities of anti-socialist elements play a considerable role in the subversive aspirations of the ideological

diversionists. Along with this, the organizers of diversion-propaganda campaigns against socialism try to promote in the minds of the populations of their countries anti-communist and anti-Soviet stereotypes and to prevent the dissemination of the truth of the achievements of real socialism.

Our class enemy is resorting to ideological diversion, considering that "their effect is manifested secretly and, frequently, is not noticed by the people against whom they are aimed." It is no accident that ideological diversions are compared to a "cancerous tumor" which gradually spreads through the entire body unless removed on time.

The imperialists are using tremendous forces and funds for their subversive ideological activities aimed at the socialist countries and, above all, the Soviet Union. Diversion activities cannot be reduced to primitive, cavemen anti-Sovietism. Unbridled slander of socialism is combined with an ever more refined approach to selected propaganda targets, more refined use of mass disinformation means and the active involvement of secret services in anti-Soviet campaigns.

The United States holds a leading position in the extensive subversive ideological activities conducted against the socialist countries. Ideological subversions have become an inseparable part of U.S. foreign policy and the American intelligence services consider their participation in them as important as customary espionage. Addressing a meeting with journalists, in March 1979, that same Turner said that American intelligence has been instructed to actively join the campaign sponsored by Washington's Administration on the notorious "defense of human rights" abroad. The local CIA agents were issued a directive mandating them to collect information on the reaction to the steps taken by the U.S. Government in this direction. Today the CIA ascribes prime importance to this work.

In order to carry out their ideological diversions, the imperialist states have developed a broad network of specialized institutions whose activities are coordinated by the leading governmental authorities within the aggressive blocs, as well as within each separate country.

In recent years, along with the reorganization of their intelligence services, a number of imperialist countries have reorganized their agencies engaged in ideological diversions against socialism. For example, in the United States, as of 1 April 1978, the closed down Information Agency (USIA) was replaced by a new governmental foreign propaganda agency--the International Communications Agency--operating under the president's personal control. With its establishment the agency concentrated in its hands all channels of U.S. foreign policy propaganda: radio broadcasting, press, filming and showing motion picture and television films abroad, publication of periodicals, pamphlets and books, the organization of exhibits, administration of so-called cultural centers and libraries, English language courses, cultural exchanges and foreign student training. The agency follows the U.S. presidential instruction to the effect

that "the main audience for American propaganda is in the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries."

Debating the appropriations for the International Communications Agency, it was emphasized in Congress that under conditions marked by profound social changes in the world which cannot be effectively influenced by the United States through military, political or economic levers, the role of foreign political propaganda and its dissemination in the socialist countries rises considerably. The decision was made to steadily increase the agency's budget: from \$413.3 million in 1979 it will rise to \$432.7 million in 1980 and \$566 million in 1981.

Ideological subversive organs operate within the aggressive North Atlantic bloc. The principal among them is the "NATO Information Service."

The anti-Soviet centers in the West, such as the "Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations," the "Anti-Communist League of Asian Peoples," the "European Freedom Council," and many others, including various Zionist organizations and mobs of exile rabble, such as the National Labor Alliance (NTS), the "outside units of the organizations of Ukrainian nationalists" and associations of Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian and Transcaucasian bourgeois nationalists are actively participating in ideological diversions.

All in all, over 400 subversive centers and organizations are actively working against our country. The work of this huge machine is based on the coordination of long-term plans for permanent operations, as well as actions aimed at making use of specific political situations. Ideological diversionary activities make extensive use of radio, television and press, public speeches, various letters, appeals, petitions, and so on. The most frenzied ideological diversionists include the noted anti-Soviets Solzhenitsyn, Maksimov, Plyushch, Amal'rik, Bukovskiy and others who were either thrown out of, or left, the Soviet Union in recent years, and the renegade Sakharov.

For the past few years the United States and other Western countries have been engaged in a provocative stir on the subject of an imaginary "violation of human rights" in the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries. Unforgivable attempts are being made to legalize the "right" of an insignificant handful of renegades to engage with impunity in subversive activities against the socialist system. The scope and intensiveness of this campaign are determined by the circumstances within the capitalist countries and the status of their relations with the Soviet Union. According to Brzezinski, the not unknown representative of the Administration in Washington, the question of human rights must become the foundation of U.S. foreign policy. He called for promoting, on this basis, a new spiral in propaganda activities against the members of the socialist comity.

Such appeals enjoy strong material backing. Behind the label of defending the "dissidents persecuted in the communist countries," the imperialist

special services actively contributed to the organization in the West of over 40 different nongovernmental "committees" and "associations" who proclaim as their main task the "struggle for the freedom of the individual in the USSR." In themselves they would be unworthy of attention, had they not been backed by known special services which finance their activities and publicize them.

All this merely confirms that the campaign mounted in the West on the subject of the so-called "violations of human rights" in the Soviet Union is a thoroughly planned and coordinated long-term diversionary operation.

We must also mention the fact that with the approaching Moscow Olympic Games, the ideological diversion centers have considerably energized their efforts, trying to discredit this world sport ceremony and the Soviet state as the organizer of Olympiad-80. The previously planned campaign of slander, directed from a single center, involving the intelligence agencies and various anti-Soviet nationalist and Zionist organizations can also be clearly traced in the anti-Soviet intrigues related to the Olympic Games.

The imperialist special services and disinformation centers consider the period of preparations for the games a convenient time for a "mass ideological Western invasion of Russia." A large number of materials are being disseminated, distortedly depicting the preparations for the Olympics. Calls are being heard to boycott the games or engage in a variety of provocative actions. Thus, according to the heads of the NTS, "All activities" of this subversive organization must be "subordinated" to anti-Soviet sallies related to the Olympic Games.

Recently an anti-Soviet stir was raised in the United States on the so-called problem of Soviet troops in Cuba. As former CIA member Stockwell stated on television, "The problem of Soviet troops in Cuba was concocted by the CIA as part of the set of measures to wreck the Conference of Heads of States and Governments of Nonaligned Countries in Havana."

Let us also recall the slanderous campaigns promoted by the imperialist disinformation centers on the subject of the events in Afghanistan. The fraternal aid given by the Soviet Union to the friendly people of that country to defend the gains of the April revolution from foreign reactionary intrigues is falsely presented as "intervention." The cynicism of the organizers of this malicious anti-Soviet and anti-Afghan concoction is shown by the fact that it is precisely they who drowned in blood the Chilean revolution and it is precisely they who, not so long ago, brought death and destruction to the peoples of the countries in Southeast Asia.

Radio broadcasting plays a major role in ideological diversions. Currently 37 foreign radio stations are broadcasting to the Soviet Union. The overall broadcast time is about 200 hours per day in 23 languages of the peoples of the USSR. Particularly zealous in their slander of our country are the Voice of America, Deutschlandzender, Radio Liberty-Radio Free Europe and Radio Israel, which have been joined by Radio Beijing as well.

The Administration in Washington is considerably expanding the anti-Soviet activities of radio stations such Radio Liberty-Radio Free Europe, controlled and financed by the CIA. A plan for the organizational restructuring and technical modernizing of said radio stations was formulated in 1977 and currently has been almost completed. The purpose of the reorganization was to increase the possibility for the penetration of radio disinformation in the territory of our country and increase the audience: the obsolete low-power transmitters have been replaced with modern ones and appropriations for subversive radio activities have been increased.

Hostile "radio voices" are not the only ones used for subversive purposes. Greater attempts are being made to send to the USSR, from the West, anti-Soviet publications. Every year our border troops and customs officials confiscate hundreds of thousands of such publications as they cross the state border.

Nevertheless, in some cases agents of subversive centers succeed in passing slanderous materials through. Thus a group of Leningrad students held near the university building a foreigner who was distributing anti-Soviet leaflets. He turned out to be Belgian citizen Pipet, a petty merchant who had accepted the NTS assignment to engage in this provocation for money. Pipet was sentenced by the Leningrad Oblast Court to five years deprivation of freedom.

Recently, a member of a group of American tourists visiting Vil'nyus University, Eckstein (Akstin), separating himself from the group, started to rush about along the university halls scattering anti-Soviet leaflets. Students Lyubinskas and Malakauskas, who noticed him, held Eckstein, gathered up the leaflets he had disseminated, took the remaining leaflets away from him and delivered him to the militia personnel. That is how this ideological diversion as well was defeated.

The imperialist special services actively use and generously finance various Zionist and exile nationalist organizations. The CIA and its NATO partners have a number of agents within these organizations and direct their activities against the USSR. Of late ties between Washington officials and anti-Soviet emigres have been clearly energized.

Zionism is ascribed a special role in subversive ideological activities against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. It is no secret that close ties have long existed between Zionist organizations and special services in the United States and Israel. The special services obtain intelligence data through the Zionist centers, from people of Jewish nationality going to the West. The Zionist organizations use tourism, scientific-technical, cultural and trade channels to send their envoys to the Soviet Union. Zionist anti-Soviet actions meet with extensive support on the part of the ruling Western circles.

Organizing ideological diversions against our country, the imperialist special services try to actively use foreign religious centers, believing

that they could serve as camouflage for the dissemination of anti-socialist views.

Engaging in subversive activities against the Soviet Union, the imperialist forces are resorting, on an increasing scale, to ideological diversions, spending for such purposes huge funds and material and technical resources. Yet however refined the special services and their agents may be and however much the ideological diversionists of all hues and trends may be raving, they are being defeated by the moral and political unity within Soviet society and the vigilance of our citizens.

The high idea-mindedness and loyalty of the Soviet people to the cause of communism and their socialist homeland, and their solidarity, united around the communist party, and the political vigilance of all Soviet people are the main obstacle blocking subversive imperialist actions.

Political vigilance was, and remains, the reliable and tried weapon in the struggle against the enemies of our country throughout its history. The communist party raises the working people in this spirit, always obeying V. I. Lenin's founding instructions of the need vigilantly to observe the intrigues of the enemies of socialism and firmly block all their attempts to harm the building of the new society.

These Leninist instructions retain their entire significance under present circumstances, for the forces of world reaction are energizing their subversive activities against socialism. Naturally, this circumstance is taken into consideration by the state security organs. Vigilantly guarding the interests of the Soviet society, they are thus decisively fighting the actions of the special services and subversive centers of the imperialist countries. Working under the direct guidance and control of the communist party, in accordance with the Soviet Constitution, the state security organs are strictly observing socialist legality. The most important conditions for the effectiveness of Chekist activities are dedicated service to the interests of the people, party guidance and the broadest possible support of the working people.

True vigilance is the ability to recognize the real enemy. That is how the state security organs operate and that is how the Soviet people act by blocking subversive anti-Soviet actions.

Risukhin and Kozlov, young workers at a plant along the Volga, reported to the state security organs that a group of foreign specialists are assembling imported equipment at their plant, one of whom, engineer Koling, is behaving very suspiciously. In the first weeks of his stay he persistently tried to meet with Soviet workers, claiming to be a friend of our country. Having developed a wide range of acquaintances, after a while he began to show an active interest in who among them had served in the Soviet Army and where, where our military units deployed, and so on. He expressed the wish to become particularly friendly with Risukhin and Kozlov. At first,

they believed that Koling was feeling friendly toward the Soviet Union. Later, however, he asked them to accompany him in a trip to one of the suburbs of the oblast center where an important defense site was located. When the Soviet workers told him that they cannot go there with a foreigner, he suggested that they introduce him as a friend who had come from the Latvian SSR. Riukhin and Kozlov did not meet request, but alarmed by this fact, reported everything to the corresponding organs.

An investigation of their statement indicated that Koling was not a competent specialist. He was frequently absent from work touring the city and its surroundings. Soon afterwards he was detained in the area of the defense project, where, applying various camouflage methods, he was trying to take motion and photographic pictures. Following his detention a map of the oblast was found in his possession, along with a hand sketch of the area where the project was located and a description of its features. Thus Koling's espionage activities were blocked thanks to the vigilance of Soviet citizens.

The KGB organs received several statements by Soviet citizens to the effect that one Mamontov, who had come to the USSR as an interpreter for various American delegations and tourist groups, was showing a suspicious interest in state secrets and had tried, to this effect, to bribe his collocutors with various gifts. The information was entirely confirmed by an investigation. It turned out that during the Great Patriotic War, remaining on territory occupied by the Hitlerites, Mamontov had cooperated with the fascist authorities and had actively participated in NTS activities, after which he had escaped to the United States where he joined the intelligence service of that country.

In July 1977 two strangers went over the fence of the territory of a military unit in Petrozavodsk. The unit's military personnel detained the strangers and took them to the commandant's office. They turned out to be working for the military attaches of the U.S. and British embassies--Williamson and Stevens--and explained their activities with the desire to look for "historical architectural monuments." The uninvited "lookers for historical monuments" were expelled from the forbidden area and a proper document on their activities was drawn up.

The CPSU Central Committee, its Politburo and, personally, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev are always concerned with strengthening the security of the Soviet state against all class-enemy intrigues. This is confirmed, yet once again, by the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Improving Further Ideological and Political-Education Work," dated 26 April 1979, which states the following: "Our duty is to counter the subversive political and ideological activities of the class enemy and his malicious slander of socialism with inflexible solidarity, powerful ideological unity within our ranks and profound conviction and political vigilance on the part of every Soviet person and his readiness to defend the homeland and the revolutionary gains of socialism."

Answering the party's appeals with practical accomplishments, the Soviet people are selflessly working to make our socialist homeland even more beautiful and more powerful and to insure that the gains of the Great October Revolution are reliably defended. This is the guarantee for successful struggle against all imperialist subversive intrigues.

5003

CSO: 1802

IN THE INTEREST OF THE PEOPLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 80 pp 120-127

[Review by B. Tulunin of the book "Izbrannyye Rechí i Stat'i" [Selected Speeches and Articles] by V. V. Grishin, Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 654 pages]

[Text] A collection of speeches and articles by V. V. Grishin, CC CPSU Politburo member and first secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee, has been published. A number of articles it contains deal with the period of his work as chairman of the AUCCTU (1956-1967). They discuss the tasks of the Soviet trade unions and the world trade union and workers' movements. Most materials deal with subsequent years and, mainly, with the activities of the Moscow party organization and its experience its practical implementation of CPSU policy. The readers will find the text of speeches delivered at our party congresses, Central Committee plenums, world trade union congresses and city party and trade union forums; articles previously published in the party press and addresses delivered to labor collectives, foreign guests, assemblies and meetings.

V. V. Grishin fulfilled the instructions of the CC CPSU Politburo of addressing ceremonious sessions at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on the occasion of the 98th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birth and the 54th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Lenin, party and October are words inseparable from each other in the minds of millions of people. They have become symbols of the liberation of the proletariat and of all oppressed peoples from the chains of capitalism and colonialism. The author considers the successes achieved by our country in the implementation of Lenin's legacy and the plans for the building of communism the continuation of the cause of Lenin and of the Great October Revolution. He proudly writes that in seven and a half decades the CPSU achieved results which not only transformed our country, but radically changed the course of history.

October 1917 marked the beginning of the age of transition from capitalism to communism on a universal scale. In this connection the author cites Lenin's words that, "We have the right to be proud and to consider

ourselves lucky that we were the first to bring down, in corner of the globe, the wild beast, capitalism, which has flooded the earth with blood and brought mankind to hunger and savagery . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 36, p 478). These words were said in 1918, under specific historical circumstances. Meanwhile, the appetite of this "wild beast" has not been sated but has increased greatly. The contemporary imperialist bosses are building the prosperity of the rich class, multiplying the income of monopolies and military corporations at the expense of the working people and bringing to many nations the same hunger, war and dislocation. Under such circumstances, the influence of the Leninist foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state is becoming ever more important and decisive. In cooperation with the fraternal parties and the members of the socialist comity and all peace-loving states, they are systematically and firmly implementing the program for the further struggle for peace and international cooperation and for the freedom and independence of the nations.

A number of articles emphasize the significance of the growing role of the CPSU as the leading and guiding force of the developed socialist society and as the nucleus of its political system and of state and public organizations. V. V. Grishin particularly notes the tremendous contribution which the 23d, 24th and 25th party congresses and the works of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, Central Committee general secretary, have made to the theory of scientific communism and the practice of the building of communism. He considers the work of the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo as a model of substantiated and scientifically organized approach to party management tasks. He emphasizes that reality has convincingly proved the correctness, strength and vitality of the CPSU political course. The author speaks of the wisdom of the Leninist theory of the party, reminding us that under contemporary conditions, with the increased complexity of the tasks and the broadened scale of the building of communism, the party organizations must steadily improve their activities and be in step with the times.

Analyzing the work carried out in this direction in Moscow, V. V. Grishin draws attention to the need to improve the planning of activities by the party organizations and make party decisions more authoritative. He particularly emphasizes the problem of cadre selection and control of execution, and the further development of criticism and self-criticism. Party, soviet and economic organs and primary party organizations, he noted, must adamantly strengthen discipline of execution. They must promptly and sharply raise the problems of individual responsibility of cadres for the implementation of decisions. "The party teaches us the adoption of a comprehensive approach to the solution of problems. The main thing, above all, is to develop more energetically the material and technical base which assures the ever fuller satisfaction of healthy and sensible human needs. . . . A responsive and attentive attitude must be displayed toward the people and their requests and requirements" (pp 592-593).

The author considers that the guarantee for the further enhancement of party authority and for broadening its relations with the masses and the successful solution of economic and political problems lies in upgrading the combat capability and activeness of the party organizations and enhancing even further the title of party member, so that "wherever party members are--at work or at home, in places of recreation or in the street, they may act like real party members, and be a model of organization, conscientiousness and discipline, reacting to disorder and negative phenomena and remaining active fighters for our party's ideas and causes" (p 380).

The Moscow City party organization is one of the biggest CPSU detachments, rallying over one million members and candidate members. The author analyzes its activities to mobilize the party members and all working people in the capital for the implementation of the decisions of party congresses. The Central Committee plenums and decrees face each of its members with strict requirements regarding the further strengthening of party ranks. The Moscow party organization is systematically pursuing a line of insuring the working class a leading position in its social structure. The influx of Komsomol members and young people into the party has increased. A great deal has been done to enhance the importance of candidate party training and work with the young communists. In most cases problems of placing party members in the most important sectors of economic and cultural construction are resolved accurately. However, the party stratum among workers in construction, consumer and communal services, trade and public catering remains small. The city and rayon party committees, the author points out, should deal more specifically with the placement of party members and direct them wherever it is necessary in increase the party's influence and improve the situation (see p 572). What makes this even more necessary is the fact that the Muscovites complain quite justifiably about the quality of construction and repair work and the organization of household and consumer services and shortcomings in the work of public transportation system.

The materials in the collection steadily focus on the complex and comprehensive work done after the 24th CPSU Congress, which set a task of tremendous political and practical importance: turning Moscow into a model communist city. "The very fact of putting on the agenda a problem of such a scale and significance clearly indicates the way the concept of the growing role of the party is refracted in the daily practice of the local organizations" (635).

The author discusses extensively Moscow as the capital of the USSR and the center of our economy, science and culture, and as a symbol of the fraternal friendship among the peoples and proletarian internationalism. He repeatedly returns to the theme of the way the Muscovites are continuing the work of preceding generations, increasing the glory of their beloved city by their labor accomplishments and asserting the communist features in its life and appearance.

The implementation of the party's important assignment of converting Moscow into a model communist city has become a matter of constant concern on the part of the city party organization, which supervises it on a permanent basis. One year following the 24th party congress, V. V. Grishin addressed a meeting of the activists of party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations of Moscow with an extensive report, raising a number of problems to be resolved, analyzing accomplishments and formulating specific tasks.

The author reminds us that the party concern for Moscow is a Leninist tradition. Following the Great October Revolution socialist planning replaced lack of control and chaos in urban construction. The main direction in the reorganization of the city was formulated in the party program adopted at its eighth congress. In 1935 the VKP(b) Central Committee and the Soviet Government passed the first general plan for the reconstruction of Moscow, stipulating its reorganization into a new, socialist city. Moscow changed rapidly. Today, as the capital of the state of developed socialism, it embodies all its achievements.

Setting the task of making Moscow a model communist city, the author points out, the party proceeded from the level reached in the development of Moscow's industry and its increased possibilities and the tremendous creative potential of its production and scientific cadres and experience acquired by the party organs and organizations and ideological establishments. Moscow must be a model effective development of production forces based on scientific and technical progress. It must be a comfortable city for the people, in all respects, in which all social life and style and work methods reflect to the fullest extent the progressive trends characteristic of society at large at this stage.

Naturally, the author emphasizes, Moscow will not develop by itself. The building of communist society is our future, the foundations of which are laid down through the development of the entire Soviet state. To a tremendous extent this future is becoming the present with the development of the leading centers of material production and spiritual culture. In this area Moscow has always played a great role and has been in the lead in a number of areas. Understandably, the significance of the project of turning the capital into a model city exceeds the framework of its administrative boundaries. The entire homeland is helping the Muscovites, who use the best features developed by the progressive collectives in the country. At the same time, the achievements of the working people in the capital and many of their labor initiatives are having a positive influence on the development of other cities, of our entire national economy.

A number of articles discuss the course of Moscow's implementation of the general plan for its development, approved in 1971 by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers. This plan contains an extensive work program for 20 or more years ahead. The author considers the tremendous importance of the general plan in the fact that it calls for the implementation of a large number of economic, social, technical and

aesthetic problems related to the development of the capital. This includes reconstruction, building and improvements and perfecting the layout structure and the architectural-spatial organization and the entire complex urban economy. The author steadily pays attention to the implementation of the plans for economic and social development of Moscow's labor collectives and rayons, and of the city as a whole.

In his addresses at CPSU congresses, Central Committee plenums and plenums of the Moscow City Party Committee, and at city party conferences, and in the course of numerous meetings with the working people, V. V. Grishin always turns to problems of further improvements in the standards of party leadership of the economy and other areas of social life. He analyzes the activities of the city, rayon and primary party organizations in the mobilization of the masses for the implementation of state plans and the plans developed together with ministries and departments for the reconstruction and technical retooling of production facilities. He draws attention to the most complex problems.

The author considers as the most important socioeconomic problem the implementation by the city party organization of a set of measures aimed at improving the demographic circumstances in the city, encourage the natural growth of the population and contribute to the quantitative and qualitative growth of the young workers' replacements. Naturally, all this will require time. That is why it is important to make use of the manpower resources available to Moscow today most rationally and effectively. Substantial reserves exist in this area.

Studying the materials, the reader can trace the way, year after year, the Muscovites have applied ever new possibilities, used scientific and technical achievements in production, and made better use of available equipment, raw materials and energy resources, eliminating heavy and unproductive labor, releasing cadres for basic production by increasing the level of mechanization of auxiliary processes, improving the training and upgrading of skill of cadres, vocational guidance and the labor education of secondary school and vocational school students, and retaining young people to work in production and services.

The author deals extensively with upgrading production effectiveness and work quality. He considers as a major reserve the fuller utilization of productive capital. Addressing the 1978 Moscow City Party Committee Plenum he discussed in detail the main directions to be followed in the implementation of this task: The rational and effective utilization of existing production capacities and of each machine tool, machine, unit and piece of equipment, and material, manpower and financial resources; accelerated mastering of newly installed production capacities; and raising the shift coefficient of the equipment. Substantiated claims were addressed to ministries, departments and planning organs, which do not always insure in the comprehensive plans for the development of the capital the full coordination of problems of sectorial and territorial development, pay inadequate

attention to production planning and organization, and try to retain enterprises scheduled for transfer outside city limits.

These and other materials emphasize that problems of utilization of productive capital, reconstruction, retooling of enterprises, improving management and strengthening party, state and labor discipline must always be controlled by the party organs and organizations, and that those who objectively delay the solution of such problems should be taken strictly to task. Management personnel who have not become imbued with a feeling of responsibility for assignments, do not make full use of their rights and powers, and do not carry out their direct official obligations are inadequate. It is important, the author recalls, to upgrade the responsibility of managers and our exactingness toward them. He describes the way, applying the Leninist principles of cadre selection and deployment, the Moscow party organization is improving its work with them, upgrading the role of organizers, production technologists and educators of the masses, and strengthens control of execution.

The author cites data on the substantial contribution made by Muscovites to the development of the country's national economy. Thus between 1976 and 1978 the volume of industrial output rose 12.5 percent, rather than 9 percent as planned; the amount of goods produced equaled that of the entire Eighth Five-Year Plan. A large number of enterprises, following reconstruction on virtually the same production area and with minor additional capital investments, achieved a considerable and, occasionally, drastic increase in better quality output. No single enterprise in the capital has failed to cope with its annual plans. The task now is not to allow straggling shops, brigades or production sectors. High-quality work and high productivity must be insured at each work place.

V. V. Grishin emphasizes that under the conditions of Moscow, where thousands of industrial, construction, transportation and communications, trade and consumer services enterprises, scientific, cultural, educational and health care institutions, and creative and other organizations are located, and where departmental lack of coordination is particularly tangible, the city party organization, which as a whole has no specific departmental interest, has the obligation to insure the purposeful and coordinated functioning and development of all structural components of the social organism of the city and be able to take into consideration and properly combine the tasks, interests and characteristics of the various collective of the different categories of working people and of the entire population of the capital (see p 635).

The author pays considerable attention to problems of the communist education of the working people in the light of the requirements of the 25th CPSU Congress and the specific practical implementation of the Central Committee decree "On Improving Further Ideological and Political-Educational Work." The various aspects of this work are presented most thoroughly, both from theoretical and practical standpoints, in

V. V. Grishin's report submitted to the All-Union Practical Science Conference, "On the Work of the Moscow City Party Organization on the Implementation of the Comprehensive Approach to the Education of the Working People in the Light of the Decisions of the 23th CPSU Congress." The author considers the development in the Soviet person of a scientific outlook, the shaping of communist attitude toward labor and high moral qualities as an interrelated and indivisible process. He discusses the characteristics of work with the various categories of working people and student youth, and for combining economic with educational activities.

V. V. Grishin highly rates the experience of the party organizations and ideological institutions which have taken a creative approach to ideological-educational work, taking into consideration the characteristics of one or another collective or category of working people, are able to approach every person and leave no single question without an answer. He warmly refers to the propagandists, agitators, political informants and party and nonparty members who tutor young people, and those who are a model of high idea-mindedness, morality and labor training through their entire way of life and work. The party organizations actively contribute to improving the system of Marxist-Leninist education, comprehensively supporting the patriotic initiative which originated at the Plant imeni Vladimir Il'ich: "The knowledge, ideological convictions and organizational talent of the propagandists must be placed at the service of the five-year plan." They are intensifying their ideological and educational activities aimed at surmounting views and mores alien to our society, seeing to it that each case of scornful attitude toward labor is firmly rebuffed and that an atmosphere of intolerance toward the violators of civic and social duty is created everywhere.

The author describes what has been and is being done to develop in the working people and the students intolerance of bourgeois ideology and morality, and develop in them the ability to recognize the falsehood and hypocrisy of imperialist propaganda. This becomes even more important under conditions in which such propaganda is increasing its efforts to slander our domestic and foreign policy and our political system, and socialism as a whole, justifying the arms race with fabrications about the "Soviet threat."

The author points out the need to mobilize in the struggle against the ideological enemy all means at our disposal. This struggle presumes high-level organization, discipline, self-discipline and a principle-minded and systematically class approach to processes and phenomena in social life. Our powerful allies in this struggle are our Soviet way of life, successes in the building of communism and the party's Leninist policy.

We are faced, V. V. Grishin said at the meeting of the Moscow ideological aktiv, with the tasks of surmounting the vestiges of the past in the minds of the people and asserting the communist morality. "We must develop in every party member and Soviet person an active life stance which presumes

intolerance of shortcomings, not in words, but in deeds. Fighting negative phenomena, we must oppose those who objectively contribute to their dissemination through their conciliatory attitude and inaction" (p 421).

Updating the role of the labor collectives and of public opinion in the areas of moral and labor education, and strengthening their positive influence in the extracurricular and nonproduction realm of life of the people plays a primary role in the solution of this problem. Our successes and, consequently, the level of prosperity would have been higher had every working person accomplished in his sector everything that is required of him.

The author reminds us that at the very beginning of the building of socialism, Lenin formulated the main task of the party's domestic policy as follows: "Labor discipline, higher labor productivity, labor organization increased output and merciless struggle against slovenliness and bureaucracy" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 43, p 402). This instruction remains topical to this day. Far from everything possible and necessary has been done to organize efficient and coordinated work and insure discipline and observance rules. We must intensify the struggle against nonfulfillment of production and official obligations. The education tasks facing us increase the requirements facing the work of economic managers and engineering and technical cadres. It is a question above all of developing in the managers the ability to take into consideration the educational consequences of their decisions, adopt a proper style of relations with people and display proper responsibility for the creation of the necessary conditions for the implementation of plans and obligations (see pp 416-417).

The author legitimately considers the creation of an efficient and creative atmosphere in the collectives and creating for the people better conditions for work, training, living and cultural recreation, among the most important factors for upgrading the effectiveness of ideological activities and communist upbringing. A number of articles discuss the valuable initiatives developed in the course of the organization of the socialist competition and the movement for a communist attitude toward labor and the effort made to increase their educational influence. V. V. Grishin has been working on such problems since he became chairman of the AUCCTU. Today they are being ever more systematically and practically implemented in the accomplishments of the capital's party members. A number of articles discuss such matters and the development of the initiative of the collective of the Moscow Marshaling Yard Depot on the resumption of communist subbotniks, which as we know was supported by the labor collectives in Moscow and, subsequently, the entire country.

Not all possibilities for a comprehensive approach to ideological, moral and labor upbringing are used to the fullest extent. In particular, the author discusses the vital tasks of mass-political and cultural-educational work at home. This must be structured as the extension of the educational process in labor collectives, rallying for such purposes the efforts of party organizations of enterprises, establishments, housing committees and various social centers and councils set up in the microrayons.

Repeatedly analyzing ideological-educational work done in Moscow, V. V. Grishin emphasizes that the city's communist aspect will be determined above all by the people and through the ever more extensive participation of the working people in the administration of governmental and public affairs. He cites Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's statement that "a model communist city is a city inhabited by people with a high level of culture and conscientiousness. A city with a model social order. It is a city showing an atmosphere of benevolence, reciprocal respect and reciprocal consideration."

The author discusses the growing role and responsibility of the personnel of secondary and higher educational institutions and of the scientific and creative intelligentsia in improving the organization and upgrading the effectiveness of communist upbringing. The idea of the need to educate the educators runs throughout the work. In his report delivered at the meeting of party group of the Moscow writers' organization, entitled "The Honorable Duty and High Responsibility of the Creative Intelligentsia," the author discusses shortcomings in the activities of the party organizations of creative unions, including their work with the creative youth. He substantiates the importance for the men of culture to master revolutionary theory and acquire profound knowledge of problems of domestic and foreign policy. The logic of the class struggle is such, he emphasizes, that political indifference, inconsistency and looseness of ideological positions of individual creative workers are frequently used by our enemies. One of their main objectives is to defame the basic principles of the art of socialist realism—party-mindedness and nationality—pitting against them bourgeois individualism, indifference to politics and lack of ideas, and to revive the toxic seeds of nationalism. The party has repeatedly pointed out that there is no place for neutrality or compromise in ideological work (see p 617).

This is well understood by the workers in literature, theater, motion pictures and other forms of art, who are dedicating their knowledge and skills to the creation of works distinguished by their high ideological and artistic qualities and are contributing to developing in the working people a scientific outlook, high moral principles and spiritual culture. Actively participating in the country's sociopolitical life, the creative workers are engaged in extensive propaganda and sponsorship work.

The interests of the people are the main feature of the activities of the communist party, V. V. Grishin emphasizes, as is confirmed by the problems covered in his book related to the creation of the material and technical foundations for communism, the improvement of social relations, the molding of the new person and the struggle for peace and social progress. The book is brimming with faith in the powerful forces of the Soviet people, who are increasing the glory of the homeland and the great Lenin's party through their toil.

STUDENT ENROLLMENT AT REPUBLIC AND INTER-OBLAST HIGHER PARTY SCHOOLS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 80 p 128

[Text] The present is to announce the regular enrollment of students in republic and inter-oblast higher party schools. Students may be enrolled in higher party schools on the recommendation of the central committees of communist parties of union republics, and kray and oblast party committees.

The following may enroll in the higher party schools: party, soviet and Komsomol and ideological workers, as follows: for the two-year term and three-year correspondence term departments--workers with higher education under 40 years of age; for the four-year term departments and five-year correspondence departments--with secondary education, aged 35 or younger.

By no later than 1 May 1980 the central committees of communist parties of union republics and kray and oblast party committees shall submit to the higher party schools copies of the decrees of the bureaus and biographies and the respective documents of comrades recommended for training.

Between 20 May and 10 June 1980 students recommended for the two-year departments and three-year correspondence departments of the higher party schools shall be summoned to the schools for a talk; students recommended for the four-year departments and five-year correspondence departments of higher party schools shall be summoned for entrance examination on the foundations of Marxism-Leninism (on the secondary party education level), Russian language (composition) and USSR history, secondary school level. A two-week paid leave shall be granted for preparations and for taking the entrance examinations.

Classes at higher party schools will begin on 1 September 1980.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1980

5003
CSO: 1802

- End -

SELECTIVE LIST OF JPRS SERIAL REPORTS

USSR SERIAL REPORTS (GENERAL)

USSR REPORT: Agriculture
USSR REPORT: Economic Affairs
USSR REPORT: Construction and Equipment
USSR REPORT: Military Affairs
USSR REPORT: Political and Sociological Affairs
USSR REPORT: Energy
USSR REPORT: International Economic Relations
USSR REPORT: Consumer Goods and Domestic Trade
USSR REPORT: Human Resources
USSR REPORT: Transportation
USSR REPORT: Translations from KOMMUNIST*
USSR REPORT: PROBLEMS OF THE FAR EAST*
USSR REPORT: SOCIOLOGICAL STUDIES*
USSR REPORT: USA: ECONOMICS, POLITICS, IDEOLOGY*

USSR SERIAL REPORTS (SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL)

USSR REPORT: Life Sciences: Biomedical and Behavioral Sciences
USSR REPORT: Life Sciences: Effects of Nonionizing Electromagnetic Radiation
USSR REPORT: Life Sciences: Agrotechnology and Food Resources
USSR REPORT: Chemistry
USSR REPORT: Cybernetics, Computers and Automation Technology
USSR REPORT: Electronics and Electrical Engineering
USSR REPORT: Engineering and Equipment
USSR REPORT: Earth Sciences
USSR REPORT: Space
USSR REPORT: Materials Science and Metallurgy
USSR REPORT: Physics and Mathematics
USSR REPORT: SPACE BIOLOGY AND AEROSPACE MEDICINE*

WORLDWIDE SERIAL REPORTS

WORLDWIDE REPORT: Environmental Quality
WORLDWIDE REPORT: Epidemiology
WORLDWIDE REPORT: Law of the Sea
WORLDWIDE REPORT: Nuclear Development and Proliferation
WORLDWIDE REPORT: Telecommunications Policy, Research and Development

*Cover-to-cover

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

23 MAY 1980

MAK