

JPRS 75780

28 May 1980

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 5, 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.

28 May 1980

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 5, March 1980

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

CONTENTS

Voice of Historical Truth	1
On Measures To Improve Party-Political Work in Railroad Transportation	14
Address by L. I. Brezhnev at the Meeting of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.	19
Leninist Principles of Economic Management Under Present Conditions (V. Medvedev)	22
Excerpts From Ho Chi Minh's Pamphlet 'The Path of the Revolution' . .	36
Developed Socialist Society--A Society of Real Freedom (V. Davidovich)	40
Inalienable Constitutional Norm of the Socialist State (V. Kuroyedov)	52
Dynamics of Social Systems (V. Afanas'yev)	66
Afghanistan: Standing Guard Over the People's Gains (P. Denchenko)	84
People's Revolution in Iran (Nureldin Kianuri)	94
United States: Corruption in the Highest Echelons; Lawyer's Notes (B. Nikiforov)	106
Comrade Kapsukas (P. Grishkyavichus)	118

CONTENTS (Continued)

Outstanding Leader of the French Communists (E. Arsen'yev)	128
Cause of the Party and the People (V. Vasil'yev and P. Pavlov)	140

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No 5,
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 : 21 Mar 1980

Copies : 914,000

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

VOICE OF HISTORICAL TRUTH

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 80 pp 3-13

[Text] Whenever our unfading memory turns to the past, to the long-gone, hard years, whether the time of revolutionary battles or the civil war, the first five-year plans or the exploit of the whole people in the Great Patriotic War, when we consider the present and its accomplishments, and when our dreams turn to the future, on each occasion we feel the powerful spiritual and moral currents which link together the past with the present and the future. The heroics of years gone by are linked with our active present and the new horizons opened to us by developed socialism.

The immortal Leninist doctrine is the life-bringing ideological base for this firm tie linking times and destinies of generations. This a theory which was a guiding star in the struggle waged by the broadest possible masses for the radical reorganization of the world, for a reorganization founded on the sensible principles of communist justice, goodness and beauty.

The attractive truth of the Leninist ideas led the Soviet people through the long chain of most severe trials, tempering them, giving them experience and wisdom and strengthening their will to reach their objective. We link our deep attachment to these ideas with the sacred feeling of love for the socialist fatherland and boundless loyalty to the cause of those who stormed the Winter Palace in the fiery Petrograd midnight. They have become an inexhaustible source of revolutionary creativity for millions of people and an organic part of the life of every builder of the new society. The fighters for communism dedicate all their thoughts, knowledge, strength and zeal of their hearts to their implementation, for, remembering Marx' shining metaphor, great ideas are ideas "which conquer our thoughts, which subordinate our convictions and to which the mind binds our conscience, ties which cannot be broken without breaking one's heart . . ." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 1, p 118).

These ideas raise us to the heights of the noble spirit of mankind, to freedom and morality!

"For nearly one-quarter of century, step by step, gradually," Henry Barbusse wrote, "Lenin prepared the most staggering change in the history of mankind. He dedicated his entire being to his task. Throughout all those years he tirelessly remained the true leader and inspirer of the movement: it was he who dealt the calculated and decisive strike which in October 1917 changed the aspect of the entire world and the course of world history."

A revolution which inaugurated the age of the liberation of the working people from calamities, sufferings and humiliations, created by millennia of domination of the oppressors, was made in Russia, on a land sitting astride two parts of the world--Europe and Asia. A new social system was born. A new measure of human life, human values and human relations was born. This marked the beginning of a path followed today by many tens of millions of people and which will be walked by anyone who lives on this earth.

At a turning point of history Lenin was able to provide this amazing lever which triggered into action the latent forces of the revolution. This lever was the proletarian party of a new type--the party of the Bolsheviks--which was the first to combine in practice scientific socialism with the mass workers' movement. It was ready to lead and led the proletariat to the seizure of power.

Lenin's party embodies the inseparable unity between revolutionary theory and practice. On the basis of the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the economic, sociopolitical and ideological processes occurring in the country and in the international arena, and as a result of the skillful utilization of the laws of social development, it formulates the general prospects for the progress of our society toward communism, earmarks the course of the domestic and foreign policy of the state and gives a conscious, planned and purposeful nature to the labor activities of the masses. The fullest possible utilization of the tremendous opportunities of mature socialism is the pivot of the Leninist party's political and organizational work at the present stage. This is confirmed by the intensive work done to implement the socioeconomic and cultural program formulated at the 25th CPSU Congress. This leads to the further growth of the prosperity of the working people, the improvement of their working and living conditions and the perfecting of the socialist way of life.

Each age faces mankind with problems without whose solution the progressive development of society would be impossible. The profound historical necessity of our age is the conversion of mankind to communist forms of commonwealth. This objective need has found its concentrated scientific reflection in Leninism. As the theory and practice of the revolutionary masses and as a science of active effort, Leninism must not only explain the world in its entire complexity, variety and contradictoriness, but show the way to its transformation. "It expresses profoundly and accurately the interests of the working class and all working people and the requirements

of global social progress. It enables us to formulate proper answers to the most burning and vital problems of our time. It teaches the bold and creative solution of ripe problems and arms us with a scientific understanding of the prospects of social development" (CC CPSU decree "On the 110th Anniversary of the Birth of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin").

The tremendous revolutionary-transforming activities of Leninism is expressed through its constant turn to new experience and new ideas. As Lenin tirelessly emphasized, revolutionary theory is not an ossified dogma but a dynamic theory to which stagnation is alien, a theory drawing its forces from social practice, which it fructifies.

In the unity and interaction among all its components--dialectical-materialistic philosophy, political economy and scientific communism--the doctrine of Marx and Engels was to Lenin a "living doctrine," whose unquestionable truth he reached from the first steps of his revolutionary activities and a loyalty to which he felt to his last breath. However, the greatest scientist of the revolution and revolutionary in science did not consider loyalty to Marxism merely as the acknowledgment of the unfading truths proclaimed by its founders. More than anyone else Lenin understood that the greatness of Marxism lies, above all, in the fact, the very essence, the very foundations of the theory contain the imperative requirement to creatively apply revolutionary principles to changing reality. Accepting the innovative and active nature of Marxism and guided by the idea of the creative application of theory to life, Lenin's genius remelted everything developed by the progressive philosophy of the century, everything that had been experienced by the working people in the class battles and acquired at the cost of heroic efforts. A striking social and political perspicaciousness multiplied by a broad moral-philosophical interpretation of the world, a very rare gift of scientific prediction and the ability for a most profound penetration into the complex fabric of social collisions enabled Lenin, under the new historical conditions, to comprehensively develop Marxist theory and enrich it with essentially important concepts. That is why in our day Marxism would be inconceivable without all that Lenin contributed to its treasury. And that is why we describe Leninism as the Marxism of our age and Marxism-Leninism as an integral, international, continually developing theory of the working class.

According to Lenin, what gives the proletarian doctrine a creative and revolutionary-critical spirit, a spirit of steady search and tireless progress and eternal self-renewal in the process of social practice? It is dialectical materialism! It is precisely this "soul" of Marxism that is the irreplaceable theoretical tool which makes human thought precise and flexible, enabling us to follow all changes and turns of reality and not lose our permanent live link with life. It is no accident, therefore, that when Lenin analyzes the reasons and shows the gnosiological roots of a betrayal of Marxism in one or another current within the workers' movement, he sees them, above all, as a lack of understanding of Marxian dialectics.

"They," Lenin wrote referring to the opportunists, "describe themselves as Marxists. However, they conceive of Marxism to an impossibly pedantic degree. They have totally failed to understand the decisive feature of Marxism: namely its revolutionary dialectics" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 45, p 378). Considering dialectics as "decisive within Marxism," Lenin dedicated a great deal of efforts to its elaboration, considering this a guarantee for the proper, the scientific study of historical practice and, therefore, for the further substantiation and concretizing of the principles of Marxist theory.

Lenin was the unsurpassable master of revolutionary dialectics. His works are brilliant examples of dialectical thinking, capturing in the course of his studies the most essential and main features of its development. The inner logic of his theoretical views itself inevitably led to revolutionary conclusions and contributed to the proper solution of problems which had never before faced mankind, yet which had appeared and which had to be answered from scientific positions. It was precisely the dialectical-materialistic approach to developing social reality and to the latest data in science, natural science in particular, that predetermined the great discoveries he made in the field of Marxist theory.

The philosophical concepts elaborated by Lenin in the stormy years of the first Russian revolution and on the eve of World War I are inseparably linked with his specific studies of the economics and policies of the new age. Lenin's theory of imperialism, the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the party, the class allies of the proletariat in the struggle for democracy and socialism, the close unity between social and national liberation and the ways leading to the building of a new society has become a priceless ideological-theoretical and methodological possession of the revolutionaries of all countries.

The ability to apply Marxism to the specific circumstances in which the Russian revolutionary movement developed and determine the specific forms of the general social laws under the conditions of the imperialist stage of capitalism, initiated at the end of the 19th century, and the thorough study of such conditions enabled Lenin to substantiate a number of most important theoretical concepts. Lenin's work "Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism" was the natural extension and development of the study of the capitalist socioeconomic system provided by Marx in "Das Kapital." Comprehensively characterizing age with its economic, political and spiritual features, Lenin proved with tremendous emphasis that the sum total of its specific contradictions and characteristics inevitably leads to a proletarian revolution as the most necessary, important and historically ripe demand of the age. Having discovered the law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism, he drew the daring conclusion that the socialist revolution could win initially in one country or in several countries. This conclusion brightly illuminated the objectives and tasks of the proletariat and defined the ways and means of its subsequent struggle.

Marx' and Engels' intransigent contribution to mankind lies in their clarification of the universal-historical mission of the working class, the maker of the socialist society, showing the factual ways for the assertion of communist ideals. In the age of ascending capitalism they laid the foundations of proletarian strategy and tactics. Entering the political stage in a period of sharp aggravation of all contradictions within the bourgeois system, at a time very close to the socialist revolution, Lenin developed their principles into an all-embracing science of the class struggle of the proletariat, tried in the flames of the revolutionary battles of the 20th century.

The thesis that the working class is the main motor of the socialist revolution and of the building of the new society was assigned by Lenin a central role in Marx' doctrine. Characteristically, to this day our ideological opponents are tirelessly launching most fierce attacks against this basic concept. Falsifying and forging facts, they keep trying to insinuate the idea that monopoly capital deprives the working class of its revolutionism (the more so as time goes on), narrowing the social base of the socialist revolution. What are their arguments? The improved material well-being of the workers, their reduced numbers and the decline of their share in the production process. Yet is this factually the case?

Actually, as Lenin predicted, everything is entirely different. The social status of the worker is worsening steadily. His wages are falling considerably behind vital needs. The level of exploitation of the working people is rising. The insecurity and hopelessness of their lives are becoming ever more obvious. To this day Lenin's statement that ". . . The oppression by a few monopolists of the remaining population is becoming a hundred times heavier, more tangible and unbearable" ("Poin. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 27, p 321) remains topical. A bourgeois society would not be what it is unless it steadily reproduced the nutritive grounds on which the revolutionism of the working class grows, called upon by destiny itself to become the grave digger of capitalism.

We know that physical labor alone was never considered by the founders of Marxism or by Lenin as the lot of the proletariat. As early as the 1840's, mocking the pompous claims of the neo-Hegelians, Engels wrote: "Critical criticism does not create anything. It is the worker who creates everything, to such an extent that he puts all criticism to shame even through his spiritual creations" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 2, p 21). This applies to the present as well, to an incomparably greater extent, under the conditions of the social and scientific and technical revolution, when the artificial "separation" of the working class from the intellectual potential of society, ignoring the facts, plays a frankly reactionary role. According to Marxist-Leninist theory the proletariat is a class of hired workers deprived of their own productive capital, living exclusively by selling their manpower and exploited by capital directly in the course of the production process (see *ibid*, Vol 4, p 424; V. I. Lenin, *op cit*, Vol 2, p 93). This view--the only accurate and scientific one--presumes the

inclusion in this category of individuals who do not perform exclusively physical but mental, creative functions in the production process. It is a question of the highly skilled workers and specialists handling complex modern equipment. It is important to note, furthermore, that Lenin also determined the trend, expanding in the period of monopoly capital, of the proletarianization of a number of people engaged in mental work. This trend has become today a profound social process, eloquently confirming the active broadening of the social base of the revolution through the joining of new detachments of working people. In this case it is politically necessary always to remember the qualitative boundaries of the proletariat as a class of exploited production workers whose leading detachment is that of the factory-plant workers.

The entire course of the world's development proves the accuracy of Lenin's conclusion that in our age as well the working class remains the main, the decisive and the ever-stronger revolutionary force. "Under the conditions of the intensification of the general crisis of capitalism, showing up in literally all realms of life in bourgeois society," notes the CC CPSU decree "On the 110th Anniversary of the Birth of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin," "the heat of the struggle waged by the working class and the working people against the omnipotence of imperialist monopolies is rising steadily. The irreconcilable contradiction between the social nature of production and the private capitalist form of acquisition, acute social conflicts, steady growth of unemployment and inflation, political and spiritual crisis, militarization of the economy and dangerous arms race clearly confirm the accuracy of Lenin's assessments of imperialism--the final stage of the capitalist society, without a future."

The study of imperialism is the base of Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution. This was an extremely important contribution to scientific communism, fully topical today. This is a frightening ideological weapon wielded by the working class in the struggle against bourgeois rule and for political power. Its viability has been confirmed by practical experience.

Lenin's theoretical study of the laws governing the socialist revolution and his views on a revolutionary situation (objective conditions for the maturing of a revolution, developing regardless of the desire of individuals or parties), and of the subjective factor (the ability of the revolutionary class to engage in revolutionary mass actions, party work to rally the masses, choice of the specific time for a revolutionary uprising and skill to lead it to victory) contain a number of valuable and durable ideas which are successfully serving the cause of the liberation of the working people from exploitation and oppression.

In their desire to lower the historical significance of Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution (as well as, incidentally, of Leninism as a whole) the contemporary bourgeois ideologues and opportunists would like to depict it as a "local concept" which would reflect merely the "strictly Russian specifics." Need we point out how groundless their efforts are?

Lenin always considered the revolutionary reality in Russia in the context of global social relations. Heading the struggle of the Russian working class against autocracy, he clearly realized that this struggle leads to a breach of the common imperialist front and that it is "part of the universal revolutionary proletarian movement . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 31, p 341). Even the simple enumeration of the most important stipulations of the Leninist theory of the revolution makes clear its international and truly global nature. Following are some additional ones: On the division of the world and the formation of two social systems; the combining of the struggle for socialism with the national-liberation movement; the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary proletariat; the combination of the struggle for democracy with the struggle for socialism; the decisive role of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the defense of socialist gains; and the noncapitalist way of development of peoples liberated from colonial oppression.

Attempts to restrict Leninism to strictly national frames, for political purposes, and to proclaim it a spiritual phenomenon lacking any international content and international effectiveness are quite old. K. Kautskiy himself spoke of Leninism as an allegedly purely Russian phenomenon created by the economic backwardness of the country. He was seconded by Mensheviks and Trotskyites. The same path is followed by our present ideological opponents. In order to weaken and separate the contemporary revolutionary movements from their ideological and theoretical foundation--Leninism--they are trying to split, to divide the single Marxist-Leninist doctrine into individual parts, which they pit one against the other. "Lenin's interpretation" (let us note the use of the word interpretation, rather than development!) is merely one of the possible interpretations of Marxism among a number of others, they claim. They are ready to submit their own "models adequate to Marxism," whose purpose is to eliminate the revolutionary essence of the proletarian outlook.

Breaching the imperialist front in one of the biggest countries in the world, and shaking up the foundations of world capitalism, the Great October Revolution led and awakened through its example the people's masses the world over and provided a powerful impetus to new revolutionary processes.

The international significance of our revolution was manifested also in the fact that its most important features were necessarily repeated (and could not do otherwise) in subsequent revolutions which brought about the formation of the comity of socialist countries. ". . . The Russian model gives all countries something quite substantial and inevitable in the not-so-distant future," prophetically wrote Lenin 60 years ago in his work "The Left-Wing Infant Disease of Communism" (ibid, Vol 41, p 4), which became a true textbook for communist party strategy and tactics. These common features, as confirmed by historical experience, are the basic laws governing all revolutions marking a transition from capitalism to socialism.

Reality confirmed Lenin's prediction as to the variety of ways and means for the building of socialism in different countries, based on the common laws of the establishment and consolidation of socialism. The expanded scientific analysis of these laws, which essentially runs through the entire Leninist doctrine, represents the further development of the basic principles of Marxist theory.

One of the characteristics of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat is that, freeing itself, it also frees all working people from all forms of economic, social, political, national and spiritual enslavement. For this reason, in the final account its victory marks the common success achieved by the working people. On the other hand, the working class can defeat the bourgeoisie and build socialism only if it isolates it, takes the nonproletarian masses away from its influence and assumes their leadership. In order to implement its class assignments, it is profoundly interested in developing the struggle of all detachments of the working people (regardless of the fact that they may be pursuing limited and as yet nonsocialist objectives), and all social movements aimed against imperialism. This characteristic of the proletarian revolution of "becoming surrounded" by a system of democratic movements which are not directly socialist, and to rely on them in the course of the struggle against imperialism, noted by Marx and thoroughly interpreted by Lenin, plays an exceptionally important role in the global revolutionary process of today.

This process is irrepressibly marching forth, expanding further and further. The struggle of the working class against the rule of monopoly capital and for socialism merges in the course of this process, on the general anti-imperialism platform, with the national-liberation and national-democratic revolutions, the various currents of social-progressive and antifascist movements and the struggle of the broad peasant masses and urban middle classes, the intelligentsia and other social forces against the oppression of the monopolies, reaction and militarism, and for the freedom, democracy and rights of the working people and for the enhancement of their living standard.

We could say full justification that the revolutionary renovation of the planet, initiated by the Great October Revolution, has become the factual embodiment of the Leninist ideas and the result of their growing influence on the fate of mankind. Leninism provided a key to the creative interpretation of today's social practice and the events occurring in the world and to the unraveling of their internal laws and, consequently, the organization of purposeful action by the revolutionary forces in accordance with these laws.

A relatively short historical time separates us from the legendary autumn of 1917. Within that period a new society free from exploitation and social antagonisms--real socialism--was built over a huge area on earth. As a result of its growth and strengthening the ratio of forces in the world arena has changed radically. Essential changes have taken place in international development and inspiring prospects have been opened to mankind.

The world socialist system is convincingly proving its inexhaustible opportunities. Its achievements are inseparably linked with the implementation of Lenin's behests concerning the close fraternal cooperation among nations which have taken the path to socialism. In our day the advantages of the socialist compared with the bourgeois system, described by Lenin, have become quite apparent. They include the planned steady upsurge of the national economy creating conditions for the optimum utilization of the material resources of the state, public control of production and distribution enabling us harmoniously to combine the interests of the entire society with those of the individual, and the absence of typically capitalist economic declines, unemployment and the uncertain future facing the working people; and the healthy social environment favoring social activity and the comprehensive development of the individual, along with boundless opportunities for the enrichment of spiritual life and the maximum revelation of the creative capabilities of man. All these advantages appeared on the basis of the establishment of public social ownership of productive capital.

At the same time the present stage of the general crisis of the capitalist system is convincing an ever-larger number of people that this system is incapable of resolving the problems facing mankind. However, understandably, the bourgeois ideologues and politicians are unwilling to acknowledge this. On the contrary, they are doing everything possible to prove that there is no alternative to capitalism for mankind. Tremendous funds are used to discredit the communist and workers' movements, slander it in the eyes of the public and claim that it is pursuing objectives conflicting with the expectations and needs of the nations. At the same time the adversaries of Marxism-Leninism extensively use political-ideological means aimed at dividing the communist parties, distorting their true positions on essential theoretical and practical problems and spoiling their attitudes toward one another and toward the communist movement as a whole. Such "falsification of communism from within," according to their expectations, starting with ideology, should bring about a degeneration of the very nature of socialism, undermine its socioeconomic foundations and destroy the unity of the fraternal socialist countries. Thus Z. Brezezinski, the zealous "apostle" of anticommunism, "combining" today this job with that of U.S. presidential assistant, has frankly acknowledged that he relies on the "erosion of the most militant aspects of Marxism-Leninism. . . . Ideological changes," he has stated, "will make it possible to make political changes." The class meaning of such views is to defend or, if possible, regain lost positions and stop or turn back the sociohistorical process.

However, as Lenin foresaw, the social revolution of the proletariat is making its way through all obstacles and difficulties of the difficult struggle for the liberation of mankind. What are the reasons for the invincibility of the global revolutionary process which makes the Marxist-Leninists and all revolutionaries confident of the global victory of the socialist system? The fact that it is born of the immanent needs of social development which irrevocably lead mankind to socialism. The fact that the

most revolutionary and progressive class of the age--the international proletariat--is in its center. And the fact that the end objective of this process--the new, communist civilization--is no longer a theoretical abstraction. Its outlines have been clearly drawn through the practice of real socialism successfully resolving the main problems of our time related to the destinies of mankind and social progress.

The most important point of Lenin's ideological-theoretical heritage is the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the only possible meaning of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism. Today when extensive possibilities have appeared for ever new countries to join the path of socialist development this doctrine is becoming particularly meaningful and the enemies of socialism are sparing no efforts to distort its nature.

The methods and means for revolution by the working class and the political forms of its dictatorship change, and so does the terminology used to describe them. However, their class nature remains unchanged: the seizure of the power of the state, the suppression and paralyzing of the opposition of the exploiters, the involvement of all working people in the building of socialism and educating the masses in the spirit of communist ideas. Without this the exploitation of man by man cannot be eliminated or a new society created.

It would be difficult to overestimate the significance of the Leninist historically confirmed views on the dictatorship of the proletariat as a particular form of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry and all toiling strata, the correlation between the destructive and constructive side of the proletarian system, the variety of its political forms, the soviets as a state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat and its system and mechanism, and the leading role which the party plays within it.

Lenin considered the question of the communist party a basic question in the building of socialism. Only a party guided by Marxist theory, tempered and united in the class struggle, can head the working class, insure the organization of the masses, make the work of all state and public institutions coordinated and purposeful and direct this work toward the common objective--communism. Relying on the experience of our revolution, Lenin pointed out that, "The rejection of party-mindedness and party discipline . . . is the equivalent to the total disarmament of the proletariat in favor of the bourgeoisie. It is equivalent to precisely the petit bourgeois fragmentation, incapability, inability to withstand and to engage in joint and effective action which would lead any proletarian revolutionary movement to failure given any indulgence" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 41, pp 26-27). The practice of the building of socialism in the fraternal countries confirmed most clearly the basic nature of this stipulation. All antisocialist forces interested in beheading the working class in power launch their "crusade" with a struggle against the leading role of the communist party.

The experience of decades of revolutionary creativity by the peoples of the socialist countries prove the tremendous theoretical and practical value of the Leninist conclusion that there is no break with the bourgeois system of true democracy and freedom without the political hegemony of the working class and the corresponding state organization of the working class and the corresponding organization of the state. This experience irrefutably proves, as exemplified by the events in Hungary (1956), Czechoslovakia (1968) and Chile (1973), that "there is no revolution without a counter-revolution, nor could there be one" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sochr. Soch.," Vol 12, p 171), and that after their defeat the overthrown classes "hurl themselves into battle for the restoration of their lost 'paradise' with ten times the energy, mad passion and hatred a hundredfold greater . . ." (ibid, Vol 37, p 264), and that "a revolution is worth anything only if it is able to defend itself . . ." (ibid, p 122). Lenin considered the defense of revolutionary gains one of the basic functions of the proletarian state.

Dictatorship against the exploiters and democracy for the working people is the essence of the power of the working class heading the building of the new life. Involving the multimillion-strong masses in active political work and shifting the center of gravity to material guarantees of the democratic rights and freedoms, the power of the working class insures the fullest possible manifestation of the popular will and freedom and democracy not in words but in action, unheard of and impossible in any capitalist country.

Whereas Marx and Engels created the theory of the development and doom of capitalism and laid a number of cornerstone stipulations concerning socialism, on the basis of their ideas and the innovative practice of the land of the Soviets, Lenin equipped the party with an all-round substantiated scientific plan for the building of socialism which crowned his theoretical creativity. He presented the principles of the communist system and the basic laws of its functioning as a specific system with its own production forces and economic base and a superstructure rising above them, through the outstanding Marxist work "The State and Revolution" and many other works. He systematically presented the theory of the state and its unbreakable ties with the class nature of the society.

The building of socialism, which lasted long years (particularly in countries which were insufficiently economically developed at the time that the working class seized the power), is a historical period. Lenin, who guided the building of socialism in our country, discovered the laws inherent in this process.

Lenin expanded the familiar Marxist thesis that socialism could appear only on the basis of large-scale progressive industry in the hands of the victorious proletariat with the following stipulation: Wherever industry is underdeveloped, using the economic and political advantages of the new system, the working class which has overthrown the exploiters reorganizes and raises

it to a modern scientific and technical base and industrialize the country. Lenin and the party formulated methods for the socialist industrialization of the USSR, proving that this is a law applicable to the overwhelming majority of countries, even relatively developed ones, for the uneven and one-sided deployment of capital in them has made it impossible to insure the industrial development of all areas and economic sectors in the country.

In his famous works, "On the Food Tax," "On the Cooperative," "Better Less but Better" and "How to Reorganize the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection," Lenin posed and resolved one of the most complex problems of the revolution (noted in the works of Marx and Engels): the conversion from a splintered, low-marketability agricultural production to the tracks of socialist progress. The principles of the agrarian reform formulated by Lenin, backed by the practice of collectivization in the USSR and the cooperation of peasant farms in a number of eastern European and Asian countries and in Cuba, are of international significance.

There is an uninterrupted connection between the problems of our time and today's party activities and Lenin's works on the industrialization and electrification of the country, the socialist reorganization of agriculture and the creation of new, superior forms of organization of labor and a new social discipline obeyed by conscientious and free workers, and his writings on the comprehensive meaning of the socialist cultural revolution.

The forward movement of Soviet society toward communism faces the party with ever more complex tasks. Their successful implementation largely depends on the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory and the proper use of this reliable scientific compass. Turning to Lenin's ideological legacy, the party finds solutions to topical problems of the building of communism. It formulates new theoretical concepts by studying and summing up the achievements, the experience of millions of people and the characteristic features of the times. The materials of the 23d, 24th and 25th CPSU congresses and the party's programmatic documents and works by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and other party leaders are vivid examples of the truly Leninist interpretation of ripe social problems. The CC CPSU decree "On the 110th Anniversary of the Birth of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin" emphasizes the tremendous theoretical and political significance of the concepts formulated of late about developed socialism, concepts which substantially enriched and refined our understanding of the laws governing the establishment of the communist and conclusions on the conversion of the party of the working class into the vanguard, the party of the whole people, in the course of the building of a mature socialist society, the growth of the state of dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people and the Soviet people as a new historical community.

In the developed socialist stage the constructive possibilities of our system and its humanistic nature are revealing themselves to an ever growing extent. This has been reflected in the new USSR Constitution--the

Fundamental Law of the first state of the whole people in the world--a document which concretely embodies the Leninist ideas of rule by the people. Its adoption is not only a historical act of the codification of the social accomplishments and the creative summation of the practice of the building of communism, but a powerful incentive for the advancement of the entire system of sociopolitical relations. Everything achieved in the course of the decades of the Soviet system is inseparable from the heroic struggle waged by the party for the good and happiness of the people. Throughout our difficult and glorious path it has invariably won and is winning through its inflexible loyalty to Marxism-Leninism. Lenin's doctrine and legacy are the prerequisites for its fruitful revolutionary-transforming activity.

We can be proud of the fact that the Leninist ideas are not triumphing in our country only, in the homeland of Leninism. Today the Leninist banner, first raised over the planet by the will and the hands of the Russian toiling masses, is the banner of all progressive mankind. The working people of all countries link with Lenin's name and his unforgettable image their lofty ideals and hopes for happiness and a lasting peace. His contribution to the struggle for the bright future of the working people and the influence of his ideas are so great that our age will justifiably be recorded in history and the grateful memory of the peoples as the Age of Lenin, the age of Leninism, of the great revolutionary doctrine which has indeed become the voice of historical truth!

5003
CSO: 1802

ON MEASURES TO IMPROVE PARTY-POLITICAL WORK IN RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Mar 80 pp 14-17

[CC CPSU decree]

[Text] The CC CPSU decree notes that under the conditions of the dynamic development of all national economic sectors in the country and the development of new economic areas the significance of all types of transportation, rail in particular, whose work organization largely depends on the level of party leadership, increases immeasurably.

In this connection the need arises to increase the attention paid to strengthening the primary party organizations of enterprises in railroad transportation, insuring the vanguard role of the party members in production, their deployment in decisive sectors, mobilization of collectives for the implementation of the plans and prompt elimination of the reasons hindering the effective work of the railroads.

Yet some party committees and primary party organizations have lowered their exactingness toward leading and engineering and technical workers concerning the education of the people, the organization of the socialist competition, the application of progressive experience and support of innovative initiatives and the creation of normal working and living conditions for railroad workers.

With a view to insuring the further enhancement of the party's influence on the work of the railroad transportation system, the CPSU Central Committee made it incumbent on the central committees of communist parties of union republics and party kraykoms, obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms to intensify their organizational and political work in railroad transportation, basing it on the instructions issued by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, at the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum, on the need to change for the better in the immediate future the situation in transportation, strengthen the discipline in all its units and immediately bring order to the railroads.

The local party committees have been instructed to study more closely the activities of the primary party organizations of the administrations of the

railroads and sections, stations, locomotive and railroad car depots, divisions, plants and other railroad transportation subunits, and to upgrade their role as the leading nuclei of labor collectives. The party organizations must exert steady influence on improving the work of the transportation system. They must approach most principle-mindedly the assessment of the party members' implementation of their official duties. They must wage a decisive struggle against manifestations of negligence and for high work reliability and effective utilization of the rolling stock, the tracks and other technical facilities.

The parochial and narrow departmental approach to the utilization of railroad cars and other actions damaging the national interest must be opposed.

It is important to improve the deployment of party forces and to strengthen the most important units and decisive sectors with party members. This must include the enrollment into the party of progressive, politically mature workers and specialists on the basis of individual selection. Fuller use must be made of the opportunities for the establishment of primary and shop party organizations and party groups. It has been accepted that, if so demanded by the interest of the cause, party members from different subunits and services along track stations and adjacent sectors should merge within a single party organization.

Attention has been directed to the need to upgrade the effectiveness of the work of junction party committees. Their most important task should be to insure the activeness of primary party organizations at enterprises, organizations and services within the railroad junction and to organize the efficient interaction among all labor collectives related to the transportation process. The party gorkoms and raykoms must provide greater help to the junction party committees in their work and deal directly with the primary party organizations in the junction.

It has been recommended to the central committees of communist parties of union republics and party kraykoms and obkoms to set up, if necessary, councils of secretaries of party organizations in transportation junctions in which other types of transportation are used along with the railroads.

With a view to further strengthening the party's leadership in the work of the transportation system, it has been deemed necessary to strengthen the sectorial subunits of the party committees of some republics, krays, oblasts, cities and rayons.

The primary party organizations of railroad transportation enterprises have been instructed to comprehensively upgrade production and sociopolitical activeness of railroad workers and direct their efforts toward the strict implementation of the party's measures for the further development and advancement of the operational activities of the railroad transportation system, and the fulfillment of socialist pledges and plans for the transportation of national economic freight and passengers.

Greater control should be exercised over the activities of the administrations. Greater strictness should be displayed toward the leading cadres in order to insure the efficient work of each production sector, improve the content and utilization of transport facilities and systems and upgrade the handling capacity of railroad tracks, stations and junctions.

Relations and interaction with the party organizations of enterprises of other types of transportation and industry, construction and trade must be strengthened in order to reduce the idling of freight cars and eliminate inefficient hauling.

The extensive dissemination of political, economic and professional knowledge must be insured in the course of ideological-educational work among railroad workers. The responsibility of every worker for his assignments must be increased. Production and labor discipline must be strengthened. It must be always borne in mind that the labor activity of a considerable percentage of railroad workers involves travel and long separations from their homes. A feeling of pride in their profession and an understanding of the significance of working on the railroads must be promoted.

The party, trade union and Komsomol organizations and the economic managers of railroad transportation enterprises have been asked to comprehensively promote the socialist competition among railroad workers, and to support and disseminate progressive initiatives aimed at the utilization of internal reserves and upgrading the reliability of railroad work. Labor cooperation among related transport collectives must be steadily strengthened in order to improve the organization of the work of the various transport facilities.

It has been considered expedient for the central committees of communist parties of union republics and party kraykoms and obkoms to take more fully into consideration the work of railroad enterprises in summing up the results of the socialist competition by republic, kray and oblast, and to analyze more profoundly and comprehensively the activities of their collectives.

The Ministry of Railways and its collegium have been instructed to insure at all management levels the organic combination of economic with educational work. The decree emphasizes the need to improve the style and organizational forms of management of all railroad transportation units, bearing in mind that the managers must rely not only on the power of orders and instructions, but their activities. Through their personal example they must develop in the people high-level conscientiousness, a statesman-like responsibility and a creative attitude toward the implementation of official duties. The selection and placement of cadres and the upgrading of their work skills must be decisively improved. Energetic and creatively thinking and initiative-minded workers must be promoted more boldly and the necessary conditions for their growth must be created.

The managers of ministries, administrations and railroad sections and enterprises and organizations have been asked to take the necessary measures for the retention of cadres. They must display daily concern for improving the social-living conditions of transportation workers. Particular attention should be paid to the observance of normal working and leisure time conditions of individuals related train movements.

The AUCCTU has been asked to take practical measures to upgrade the work level of trade union organizations in railroad transportation and to improve the style and methods of their work and intensify their influence on all aspects of the production and social life of the labor collectives. They must direct the activities of the central, rail, rayon and local committees of the trade union of railroad transportation workers in upgrading the effectiveness of the socialist competition for the implementation of the state transportation plans, better utilization of transport facilities, extensive application of progressive experience and improvements in the practice of the moral and material incentives of the competitors. The role of the trade union organizations must be enhanced in the solution of important social problems related to the labor safety of railroad workers, the strengthening of their health, the broadening of the network of sanatoriums and rest boarding houses and bases, the improvement of the housing and living conditions of the personnel, the development of auxiliary farms and the expansion of cultural services offered the railroad workers and the members of their families.

The Komsomol Central Committee was asked to organizationally strengthen the Komsomol committees at railroad transportation enterprises. It must direct the young people to voluntarily to join the shock detachments of railroad transportation enterprises and encourage the young people to remain in this important sector. The young men and women must adamantly master their skills and multiply and develop the best traditions of the railroad workers. The Komsomol-youth shifts, columns, shops and brigades must develop the socialist competition for the right to participate in the Komsomol-youth five-year plan itinerary.

The editors of PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA and GUDOK, the republic, kray and oblast newspapers, and the journals KOMMUNIST, PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN', AGITATOR and POLITICHESKOYE SAMOBRAZOVANIYE have been instructed to systematically cover organizational and political work in the labor collectives of the railroad transport system, to adamantly struggle for the application of progressive experience and expose shortcomings in the administration of the transport system and the organization of the haulage and insure the preservation of the freight and traffic safety.

The publication of house newspapers along all railroads was deemed expedient.

The USSR State Television and Radio and USSR State Motion Picture administrations were asked to cover in detail the life and work of railroad

transportation collectives. Particular attention should be paid in the making of documentaries and feature films of the profound depiction of the great traditions of the railroad workers and the importance of their work today.

Jointly with the Ministry of Railways, the USSR Writers' Union, USSR Composers' Union and USSR Painters' Union have been asked to organize in 1980-1981 contests for the best works dealing with the life and labor heroics of the working people of the railroads and promote exhibits on topics related to railroad workers

5003
CSO: 1002

**ADDRESS BY L. I. BREZHNEV AT THE MEETING OF THE USSR SUPREME SOVIET
PRESIDIUM**

Moscow **KOMMUNIST**, in Russian No 5, Mar 80 pp 18-19

[L. I. Brezhnev's 4 March 1980 speech]

[Text] Discussing the elections held for the supreme soviets of union and autonomous republics and local soviets of people's deputies, L. I. Brezhnev pointed out the following:

The results of the elections are pleasing. The extensive work done by the party organizations, the soviets, millions of deputies and our state as a whole, for nearly five years, has been approved.

The significance of this nationwide support is tremendous. We must resolve the complex economic problems discussed at the November Central Committee Plenum. Complex problems have arisen also in connection with the aggravation of the international circumstances. However, we are convinced that we shall surmount the difficulties. This is guaranteed by the inviolable unity between the party and the people.

The bloc of communists and nonparty people is not a "momentary coalition" so characteristic of bourgeois elections. It is operating permanently, on an ever-broader basis.

Upgrading labor effectiveness and quality, improving the management of the national economy and strictly implementing the planned assignments remain our key tasks. The new members of the soviets must do a great deal in this respect.

Here again, comrades, particular attention should be paid to the further advancement of our socialist democracy. Maximum scope for the people's initiative, support of the new and progressive at all levels, ranging from settlements and rayon soviets to the supreme organs of state power, and intolerance of routine must become the rule. It is important to encourage the creative atmosphere in our society.

The work of each soviet must be conducted in close contact with the population and with reliance on the broad public. The political and labor activeness of the masses, triggered by the elections and the Leninist anniversary, must not only be retained but doubled and tripled.

Life adamantly demands greater control of all sectors on the part of the soviets. Such control must help to strengthen the state and planning discipline and to upgrade the responsibility of all officials. Naturally, it is not a question of merely pointing out shortcomings but of decisively uprooting them. In a word, the effectiveness of control, like economic activities, must be assessed above all on the basis of end results.

The new members of the soviets, L. I. Brezhnev concluded, bear the great responsibility to be at the helm of the ship of state in the period of preparations for the 26th party congress and, subsequently, in the period of the implementation of its decisions. This will be a period in which we will rise yet another step in the progress toward communism. I do not doubt that the soviets, the over two million of our deputies, will do their work properly.

Summing up the results of the consideration of the suggestions and remarks of the permanent commissions of the chambers and of the deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet, submitted at its second session in the discussion of the 1980 plan and budget, L. I. Brezhnev said:

This is the fourth time that the Presidium is presented with a report by the USSR Council of Ministers on such matters. Following the adoption of the constitution such governmental reports have firmly become part of our practice. This is good.

The reports and materials we received lead to the conclusion that the government is doing the necessary work to implement the proposals of the deputies and the permanent commissions. This enables us to find the best solutions to many problems. We are following the Leninist instruction that the soviet deputies are not only passing laws, but are actively participating in the administration of the state.

Here is something else.

Great concern for the development of the economy is visible in the speeches by the deputies at the sessions and in the permanent commissions. Quite justifiably their main attention is focused on improving the economic mechanism. The deputies are approaching this problem on the basis of broad positions, taking into consideration economic, social and even psychological factors. This is the only proper approach to such a most important national problem.

Assessing the amendments and supplements to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium ukase "On the Procedure for the Consideration of the Suggestions,

Petitions and Complaints by the Citizens," L. I. Brezhnev noted that they will contribute to the further strengthening of socialist legality and democracy. Every Soviet person, said he, must be certain that any legitimate suggestion, request or complaint will be carefully considered and that a just decision will be made.

A great deal has been accomplished in recent years to improve the work with letters. Formalism, red tape and a careless attitude toward the petitions of the people have not been entirely eliminated yet. Consequently, frequently the legitimate needs of the working people remain unsatisfied. This matter, as you know, was sharply discussed at the November CC CPSU Plenum.

The party demands of all our institutions and officials maximum responsiveness, maximum attention and maximum concern for the people.

5003

CSO: 1802

LENINIST PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT UNDER PRESENT CONDITIONS

Moscow KODRINIST in Russian No 5, Mar 80 pp 20-31

[Article by Prof V. Medvedev, doctor of economic sciences]

[Text] There are no areas of social life in which Lenin's theoretical genius and gigantic revolutionary activity have failed to leave ineradicable traces and which, today as well, are not experiencing their profound and fruitful influence.

Lenin's legacy holds a special position in the theory and practice of socialist economic management. On the basis of the fundamental stipulations of historical materialism on the decisive role of material production in the life of society, following the seizure of political power in our country by the working class, V. I. Lenin focused his attention on the organization of the socialist economy and to its management. "We convinced Russia," he wrote. "We won Russia back from the exploiters for the working people and we suppressed the exploiters. We must learn how to manage Russia" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 42, p 347).

What Lenin meant by the management of the country was, above all, economic management. He considered that it must be undertaken with the organization of nationwide accounting and control over production and the distribution of products in order to insure the enhancement of labor productivity on a national scale.

It was precisely from such positions that Lenin approached the definition of the economic role of the socialist state. The second party program, drafted under his guidance and passed by the Eighth Congress of the BCP(b) states the following: "In the age of the beginning socialization of productive capital, expropriated from the capitalists, the state power is no longer a parasitical apparatus placed above the production process. It begins to turn into an organization directly performing the functions of managing the country's economy . . ." ("KPSS v Resolyutsiyakh i Resheniyakh S'yezdov, Konferentsiy i Plenumov TsK" [The CPSU in Resolutions and Congress Decisions, Conferences and Central Committee Plenums], 8th ed, Vol 2, Politizdat, Moscow, 1970, p 56). Lenin considered that an apparatus such

as the Higher Council of the National Economy should assume in the future all most important activities of the organized society.

Lenin kept track of the entire range of problems related to management, starting with the elaboration of general methodological problems and ending with specific forms of organization of managerial work. Vladimir Il'ich was not only a brilliant theoretician and strategist of the building of socialism. He gave unsurpassable examples of flexible tactics, finding the only proper solutions to current problems and choosing economic management methods consistent with the economic and political circumstances. He boldly revised existing concepts and forms of economic management whenever they conflicted with life and with the tasks of the building of socialism.

Lenin considered it necessary for the vanguard of the proletariat, involving in this historical cause the broadest possible toiling strata and taking into consideration the factual level of their awareness, demands and needs, to use the ways and means of management understandable to the people, insuring the participation of the masses in the active process of creating the new life, gradually changing their views, interests and habits on a socialist basis.

The system of measures suggested by Lenin in the spring of 1921, described as the new economic policy, was the most outstanding example of daring, depth, flexibility and realism in the approach to economic management and overall social development. In this connection, Vladimir Il'ich did tremendous theoretical, political and organizational work to substantiate and explain the planned measures and to reorganize the activities of party organizations and state organs. His efforts yielded proper results: tortured and ruined by the imperialist and civil wars, on the edge of an economic catastrophe, within a relatively short time the country was able to rebuild its economy and undertake extensive socialist changes.

Following the Leninist way and guided by Lenin's doctrine, under the leadership of the communist party, as early as the mid-1930's the Soviet people laid the foundations of the socialist system. Subsequently, in the postwar period, as the result of all-round economic, social, political and spiritual progress, they created a developed socialist society. "The universal-historical result of the activities of the CPSU and the Soviet people in the implementation of Lenin's ideas," states the CC CPSU decree "On the 110th Anniversary of the Birth of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin," "was the building of a developed socialist society in which the constructive forces of the new system and its truly humane nature are being revealed ever more fully."

Developed socialism is not merely a landmark or a brief period but a relatively lengthy stage in the life of a society. It is precisely at this stage that the problem of winning the economic competition against capitalism is resolved and conditions are created for the conversion to the higher phase of communism.

The country's entry into the stage of mature socialism raised most urgently the task of the scientific elaboration of the entire set of problems related to the planned management of social development, of economics above all, as applicable to the qualitatively new conditions: the economic policy with its strategy and tactic, the economic mechanism, the style and method of management activities, the work of party, state and economic organs and public organizations, the further broadening of the democratic foundations of management and the development of the creative activity of the broadest possible toiling masses. On the basis of the reliable foundations of Marxist-Leninist theory and, above all, Lenin's legacy, the party is engaged in the development of these conditions, creatively applying them to the present circumstances.

The comprehensive substantiation of the party's current economic policy is the greatest accomplishment of the party, its Central Committee and, personally, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev. The significance of this policy can be fully assessed from the positions of the Leninist theory of the correlation between economics and politics.

According to Lenin politics is the concentrated expression of economics. It shows the ripe needs of economic development and the basic interests of the working class and all working people and their place within the system of production relations. The party's policy is based on the knowledge of objective economic laws. This aspect of the matter characterizes the origin and objective foundation of politics, its superstructural nature and its dependence on the economic base of society.

The other side of the problem is the role of politics in the mechanism of the functioning and development of the economy and society as a whole. As the concentrated expression of economics, politics is the most important organizing and guiding factor of economic development. In this sense it cannot fail to have priority over economics. Clarifying this elementary Marxist truth in his polemics with Bukharin, Lenin wrote: ". . . Without a proper political approach to the matter this class would be unable to retain its domination and, consequently, to resolve its production problem" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 42, p 279). The national economic plan is the specific manifestation of the party's economic policy and the principal lever for its implementation.

Any underestimating of the role of politics and its belittling as the basic organizing factor of social development leads to lack of control and drifting. Yet it would be erroneous to separate politics from economics and to abandon economic necessity. Such attempts lead to subjectivism and voluntarism, naked ordering and bureaucratic administration. In the various stages of its history, our party has waged a decisive struggle this on the basis of Leninist methodology. The result of such separation is seen in the example of Maoism with its anti-Marxist slogan that, "Politics is a command force." The policy of the "Great Leap" and of the "People's Commune," proclaimed in its time by the Maoist leadership, was a gross

violation of economic necessity and led to severe consequences affecting the Chinese people and the fate of socialism in the PRC.

The CPSU economic policy, elaborated at the latest party congresses and Central Committee plenums, starting with the October 1964 CC CPSU Plenum, is profoundly scientific. Its supreme objective reflects the basic socialist law and the objective subordination of socialist production to the task of the all-round development of man, the satisfaction of his needs and insuring the full prosperity of all members of society, as described by Lenin in the very first program of our party.

From the very beginning, socialist socialization gives the production process precisely such a direction. However, for a certain time it could not be considered basic in the national economy because of its insufficient development and the need to resolve more urgent historical problems, such as surmounting the economic backwardness of the country, strengthening its defense capability, technical retooling, restoration of the economy destroyed by the war, and so on.

Mature socialism offers the possibility to subordinate directly and more completely the development of the production process to the satisfaction of the needs of the working people. This task was given priority initially at the Ninth and subsequently the 10th Five-Year plans.

Occasionally we come across views obviously influenced by one or another difficulty or unresolved problem, such as: should we not complete first the industrialization of agriculture and fully eliminate its lagging, develop even further machine building and other heavy industry sectors, and then undertake the radical solution of problems related to upgrading the people's prosperity? The answer to this question is found in the party documents. Upgrading prosperity is not only our desired objective, but a necessity, a most important factor of economic growth and social progress.

A modern socialist production cannot be developed successfully over a long period of time without subordinating it to the satisfaction of the needs of the people. Upgrading prosperity is one of the most important sources and factors for the growth of the labor activity of workers, kolkhoz members and intellectuals. We cannot fail to take also into consideration the fact that the current planned economy and the scientific and technical revolution steadily increase the requirements facing the person as a worker, his general and professional standard, skills, knowledge and education. The harmonious development of a person is a necessary prerequisite for upgrading labor productivity.

The problem of prosperity cannot be reduced to the simple quantitative increase in the consumption of material goods. The law of increased requirements, described by Lenin himself, also means qualitative changes in the consumption structure and the means for the satisfaction of the various needs. Both today and in the future these structural changes will follow

the line of increasing the share of the spiritual, the intellectual needs of the people and the gradual shaping of a harmoniously developed person as the creator of material and spiritual goods, as an individual, as a member of society and as a citizen. The Marxist-Leninist concept of man has nothing in common with the aspiration ascribed to us toward nothing but material prosperity and a sated life.

Another most important element of the party's contemporary economic policy is closely and inseparably linked with the turn of the production process toward the fuller and more extensive solution of the problems of raising the prosperity of the working people. It is the course to upgrading production effectiveness and reliance on intensive economic growth factors. Occasionally this is related only to the limited nature of labor resources. We find it hard to accept this approach. We need a growth of public production far higher than the one which could be obtained by involving in it additional manpower, even in a favorable situation. In this case increasing output only by increasing the number of employed workers does not resolve the problem of raising the level of real incomes.

Naturally, the situation with manpower resources may affect the gravity of the problem of upgrading effectiveness. The need for such increased effectiveness stems from the highest objective of socialist production, expressed through the basic economic law of socialism. ". . . In order to systematically upgrade the prosperity of the people," Comrade I. I. Brezhnev emphasized at the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum, "we must implement the party's course toward upgrading effectiveness and quality with double and triple energy. There is no alternative to this course . . ."

The party also entirely relies on Lenin's ideas and, above all, on the decisive role he substantiated of the growth of labor productivity in the development of the economy and in achieving the victory of the new social system, in its elaboration of the concept of production effectiveness.

As we know, Lenin approached the interpretation of the content of the concept of "labor productivity" quite broadly. He did not reduce it to output at the individual work place. He included conditions governing the growth of labor productivity, increased profitability and labor intensiveness, the development of the material foundations of modern industry, improved location of production facilities, the rational utilization of natural resources and the enhancement of the general educational standard of the population. Essentially, Lenin provided the initial methodological and theoretical ideas for defining the concept of "production effectiveness" as the ratio between the end result of the production process and the sum total of outlays and investments within it.

At the same time the contemporary concept of production effectiveness includes the comprehensive influence on results of outlays within the framework of a single national economic complex of the scientific and technical

revolution underway. Naturally, labor remains the only creative and active production principle. Labor savings are an inexhaustible reserve for upgrading effectiveness. Today, however, the role of other components of effectiveness rises drastically: upgrading the quality of output, conservation of material resources, increased returns from productive capital and capital investments and their expanded interchangeability.

The contemporary scientific and technical revolution is of a universal nature. It brings with it a profound reorganization of all production factors--labor means and objects, technology and energy sources. It offers opportunities for the more effective satisfaction of social requirements by upgrading the quality of output. Each national economic problem may be resolved through a variety of methods distinct from each other, not only in terms of the size of labor outlays, but of simultaneous investments, materials, natural resources, and so on. Under such conditions, taken by themselves, labor outlays cannot be used as an exhaustive effectiveness criterion. Thus, for example, the dynamics of labor outlays does not allow us to determine alone the effectiveness of the work in the machine building industry, for it is called upon to make its most substantial contribution to upgrading social production effectiveness by improving the operational qualities and technical and economic characteristics of its output, including metal savings. The same could be said of metallurgy, where the most topical task is to upgrade the quality of metal production and broaden the variety of the produced rolled metal.

The influence of the conservation of material resources on production effectiveness rises because of their relative increase in cost, the need to develop ever further uninhabited areas and the need for an ever deeper penetration in the soil and the world's oceans. We must also bear in mind the sharp changes in the relative value of the various mineral resources, petroleum above all, influenced by improvements in the methods for its processing and increased volume of final products.

The effectiveness components are closely interrelated. Essentially, any measure aimed at improving the production process has a complex influence on effectiveness, affecting all its factors, but not to the same extent and sometimes acting even in opposite directions. That is why it is so important to have a single aggregate effectiveness indicator which would sum up its general level and dynamics.

On the one hand, the party's course toward a comprehensive enhancement of social production effectiveness entirely relies on Lenin's stipulation of the decisive role of the growth of labor productivity in social progress; on the other, it takes into consideration the profound changes in the production process under the conditions of a develop socialist society and of the scientific and technical revolution.

As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted in his speech to the electorate of Moscow's Baumanskiy Electoral District, on 22 February 1980, "In the 1970's we

undertook a turn of our entire economy toward intensive development, toward upgrading effectiveness and quality and emphasizing the 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 economic mechanism, i.e., the sum total of organizational structures and ways and means for national economic management as a whole and of its components, must serve the implementation of this objective. In recent years such problems have been the party's focal point of attention.

The CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decrees on economic problems, passed in the summer of 1979, are a most important step toward the creation of an economic mechanism consistent with the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution and developed socialism and in insuring the organic combination of these two powerful factors of human progress.

We cannot fail to note the continuity between the current measures and the economic reform undertaken in the second half of the 1960's. Some basic directions and principles of this reform were confirmed and developed further. Others required more effective solutions. The search will continue. But even today, however, in the light of the basic problems of economic development, which were profoundly and attentively considered at the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum, and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's speech at the plenum, the task of improving the entire system of planning and economic management assumed particular urgency and current importance.

The Soviet economy has reached a major scale. It can resolve problems of historical significance. It is steadily progressing. In his recent answers to questions asked by a PRAVDA correspondent, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev rejected the foolish views of some Western circles concerning our economic potential and attempts to exert pressure on our policy by a one-sided break in trade and economic relations. "The Soviet people," he emphasized, "have sufficient possibilities to live and work in peace, fulfill their plans and upgrade their prosperity."

We decisively reject as groundless and as something which has nothing in common with reality the fabrications of bourgeois propaganda on some sort of crisis in the socialist economy, and its hypocritical advice on how to "improve" and "liberalize" socialism. This conceals the profound wish on the part of our opponents to weaken its foundations. The path steadfastly followed by our party, a path which will insure the growth of output and above all its increased effectiveness, goes not through weakening, but on the contrary strengthening the socialist principles of economic management elaborated by Lenin, their more systematic implementation in accordance with the new conditions and the all-round perfecting of the specific ways and means of economic management on the basis of such principles.

The current stage in the efforts to improve the economic mechanism is distinguished by a comprehensive approach to the solution of the problem. It covers all basic aspects of socialist economic management: planning,

financing, material and technical supplies, cost accounting, material incentive, and so on. It is very important that the adopted measures were the result of serious scientific developments and summations of progressive experience in the organization of the production process and were subjected to extensive experimental tests. In this connection it would suffice to refer to the scientific studies and progressive practice of comprehensive economic and social development within the framework of enterprises, associations and regions, the formulation and implementation of counterplans, the experience in program-target planning, the scientific substantiation and experimental testing of the utilization of net production indicators for changing the volume of production activities of enterprises and associations, the experience in planning and stimulating capital construction for the commissioning of finished projects and marketable construction output, the brigade organization of labor and wages, and so on. For the first time in history such a broad range of results of scientific studies and experiments has been given an authoritative recognition and a pass to life.

Today the outlines are clearly marked of the economic mechanism, objectively determined by the characteristics of the contemporary development stage, able to insure the steady upgrading of the economic effectiveness of the production process for the sake of insuring the growing satisfaction of the needs of the people. It is based on democratic centralism, a founding principle of the organization of the socialist society and its management.

Lenin paid exceptional attention to the elaboration and interpretation of this principle. Lenin linked centralism with basic phenomena such as the dominating position of a technically equipped and scientifically organized big industry and the national ownership of productive capital. A strict subordination of the single will for success in the work organized in the likeness of a machine industry is unquestionably necessary. "This subordination," Lenin pointed out, "could, with ideal conscientiousness and discipline on the part of the participants in the common work, resemble the less rigid leadership of an orchestra conductor. It could assume the sharp forms of dictatorship if ideal discipline and conscientiousness are lacking" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, p 200).

As Lenin proved, centralism in the socialist organization of social life has profound democratic roots, i.e., it is based on the independent historical creativity of the masses as the masters of their country and the collective participants in the single socialist production process and on broad local autonomy and initiative. "Nothing could be more erroneous than to confuse democratic centralism with bureaucracy and routine," he wrote. ". . . Centralism, understood in its truly democratic meaning, presumes, for the first time in history, the established opportunity for the full and unhindered development not only of local characteristics, but of local initiative and of a variety of ways, means and methods for advancing toward a common goal" (ibid, p 152).

The strengthening and development of the centralized principle, aimed at the utilization of the most essential advantages of socialism, is expressed above all in perfecting state planning. In accordance with the Leninist principles of combining long-term with current planning, a purposeful system is developed of long-term, medium-term and current plans. It includes a comprehensive program for scientific and technical progress, formulated for a period of 20 years and renewed with each new five-year period, the basic directions of USSR economic and social development for a decade, also renewed each five years, a five-year plan and annual plans.

The elaborated measures call for the factual development of five-year plans as the main form of planning. Today, as distinct from the past, five-year assignments should be the base for the formulation of annual plans and the main criterion for the successful work of enterprises, associations and sectors. Naturally, this raises stricter requirements concerning the depth and substantiation of the five-year plans themselves. The retention over a five-year period of fixed norms regarding wage and economic incentive funds, stable wholesale prices in industry, budgeting prices in capital construction and freight haulage rates will contribute to the enhancement of their role.

The quality of the five-year plans will unquestionably grow as a result of the elaboration of target comprehensive scientific and technical, economic and social programs, as well as programs for the development of the individual areas and territorial-production complexes. Priority is given to the elaboration of programs for the conservation of fuel and metal, the development of the Bykal-Amur Main Line zone, the reduction of manual labor in the national economy and the increased production of new consumer goods.

In his time, formulating the basic ideas of the GOELRO plan, Lenin particularly emphasized the importance of relating planning with scientific and technical progress and the need to have "extensive plans based not on fantasy but backed by technology and drafted by science . . ." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 40, p 108). This problem holds one of the leading positions in the system of current measures aimed at improving planning and the entire economic mechanism. Basing long-term planning on long-term scientific and technical forecasts makes perfect sense. The five-year plans of ministries, associations and enterprises will include basic assignments on the implementation of scientific and technical programs and indicators of the technical level of output and the production of most important commodities, and the economic results of the implementation of scientific and technical measures. Furthermore, the annual plans of associations and enterprises will stipulate assignments on the use of progressive experience in technology and the scientific organization of labor, production and management.

Lenin's idea of a single and balanced national economic plan will be developed further. "All the plans of the individual production sectors," Lenin said, "must be strictly coordinated and related. They must

constitute the single economic plan which we need so greatly" ("Poin. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 42, p 154). Under contemporary conditions balance becomes even more important. Our present national economy is characterized by unparalleled compactness and intensiveness of internal relations. Each disproportion, in this case, triggers a chain reaction which becomes ever more difficult to stop. At the same time, under the influence of scientific and technical progress, a steady change in ratios takes place.

The purpose of planning is to insure the balanced development of output on the basis of progressive scientific and technical solutions. Balance in the national economy is an exceptionally important prerequisite for upgrading effectiveness. Conversely, disproportions and scarcities are the opposite of effective economic management. They drastically weaken consumers' control over the quality of output, level of outlays and effect of all material levers and incentives.

The decrees which were passed call for substantially improving the balance of the plans in terms of material and technical, labor and financial resources. Material resource balances will be drawn up also for the basic directions of economic and social development for 10-year periods involving the most important types of output; in the five-year plans, for consolidated varieties; in the annual plans, on the basis of expanded nomenclatures. For the first time the five-year plan will include a consolidated financial balance with a breakdown of population revenues and expenditures. It will call for the creation of the necessary reserves to insure the stability of monetary circulation.

The measures taken for the creation of a planned mechanism for the control, distribution and utilization of manpower, aimed at surmounting manpower shortages, are of essential significance. Manpower balances will be drawn up for 10-year periods, by five-year plan and by annual plan, along with economic and organizational measures aimed at strengthening planning in the distribution and redistribution of manpower, reduction of turnover and consolidation of cadres.

Major changes are being made in the system of plan indicators. They are oriented toward improvements of production end results and increased production effectiveness. Greater attention will be paid to the physical structure of the products, their quality and consistency with social requirements on the scale of the entire national economy, the sector, the association and the enterprise. This will be helped by assessing the activities of associations and enterprises on the basis of their implementation of contractual obligations for the delivery of commodities in the necessary variety and within stipulated deadlines and, in the case of construction organizations, the completion of finished capacities and projects. The introduction of the net production indicators will eliminate the interest of enterprises to produce material-intensive goods.

The system of measures to upgrade production quality, improve its planning and incentive and overall goods standardization will act in the same

direction. The necessary changes must be made in the system of physical measures of the produced goods, on the basis of the extensive application of scientific, technical and economic indicators, which will enable us to determine consumer qualities.

The intensified centralized planning of the national economy faces the science of economics with major tasks in the elaboration of problems of direct social control of the production process. In terms of the general theoretical aspect, everyone of our economists agrees that by its nature socialist production is directly social. However, when it comes to specific control instruments, they frequently turn only to the well-familiar categories of marketable output. Naturally, market-monetary relations must be used better. However, socialism establishes a system of categories which express its characteristics as a system with a socialized economy, playing a determining role in the management of the production process.

From this viewpoint a category such as the norm, whose utilization in the economic mechanism is increased considerably, deserves greater attention. From the political-economic viewpoint the norm is a manifestation of the planned development of socialist production and the main yardstick for assessing the activities of the working people and their collectives. Lenin's words on the subject of the plan, that it is a "measure, criterion, beacon, landmark, etc" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 43, p 362) fully apply to the norm. The elaboration of a system of norms covering the basic aspects of the production process and the exchange and distribution of goods is one of the most important tasks in improving management and planning.

The growing importance of consumer value, of the quality of goods within the economic mechanism requires a more thorough theoretical interpretation. In "Anti-Duhring" Engels himself emphasized that the production plan "will be determined, in the final account, by the weighing and comparing of useful effects among various consumer items and against the amount of labor needed for their manufacturing. At that point the people will do this quite simply, without resorting to the services of the notorious 'value'" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 20, p 321). This problem proved to be complex. However, we cannot say that it is insoluble.

The elaboration of the problem of the social consumer value and the direct social measurement of labor and other production factors are, in our view, one of the promising and fruitful directions for the development of economic theory and, at the same time, the perfecting of planning practice. Attention to consumer value and to methods for its assessment and measurement is in imperative of the time, related to the turning of the national economy toward social production effectiveness. The full reorientation of planning toward the reaching of best end results would be impossible without the solution of these problems.

The further development of the economic autonomy of economic units, sectors and regions, and the broadened rights and opportunities of cost accounting

associations and enterprises in the utilization of funds for the development of their output and for material incentives to their collectives is added to the intensified role of centralized planning in the economic mechanism. A transition to the establishment of economic incentive funds based on fixed norms and approved on the basis of differentiated amounts, on an annual basis, will be completed in the 11th Five-Year Plan. Industrial associations and production associations and big enterprises have been allowed to set fixed norms for withholdings from profits, left at their disposal. Associations and enterprises have been given broader rights in the utilization of amortization withholdings and obtaining Gosbank credits.

The new procedure for planning the wage fund, on the basis of long-term norms per ruble of output, and the broadened rights related to its utilization offer associations and enterprises great opportunities. Supplements to wage rates and salaries will be paid out of wage fund savings for achieving high labor productivity. Thus the principles of the Shchekino system will become universally widespread.

A greater emphasis on the solution of social problems is a characteristic feature of the developed economic mechanism. It stems from the fuller and more systematic implementation of the basic law of socialism and of subordinating the production process to the task of the all-round development of man and the satisfaction of his material, social and spiritual needs. It is also related to the enhanced role of social factors in the sense of their inverse effect on the production process.

Under the new conditions Lenin's idea of involving the working people in production management will be developed further. As early as 1918, Lenin wrote that, ". . . What great forces are concealed within the mass of the working people, the variety of labor communes of a big state and the intellectual forces which, so far, worked like dead and voiceless executors of capitalist plans; what forces are concealed and could be developed under the socialist system of society. Our project is merely to clear the way for all these forces" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, p 153). Lenin considered the broadest possible participation of the working people in economic management and in all social matters the most important prerequisite for the building of socialism and an important guarantee in the struggle against bureaucracy and technocracy, as well as a guarantee for the acceleration of social progress.

This historical task acquires a new meaning under developed socialist conditions. "Initiative from below," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the November CC CPSU Plenum, "is our irreplaceable reserve in the acceleration of economic development." He also stated that, "The socialist economic mechanism must insure a proper outlet for the energy and initiative throbbing with life."

In the 1970's, thanks to the systematic efforts of the party organizations, the practice of the socialist competition as the principal method for

Involving the working people in management was greatly enriched. Publicity, comparability and competitiveness within the competition were developed further.

Yet a number of problems related to the organization of the competition, particularly in terms of its relations with the economic mechanism and planning remained unresolved. By this I mean, for example, the existing practice of formulating socialist pledges after the state plan has already been signed and approved. Naturally, this yielded positive results particularly when the pledges emphasized improvements of quality indicators. However, negative phenomena appeared as well. An occasional tempted economic manager, foreseeing the future adoption of obligations, "held back" reserves, not including them in the plan, so that at the proper time he could bring them up and assume a leading position. Frequently, such obligations were not backed up by the necessary financial and material support or related with the work of suppliers and consumers. Frequently they violated the proportionality and rhythmical nature of the production process and froze assets.

Today this problem is being given a different solution based on progressive experience. The mass movement of the working people aimed at the finding of internal production reserves and the adoption of counterplans must begin not after the ratification of state planned assignments, but in the course of their formulation. The counterplans of the collectives must be coordinated with material resources and consumers and be included in the annual plan. In this manner the labor competition will be included more completely and organically within the very mechanism of socialist economic management, insuring its major economic substantiation, while in turn the economic management mechanism will be tied more closely to the live creativity of the masses.

The conversion of the brigades into the basic form of labor organization is of essential significance in the development of the creative initiative and activity of the working people and in broadening the democratic foundations of management. It is based on the mass experience of the brigade contracting method acquired in recent years, combined brigades at industrial enterprises with wages based on end results, harvesting-transport complexes in agriculture, and so on. The valuable feature of this experience is that organically combines the features of the progressive form of labor organization, cost accounting and socialist competition.

The party documents issued in recent years and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's speeches have considered the problem of production effectiveness as inseparably linked with work quality improvements. The quality of the work is the most important factor in the growth of production effectiveness. No changes in material and technical conditions would yield the desired results unless the quality of the work of every working person and every participant in the socialist production process is improved.

The slogan of upgrading the quality of the work goes back to the task formulated by Lenin in the very first months of the Soviet system of learning how to work by combining the highest achievements of scientific and technical progress with the new, the socialist methods for involving the people in the work and its organization. Circumstances have radically changed since then, but to this day the task of "learning how to work" not only remains but is acquiring a richer content and an even greater meaning. Today high work quality means the maximum utilization of the achievements of scientific and technical progress at each national economic sector and work place; the scientific organization of labor; high level of organization; and close comradely mutual aid. It is a complex concept with a scientific-production, economic, social and moral meaning. The consistency between the labor of a person and the system of requirements and norms, objectively dictated by the technology and organization of the contemporary production process, mature socialist production relations, labor and technological discipline norms and a conscientious, communist attitude toward labor is a criterion of high work quality.

Today, under the conditions of the tremendously expanded scale of economic management and increased complexity of the system of economic relations within the national economy, strengthening labor, technological and planning discipline assumes one of the leading positions in the common struggle for upgrading production effectiveness. The set of measures formulated in the recently adopted CC CPSU, USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU decree "On the Further Strengthening of Labor Discipline and Reducing Cadre Turnover in the National Economy" is aimed at their solution. Improving ideological and political-educational work plays an important role among them.

The profound understanding by the broad toiling masses and leading cadres of the characteristics and tasks of the current stage of economic development and the mastering of contemporary methods of management and economic knowledge, important from the viewpoint of combining socialism with the scientific and technical revolution, are all problems of prime significance and a necessary prerequisite for the fact that the planned reorganization of the economic mechanism will be successfully implemented. This reorganization cannot be postponed for the distant future. It is inseparably linked with the struggle for the successful implementation of the plan of the final year of the 10th Five-Year Plan and of the five-year plan as a whole. It must contribute to the laying of firm foundations for the next, the 11th Five-Year Plan.

Relying on the management principles formulated by Lenin and tested through historical practice, creatively developing and applying them to contemporary conditions, our party is confidently looking at the future and leading our society on the path to the building of communism.

EXCERPTS FROM HO CHI MINH'S PAMPHLET 'THE PATH OF THE REVOLUTION'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 80 pp 32-34

[Excerpts from Ho Chi Minh's pamphlet "The Path of the Revolution" and the article "Lenin and the Colonial Peoples," both written under the pseudonym of Nguyen Ai Quoc]

[Text] From the Pamphlet "The Path of the Revolution"

. . . What is needed, above all, for a revolution?

Above all, a revolutionary party, to mobilize and organize the people's masses and, furthermore, to establish relations with the oppressed peoples and the proletarian class the world over. Only a truly revolutionary party could be victorious, the way a person would be able to sail a boat only by firmly holding the wheel. If a party wishes to be truly strong it must have a scientific ideology and every party member must understand this ideology well and follow it firmly. A party without ideology is like a person without a mind and a ship without a compass.

Today there are many philosophical doctrines and all sorts of "ideologies." However, Leninism is the most true ideology, the most accurate one and the most revolutionary one.

1925

From Ho Chi Minh's book "On Lenin and Leninism," in Vietnamese, Hanoi, 1977, p 31

Lenin and the Colonial Peoples

Lenin laid the foundation of a new and truly revolutionary age in the colonial countries.

Lenin was the first to firmly condemn all prejudices on this matter still smoldering in the brains of many European and American revolutionaries.

The Comintern theses on the colonial problem are familiar to all. At all its congresses, at the congresses of the Trade Unions International and the Youth Communist International the problem of the colonies came first. Lenin was the first to understand and evaluate the entire tremendous importance of involving the colonial peoples in the revolutionary movement. He was the first to point out that a social revolution would be inconceivable without their participation.

Lenin found the necessary method for successful work in the colonies. He emphasized the need to use the revolutionary-national movements in these countries.

Representatives from the colonies attending Comintern congresses remember the great attention which the leader-comrade paid to them and the way he was able to penetrate into the most complex and purely local working conditions. Each one of us had sufficient time to see how impeccable his views and how valuable his instructions were. Through his skillful approach Lenin was able to stir even the most inert and backward masses of colonial peoples. Lenin's tactic on this matter, applied by the communist parties the world over, is drawing to the communist movement the best and most active elements of the colonies.

Lenin's solution of the most complex national problem in Soviet Russia was a powerful propaganda weapon in the colonial countries.

In the eyes of the colonial peoples and in the course of the painful history of their rightless existence, Lenin is seen as the creator of a new life, a beacon indicating the path to the liberation of all oppressed mankind.

BAKINSKIY RABOCHY, No 16, 1925

Long Live the Great Leninism

From ancient times to the present (excluding the epoch of primitive communism) the history of mankind may be divided into two stages.

The first stage begins with the slave-owning system and develops through the feudal system toward capitalism. Despite the fact that systems may have changed, the exploitation of man by man remained under all.

Since 1917, thanks to Lenin, the history of mankind entered an entirely new stage—the stage of the appearance and development of a system excluding the exploitation of man by man.

Lenin and his party headed the victorious October Revolution. Today over 200 million people, inhabiting one-sixth of the globe, are building a society without an exploiting class.

We could say that the shot from the Cruiser *Avrora*, which marked the beginning of the revolution, was heard the world over. The name *Avrora* has a truly deep meaning, for it was precisely as of that moment that mankind began to emerge from the darkness of the night, joyfully welcoming its dawn.

The second stage. Starting with October 1917, the forces of communism have developed exceptionally powerfully. In August 1917 there was only Lenin's party, the Communist Party of Russia, with 240,000 party members. At the beginning of 1919, when the Communist International was created, already 30 parties were participating in its founding, including several left-wing socialist parties. Despite the fear of imperialist terrorism, the communist parties have been developing on all five continents, as follows:

1928: 46 parties with 1.3 million members;

1935: 61 parties with 3 million members;

1957: 75 parties with 33 million members;

1962: 88 parties with 42.6 million members.

Adding to that membership the youth organizations under the guidance of the Communist parties, the communist forces would total about 100 million people who, united, are marching under the victorious banner of Marxism-Leninism.

The forces of national liberation are developing rapidly and powerfully along with the communist movement. Until very recently virtually all countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America were either colonies or were dependent on the colonial imperialist countries. Today the overwhelming majority of the colonies have gained their independence and their freedom. In Africa, for example, whose peoples were described by imperialism in the past as "black savages," and where, until very recently, colonial powers ruled entirely, today 30 countries inhabited by 80 percent of the population of the continent have rejected the slavery of the colonizers. The armed struggle against the imperialists is growing in countries such as Rhodesia and Angola.

These two tremendous forces--the communist and the national-liberation movements--are forcing a retreat of the colonialist forces until their total elimination.

Despite the fact that American colonialism is boasting of its rule in Taiwan, South Korea and South Vietnam . . . its future is no different in the least from the future of a flare which flies upwards with a great deal of noise and thunder, but then quickly goes off. Historical experience confirms that no forces of foreign aggressors can conquer a closely united struggling nation. The Cuban revolution defeated American imperialism.

The Vietnamese and Algerian revolutions defeated French imperialism. These victories convincingly confirm historical experience and inspire even further the peoples oppressed by the American aggressors to decisively surmount their difficulties and wage the struggle to the final victory.

The conclusion is that the great Leninism led mankind to a new stage--the stage of socialism and communism.

NYAN ZAN, 22 April 1962

5003

CSO: 1802

DEVELOPED SOCIALIST SOCIETY--A SOCIETY OF REAL FREEDOM

Moscow **KOMMUNIST** in Russian No 5, Mar 80 pp 35-44

[Article by Prof V. Davidovich, doctor of philosophical sciences]

[Text] The system of Marxist ideas contains theoretical formulas which express in a concise yet unusually extensive way the objectives and tasks of comprehensive communist activities. One of them completes the second chapter of the "Communist Party Manifesto"--the first Marxist programmatic document. It is a summed-up characterization of the basic features of the new system replacing the world of social antagonisms and the society of exploitation and oppression.

It is precisely the formula that "the free development of each is a prerequisite for the free development of all" that the developed socialist society built in the Land of the Soviets was able to include in its Fundamental Law as one of the basic constitutional principles, a manifestation of the ever closely attained objective and proof of the fact that to the Soviet people freedom is not only an appeal and a motivation, but reality itself.

While remaining the inner content of social progress and a major reason for actions, a lofty social ideal and a personal value, in the world of real socialism freedom has assumed visible features. It has become a dominant feature of human activities. It has entered production and life and all realms of material and spiritual life.

I

The problem of freedom holds a most important position in the historical confrontation between socialism and capitalism--the two main social systems of today. It encompasses many theoretical and practical problems of politics, ideology and daily life. This circumstance is well realized both by the Marxist-Leninists and their ideological-political opponents, for which reason they do not ignore it in the irreconcilable and further aggravated ideological struggle.

Thus the notorious "Sovietologist" James O'Rourke begins his book "The Problem of Freedom in Marxist Thinking," published in 1974, with the statement that, "It would be difficult to find a basic concept toward which the views of East and West would differ more than the concept of human freedom. . . . One of the most basic and fierce arguments between the communist and noncommunist worlds deals with the question of which one among them is the true guardian of freedom." "Freedom against socialism" is the slogan with which the reactionaries of the CDU/CSU are waging their political struggle in the FRG. "Freedom or socialism" proclaims the organization of the British Tories. "The West and the West only is and could be the cradle of freedom" is a thesis which is sounded ever more loudly and persistently in the speeches of governmental figures in the capitalist countries, the articles by bourgeois publicists, the statements by radio commentators and electoral promises and philosophical treatises. The bedlam raised by bourgeois politicians and ideologues on the problem of civil rights and freedoms clearly indicates that their shouts become the louder and more piercing the more human rights are violated in the callous world of the pursuit of profits.

Let us remember that in his speech "On Misleading the People with Slogans of Freedom and Equality," V. I. Lenin warned that world capital, having created its own "bourgeois freedom" uses the "freedom" phraseology in the struggle against the ideas and policies of the working class and that it will "raise against us the banner of freedom" ("Poin. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 38, p 347). Vladimir Il'ich clearly pitted the proletariat against the bourgeois understanding of freedom. He based its Marxist interpretation on the principle of a class specific-historical analysis. He emphasized that "freedom, unless it is subordinated to the interest of liberating labor from the oppression of capital, is a fraud" (ibid). Today demagogic references to the "lofty ideal of freedom" are once again extensively used by imperialist propaganda.

The Marxist ideal of true freedom, clear, defined and historically specific, is based on the recognition that the freedom of the individual is a manifestation and awareness of social necessity, of the social nature of man. This is countered by our opponents with some abstract "value" which, allegedly, is inherently found in everyone and is abstract and thoroughly individualistic.

The theme of their freedom song is the ideals formulated by the bourgeois ideologues when the bourgeoisie was still historically progressive. However, being from the very beginning an exploiting class, the bourgeoisie asserted their class-egotistical understanding as well, radically changing the meaning of the very concepts of freedom, equality and fraternity. It defended not the freedom of labor and the discovery of human talents and capabilities, but the freedom of private interest and private arbitrariness, business and competition and the right to unrestrained grubbing.

A characteristic method used by the present bourgeois theoreticians is the attempt to present personal freedom as a kind of extratemporal constant

individual life, taken outside its socioeconomic context. For this reason all their considerations of freedom are related to recreation and narrowly interpreted participation in political life. The point is that the cruel reality of monopoly rule faces the theoretical servants of the monopolies with the task of promoting the illusion of freedom in the minds of the people who have lost their freedom. It is understandable, therefore, why the old idea of the danger of restricting people in terms of petty matters is so willingly preached in the West. It is claimed that freedom is less necessary in major matters. On this basis the troubadours of the capitalist world intensively proclaim the "freedom" of individual actions and the "right to arbitrariness" and independence in the field of life-styles. However, all this famous "arbitrariness" is unceremoniously expelled from the areas of production, economics and politics and restricted to the narrow and petty world of an egotistically understood personal life. In terms of socially significant activities, the monopoly-state dictate will be unquestionably obeyed. In personal life one may do as one pleases. Such is the real underlining of all these complaints concerning personal freedom. Noteworthy in this respect are the newly fashionable ideas expressed by Daniel Bell concerning the "area of culture" in which, allegedly, "everything is permitted" as compared with the functional rationality of the production process, rigidly oriented toward effectiveness.

Marxism-Leninism considers that the ideal of human freedom coincides with the social ideal, i.e., with the concept of a dynamic and comprehensively advancing classless society which has put an end to exploitation and all types of oppression and social inequality, insuring unity between social and personal ideals and providing optimum opportunities for constructive activities, self-realization and self-assertion within labor creativity and leading to the development of the individuals. In "Das Kapital" K. Marx described communism as a social system "whose basic principle is the full and free development of every individual" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 23, p 605). Communism is the true kingdom of freedom. Our own developed socialist society has already proved its all-embracing democratic nature, the essentially new and, for the present, highly progressive economic and sociopolitical, cultural and ideological-moral realities, which reveal the specific meaning of true human freedom.

II

The first and decisive realm of human life is material production, the area of constructive toil. Under socialism work has indeed become the main manifestation of human freedom. Metaphorically speaking, it coincides with freedom. Developed socialism is creating ever more favorable conditions for human labor activities.

Ever since classes appeared, all historical forms of labor were, one way or another, labor based on outside coercion. They were neither free nor voluntary. In all antagonistic systems labor, whose essence from its very beginning has been the most profound foundation and the true substance of

freedom, has been exploited, forced, alienated. Despite its essence, labor was a physical, spiritual and moral yoke, a chain, a tie. "The alienation of labor," Marx pointed out, "is clearly manifested in the fact that the moment a physical or any other coercion to work is removed, people run away from labor as from the plague" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op cit, Vol 42, p 91).

The problem of the reasons, conditions and factors for the appearance of non-free (alienated) labor was profoundly studied by the Marxist-Leninist classics. The elimination of all these factors is the main objective of the socialist change and the pivot of the building of communism. It is the internal dominant feature of the universal-historical transition from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom. The entire history of Soviet society and the development of the members of the socialist comity tangibly and clearly show what labor is free from exploitation. Again and again life confirms the Marxist-Leninist concept that the liberation of labor is the basic condition for the true freedom of the individual.

Legitimately, the USSR Constitution gives priority to the characterization of the Soviet society as a society of working people. In his speech at the seventh session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, ninth convocation, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev described the question of the role of labor under socialism as a basic problem. The constitutional right to work and to prove oneself in such activities which are "human" in all their parameters is an initial socioeconomic right, a basic guarantee for the freedom of the people. As a system for a social organization and a way of life, socialism has long proved a fundamental advantage such as the firmly guaranteed universal possibility to work.

The description of socialism as the society of free labor and the right to work as a basic freedom among the sum total of individual freedoms has, therefore, a deep meaning. It is precisely here that the entire variety of human activities finds its common denominator and manifests its deep nature. It is entirely natural that the enumeration of the basic rights, freedoms and obligations of the citizens, as proclaimed by the constitution, begins with Article 40, which asserts the broadly interpreted right to work. It is materially backed by the entire socialist economic system, the steady growth of production forces and the possibility to have a guaranteed job in accordance with social requirements and the right of the individual to choose his employment and profession in accordance with his avocation, capabilities, professional training and education.

Speaking of free labor as basic in the entire hierarchy of individual freedoms, let us recall the first part of the socialist and communist principle which states "from each according to his capabilities." Our society is steadily progressing toward the full implementation of this thesis in practical life. As of now the level and scope of socialist production, the quality of education and the dominant position of the ideology and mentality of collectivism and the cultivation of a communist attitude toward labor

are creating ever more favorable conditions for the manifestation and development of the capabilities of everyone in one or another kind of socially useful activity. The fact that in the overall system of human requirements the need to work is assuming an ever leading position is a tremendous accomplishment of socialism today. This marks the rejection of the distorted and inhuman features which the domination of private ownership brought to life.

We must point out that in the capitalist countries as well visible changes have occurred in the living standard of the working people. Their energetic struggle has made it possible to force from the ruling classes certain concessions in terms of improving material working and living conditions. These processes have their objective foundation.

The development of the scientific and technical revolution entails the growth and changes of vital human needs. Without this, in order to take any step whatever toward meeting such needs, the capitalist production mechanism would be unable to function at all. Displaying a characteristic "demagogy of action," the bourgeoisie is trying to publicize a certain improvement in the material prosperity of some of the population and is doing everything possible to conceal and hide increased exploitation and labor intensiveness. One of the gravest conflicts currently facing the people in the capitalist world in the material area is the instability, unreliability and insecurity of their existence. Occasionally, "prosperity" may seem to exist. However, it is ephemeral and hangs on a thread. The intensification of crisis phenomena in the capitalist economy threatens the level of sufficiency achieved by the working people in the course of a difficult class struggle undermining it. In the abyss of inflation and under the pressure of the arms race and conditions of headlong expansion of unemployment the material possibilities of the working people are becoming drastically narrowed and limited. Many millions of people are living below the official poverty level. Insecurity in the future and balancing on the edge of the abyss trigger, to a tremendous extent the fearful concern and psychological stress steadily noticed in the West today.

The developed socialist society is showing ever more fully and vividly its most important characteristic insured by the course followed by the CPSU toward the solution of the various problems of upgrading the people's prosperity and achieving a radical change in the living conditions of the broadest possible popular masses. Equally alien to the communist ideal of freedom are puritanical-ascetic concepts and orgiastic fast-living aspirations. The establishment of sensible, dynamic and broadening needs is a necessary material prerequisite for the exercise of freedom. The primary condition is not merely "from each according to his capabilities," but also "to each according to his needs." Well aware of the fact that the implementation of the second principle is a complex task whose implementation will require a great deal of time, we are convinced that this will mandatorily be achieved by the Soviet society. Today we are already factually feeling the extent of real freedom gained by the Soviet people.

Sensible needs are a specific item pitted against crazy whims, excessive thirst and accumulation. We know that Marx and Engels considered communism a social organization under which the "normal, i.e., the satisfaction of all needs, restricted by the needs themselves," will become possible (K. Marx and F. Engels, op cit, Vol 3, p 246). Human needs are historically specific and conflicting. They grow and become more complex. The level of satisfaction of material needs cannot be expressed simply in some absolute terms. We must bear in mind that the material freedom of man is inseparable from his ability to control his needs, consciously to determine his choice of means for their satisfaction. It is precisely from this viewpoint that can speak with full justification of the high level of real freedom of the individual we have achieved.

Socialism created a comprehensive system of healthy (normal) needs and real demands of a developed individual. This entire system, on the basis of which the need to work is asserting itself to an ever greater extent, is transformed and enriched in accordance with the effect of the law of increased needs noted by Lenin. The steady growth of the people's consumption and the increased volume and improved quality of goods and services granted by society to every person are clearly visible to all. Suffice it to cite the fact the production of consumer goods (group "B") rose on a per capita basis in our country by a factor of 29 since 1913; real workers' income per worker, taking into consideration the elimination of unemployment and the reduction of the duration of the working day, has improved by a factor of 10.2; the factor for the peasants is 15.3.

We fully realize the fact that in this area far from all problems have been resolved. Unfortunately, shortages and stoppages and "scarcities" of all kinds are still extant. The policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state is aimed at insuring the optimum satisfaction of the ever-growing needs of the Soviet people.

The constitutional right to recreation and health care, material support in old age and in sickness or in full or partial disability, and the right to housing, for the first time included in the Fundamental Law of the state, are all features which, taken together, depict the true level of freedom achieved by developed socialism.

III

Socioeconomic freedom is basic to any system of human freedoms. However, Marx noted that the true kingdom of freedom begins "that side of the realm of strictly material production" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op cit, Vol 25, Pt II, p 387). He had in mind a developing situation in which "the development of human forces as an end within themselves begins" (ibid). Freedom of satisfaction of material needs and "living" problems is a prerequisite, a condition, a means for reaching the area of the freedom to live, think and decide and the freedom of creativity.

Considered in this dimension, developed socialism is a society which insures, to a high extent, the spiritual freedom of man. The juridical manifestation of its level and nature is found in the rights guaranteed by the USSR Constitution to education and the use of cultural achievements and the freedom of scientific, technical and artistic creativity.

Unquestionably, freedom of the intellect has its objective foundations. It is based on the level of socioeconomic freedom. Its nature is influenced by the sum total of material and sociopolitical human living conditions. Mentally mastering the world and recreating it intellectually, undertaking with a scalpel a logical analysis of the objective underlining of events, perspicaciously predicting the course of events and gaining the possibility to control them are, precisely, the features of true spiritual freedom. Our society has only one cult: the cult of knowledge, bold thinking and searching and creative daring.

The very foundation of the freedom of thought is the molding in the Soviet people of a Marxist-Leninist outlook, which most adequately expresses the objective laws governing social development and insures the creative mastering of any factual and specific "material" which man must interpret. Under mature socialist conditions the extensive and comprehensive social relations which influence the behavior and awareness of the people determine the fact that each action in spiritual life is imbued with an ideological, a conceptual content. We could boldly say that communist ideamindedness is the prime condition, the prerequisite and the basic manifestation of a free spirit.

Freedom of creativity is one of the most impressive manifestations of spiritual freedom. However, as a rule, the social conditions of antagonistic systems suppressed the creative potential of the masses, ignoring and deforming it, leaving it at the level of unrealized opportunities. Such was the case in the past and such is the case today in the capitalist world. In the world renovated by revolutionary changes, however, particularly in the developed socialist society, previously unheard of conditions are created for mass (precisely, mass, nationwide) creativity.

A true creativity must be free. Otherwise it will be no creativity in the full meaning of the term—a manifestation, a self-discovery of the individual. Noting the fact that freedom and creativity were indivisible, Marx emphasized that, ". . . Freedom applies not only to what I live from but how I live, and not only the fact that I am exercising my freedom, but the fact that I am doing this freely" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op cit, Vol 1, p 68). The contradictions of reality are manifested, concentrated and expressed in their "concentrated" aspect in the efforts of the searching human mind acquiring the truth and the actions of constructive human activities. The thought, converted into creative action and realized through labor, resolves these contradictions more effectively and fully than they could be resolved by man and human history. In creativity, man (as the subject of activities and knowledge) rises maximally above the object,

"comes out" of it and, at the same time, most completely "enters" into it, reaching and transforming it according to his objectives. Creativity is the synonym and peak of freedom. It is not accident that Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out that the October Revolution and socialism enriched the history of mankind through the experience of the spiritual emancipation of the working people. The historical encounter between labor and culture is a turn of tremendous importance in the development of all human civilization and a powerful start for the creative daring of the Soviet people.

The level of economic and cultural construction in the USSR is a convincing proof of the tremendous scales of the creative constructive activities of the Soviet people. In 50 years, from the beginning of the First to the middle of the 10th Five-Year Plan, the gross social product rose by a factor of 57. The produced national income rose by a factor of 68 and the value of productive capital in all national economic sectors, by a factor of 34. This is the direct result of emancipated labor.

Quite justifiably, having become the real maker of the Fundamental Law of their state, the Soviet people introduced in it stipulations guaranteeing creativity. In accordance with the objectives of the building of communism, Article 47 of the new USSR Constitution reads, the citizens are guaranteed freedom of scientific, technical and artistic creativity, supported by a broad development of scientific research, invention and rationalization activities and the development of literature and the arts. The inclusion in the constitution of such a stipulation has no precedent. The introduction of a creative principle in the entire life of the people is a feature of the communist ideal, which is extensively penetrating our lives. Creativity is the result and manifestation of the spiritual freedom of the Soviet person. The great accomplishments of Soviet science and the outstanding successes of our art are the factual results of the freedom of creativity created by the socialist system. The Marxist-Leninist understanding of creative freedom was embodied in the creation of an atmosphere of great concern for the scientists, artists, designers, and so on. Conditions for unhindered development have been created in our country for all types and varieties of creative work. We acknowledge only one restriction: intolerance toward the subjectivistic distortion of reality, dictated either by ideological immaturity or intellectual limitation, or else deliberate crossing over to the positions of the defenders of reaction. Freedom and communist party-mindedness in the realm of creativity are inseparable from each other.

Developed socialism insured a broad range of political freedoms. The entire process of the establishment and development of representative organs of the Soviet state of the whole people, carried out in the new USSR Constitution, are aimed at creating the most favorable possibilities for the free participation of every citizen in the administration of governmental affairs. Lenin saw in the broad popular representation under socialism a political form in which "every citizen must be placed in conditions

enabling him to participate in the discussion of governmental laws, the election of his representatives and the implementation of state laws" ("Poin. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, p 157).

The profound changes predicted by the classics of Marxism-Leninism are steadily increasing in the strengthening full-blooded life of the state of the whole people. The entire range of political rights and freedoms enjoyed by the Soviet people are a powerful means for insuring truly human living conditions for everyone. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized on 2 November 1977, our constitution "has convincingly proved that the concepts of freedom, human rights, democracy and social justice acquire real meaning only under socialist conditions."

The molding and development of high political standards of the broad popular masses and the establishment of an active life stance by every Soviet person aware of his rights and able to "exercise freedom" is a necessary prerequisite for the further development of socialist democracy, which in the course of time will lose its political nature and will grow into communist social self-management. In its current aspect the system of Soviet socialist democracy is already all-embracing. "For the first time, the principles of democracy," points our Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the article "A Historical Landmark on the Way to Communism," were extended to all realms of social life, including its base--production relations." Along with participation in the work of the soviets, which are the most representative organs of state power, millions of people are involved in a variety of activities of social organizations and voluntary associations, insuring the manifestation of the specific interests of all strata and groups of our people and their coordination with the interests of the entire society.

Civic and social activeness, the transformation of the ability to rule into a need, and the possibility to personally influence governmental and social affairs in real life is an essentially important aspect of the development of individual freedom. The key role of the communist party in the course of the development of the entire democratic mechanism of our society is the most important guarantee for the triumph of the principles of freedom in the sociopolitical area.

IV

To us the problem of individual freedom is not exhausted in the least by a list of basic "rights and freedoms" accepted by the world's progressive public opinion and codified in a number of international declarations. The new USSR Constitution develops them more extensively and deeply than any state act ever passed by anyone. The quality changes in the rights and freedoms of the Soviet people are codified in the Fundamental Law. They are clear and expressive.

At the same time, we see in the problem of individual a broader dimension in which it acts as a positive force for the manifestation of true

individuality. Personal freedom is the greatest possible value to the extent to which it is called upon, as Marx and Engels noted, "to grant everyone the necessary social scope for his vital manifestations" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op cit, Vol 2, p 145). In this respect what makes the USSR Constitution important is that it legislatively delineates this "social scope" offered the Soviet person. The ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the self-attainment of the individual and the fact that every person tries to realize his potential and "achieve (fulfill) himself" find their practical material base in socialism. In labor, recreation, life and creatively lofty activities, everywhere, reliable prerequisites are developing for the free revelation for the best features of the individual. Asserting this, we must also note that the Marxist-Leninist understanding of individual freedom has a consistently collectivistic nature.

Its individualistic interpretation, Marx emphasized, "places every person in a situation in which he considers another person not as the realization of his freedom, but conversely as its limit" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op cit, Vol 1, p 401). Such "freedom," which asserts not the connection but the contraposition, the separation of one person from another, is deeply alien to socialism. To the individualist the other person is either a means for achieving selfish interests or an obstacle on the way to his egotistical objective and which should be "removed." It is precisely this line that is followed by the erroneous claim that the freedom of the individual, based on the social ownership of productive capital, begins with equal access to material and spiritual goods and the freedom to consume them, rather than with constructive creativity.

In a society where the collectivistic principles have won, the freedom of the individual, in its real content and real completeness, is found and revealed as the individual embodiment of a system of social relations and individual activities coordinated and interrelated with the activities of other people. The problem of individual freedom is to us a problem of the indivisibility of the individual human destiny and the life of the collective and society. It is a question of the "link between one's biography and history."

It is precisely here that the problem arises of the correlation between the individual (inner) freedom and social discipline, rights and obligations, and freedom and responsibility. In this aspect, the freedom of man is the deliberate choice of a specific position based on the inner conviction of acting precisely this way and not otherwise. The freedom to act with an awareness of social and moral values is the opposite of weak-willed mechanicism, blind strictness and soulless automatism. The greatness and attractiveness of the spiritual aspect of the Soviet people lies in the fact that the mass of the people are pursuing noble ideals of communism with a profound understanding of the nature of life and realized convictions. Our people are not dummies passively accepting the imperatives of duty. The concepts of duty as a social and moral necessity, of discipline and self-discipline as the need to coordinate one's motivations with the will of

society, are organically inherent in the spiritual world of the Soviet person. The voluntary nature of the fulfillment of the objectives facing everyone by developed socialism is a necessary prerequisite for the indivisible link between freedom and responsibility.

In this area our ideal is for every individual to develop the ability for consciously establishing the correlation between individual and public interests; to find a harmonious correlation between the demands of society and one's own motivations. Characteristic of a person who is internally free are the dialectical interconnection between thought and feelings, the necessary and the desirable, and rights and obligations. This largely accounts for the unity and solidarity within Soviet society, described by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his 22 February electoral speech as the unique position of socialism as our priceless and invincible strength.

Granting the individual ever greater freedoms, society thus assigns to the individual ever greater obligations as well, facing him with the sensible need to pursue the social objectives. Here the dependence is direct and immediate: greater freedom—greater responsibility. It is a question not only of responsibility for the immediate consequences of one's own individual actions but responsibility for the fate of the world, the course of history, one's age. Unquestionably, social, civic responsibility is not identical to all-embracing control. However, the one cannot be separated from the other. Considered in its positive aspect, responsibility means a restriction imposed by society on individual arbitrariness and the dialectically related maximum total manifestation of true human freedom and creative activity.

Every person is free to choose the means for the fulfillment of his social obligations. However, no one can be released from them, from responsibility to the homeland, the people, the interests of the building of communism and his own civic and party conscience.

In his article "A Historical Landmark on the Way to Communism," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev justifiably recalled the words drawn on the flag of the First International, created by Marx and Engels: "There Are No Rights Without Obligations and There Are No Obligations Without Rights." Today this slogan has indeed become one of the basic principles governing the life and activities of the Soviet people.

Freedom presumes choice and decision. It broadens the range of possibilities and contributes to their conversion into reality. The world opened by freedom is always richer, more varied and more complex. The people must learn to "master" the new opportunities offered for their free, active and constructive efforts. They always must "grow up" to freedom and be worthy of it and broaden its limits further and further. Freedom is a process, a real process of historical development of man and mankind and a climbing of the stepladder of progress.

The level of conscientiousness and fullness of freedom of the individual reached by our country is convincing and impressive. The building of a developed socialist society laid the foundations of an ever-accelerating process of full-blooded revelation of the essential forces of man. It was precisely this circumstance that was noted, once again, most emphatically by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev: "Never before have we had such favorable possibilities for the solution of the problems for the sake of which, in the final account, the revolution was made: the enhancement of the prosperity of the masses, the development of socialist democracy and the all-round development of the individual."

The most essential features of communist theory and practice are expressed, in their most concentrated and impressive way, in social and individual freedom. Freedom is the real content of social progress, an indicator of the truly humanistic socialist changes and measure of what toiling mankind has achieved in its difficult path to the communist reorganization of reality.

5003

CSO: 1802

INALIENABLE CONSTITUTIONAL NORM OF THE SOCIALIST STATE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 80 pp 45-55

[Article by V. Kuroyedov, USSR Council of Ministers chairman for the Council for Religious Affairs]

[Text] 1

Guaranteeing the freedom of conscience is one of the greatest changes made in our country under the Soviet system.

Freedom of conscience is one of the historical gains of the working people. It is codified in Soviet legislation as the right freely to profess any religion, change one's faith and join a religious association. At the same time, it is the right not to profess any religion and engage in atheistic propaganda, naturally, without insulting the religious feelings of the believers.

Lenin's decree "On the Separation of the Church from the State and the School from the Church"--one of the first legislative acts of the Soviet Republic, which laid the beginning of guaranteeing the freedom of conscience--was the basis of all subsequent legislation on religious cults. The decree is imbued with true democracy, respect for the beliefs of people, their religious faith and traditions, and concern for human rights.

Characteristically, as our society developed Soviet legislation insured to an ever fuller extent the implementation of the principle of freedom of conscience. Whereas the 1936 constitution stipulated that the freedom to exercise a religious faith and freedom to engage in anti-religious propaganda is granted to all citizens, the new constitution guarantees to all citizens of the USSR the right to profess or not to profess any religion, to exercise a religious cult or to engage in atheistic propaganda (Art 52).

The article on freedom of conscience stipulates that, "It is forbidden to incite enmity and hostility related to religious beliefs." This stipulation is aimed above all at defending the rights of the individual regardless of his attitude toward religion. In our country believers and

nonbelievers are equal in the eyes of the law. Both are builders of the new society. The equality of USSR citizens in all areas--economic, political, social and cultural--is constitutionally guaranteed. The Soviet laws guarantee the inadmissibility of violating the rights of believers or of slighting and insulting their religious feelings. At the same time they protect nonbelievers from any hostile attitude toward them on the part of the supporters of religious ideology.

The stipulation banning enmity and hostility related to religious beliefs is aimed at any and all anti-social actions committed under the cover of religion and against fanning a hostile attitude toward the order and laws governing the socialist society. The constitution emphasizes that the most important duty of all USSR citizens, including believers, is to observe the Soviet laws and follow the legal norms governing our state and society. Article 39 of the constitution, for example, stipulates that the exercise of the citizens' rights and freedoms (naturally, including the right to the freedom of conscience) should not harm the interests of society and the state, or violate the rights of other citizens.

This stipulation is the base for the requirement not to allow the inciting of hostility among followers of different religious faiths. It is well known that quarrels between religions are being encouraged and incited by imperialism in all possible ways in an effort to draw the working people away from the class struggle. Let us recall in this respect the religious conflicts in the Indian subcontinent and in Ulster, Lebanon and a number of developing countries. From the very first days of its existence the Soviet system proclaimed that all religions were equal in the eyes of the law and firmly put an end to granting privileges to some religions to the detriment of others.

The USSR Constitution reflects all conditions governing the freedom of conscience with extreme clarity and completeness.

They include the citizens' equal rights regardless of their attitudes toward religion and the equality of all religions in the eyes of the law, as well as the absence of any coercion whatever in terms of professing or not professing a faith;

The inadmissibility of using religion to the detriment of society and the state or of individual citizens;

Finally, the noninterference of the state in the internal (liturgical, canonical) affairs of the church; and, at the same time, the noninterference of the church in the affairs of the state.

The exercise of the freedom of conscience is inseparably linked with all aspects of socialist democracy, beginning with the equality of citizens regardless of their religious affiliation and ending with their right to profess any religion or support an atheistic outlook and the right to engage in atheistic propaganda.

There is a radical difference between the Marxist-Leninist and the bourgeois concept of the freedom of conscience. In the antagonistic society the ruling classes are profoundly interested in preserving religion as a tool for strengthening their domination of the masses. K. Marx himself pointed out that the bourgeois state has a political attitude toward religion and a religious attitude toward politics. Exposing the nature of the freedom of conscience in a capitalist society, V. I. Lenin pointed out that the problem of religion, following a bourgeois-democratic direction, has not been fully resolved in any, even the most progressive Western country (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 44, p 146).

The constitutions of the capitalist countries which proclaim the freedom of conscience are rife with stipulations and restrictions which curtail it in practice and contain the elements of coercion regarding the practicing of one or another religion, and the imposition of religion on population masses. As a rule their texts include the words "freedom of conscience." However, not one of them contains an article protecting the freedom of atheistic views. The interests of many millions of people who do not believe in God are ignored, while the proclaimed "freedom of conscience" is reduced merely to the right to choose one or another religion. A number of bourgeois constitutions proclaim the separation of the church from the state. In fact, however, this is merely a deception of public opinion.

In the United States, for example, the principle of separation of the church from the state was proclaimed long ago but has remained meaningless. To this day the activities of state organs are sanctified by religion and, in a number of cases, are closely linked with the exercise of religious rituals. The sessions of the houses in the U.S. Congress open with a prayer. The U.S. Government has clergymen on its payroll in Congress and chaplains in the Army and Navy. The preambles of the constitutions of 42 states contain appeals to God. The laws demand a religious oath in court and other state institutions, and in assuming a governmental position. Every elected president, assuming his position, swears on the Bible. Typically, in 1956 the Congress stipulated that the U.S. national motto is "In God We Trust."

According to the laws of the states of New Jersey and Maryland the local courts do not recognize testimony by witnesses who are nonbelievers. Arkansas' constitution stipulates that, "No one who denies the existence of God may assume a state position or give testimony in court." In 16 U.S. states atheistic actions are punished by a fine of up to \$1,000 or a jail sentence not to exceed 3 years.

The legislative acts of 43 countries insure the ruling status of a specific religion. In 14 European and Latin American countries the Roman Catholic Church is the ruling church; Islam is the ruling faith in 17 countries in the Middle and Near East, Southeast Asia and Africa. Enjoying a great

variety of privileges granted by the state, the ruling churches penetrate all fields of life, perform a variety of social or governmental functions and interfere in the private lives of citizens. The constitutions of 22 countries stipulate that only the followers of the ruling church may assume the position of head of state. A system which stipulates privileges for one church creates conditions for discrimination against believers professing other faiths and against atheists.

The school curriculums of most bourgeois countries call for mandatory religious instruction for children. In Austria and Sweden, for example, religion is taught in all primary, secondary and specialized schools, and in schools for teachers and kindergarten educators; in Britain religion is taught in primary and secondary schools supported or subsidized by the state. In Israel Judaism is a required subject, to which more class hours are assigned than to all mathematical disciplines. In Italy Article 36 of the Concordat stipulates that "the teaching of the Christian doctrine in a form consistent with Catholic traditions" is the basis and the highest manifestation of public education. According to the laws of most U.S. states daily reading of the Bible and the preaching of sermons in schools are either mandatory or admissible. In some states the teaching of any subject must not contradict the Bible. To this day the teaching of the theory of evolution is forbidden in U.S. schools. The laws of some countries (such as, for example, Ireland and Norway) call for the mandatory religious education of the children.

"One of the 'secrets' of the rule of the oppressors has always been," L. I. Brezhnev said at the ceremonious session honoring the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, "that spiritual coercion was added to the physical coercion of the masses. The ruling classes did everything possible to hinder the working people's access to education and culture, entrapping them in false ideas and concepts."

In the USSR no one is forced to be a believer or an atheist or to perform or not perform religious ceremonies. All this is a matter of conscience of the individual citizen, a matter of his convictions, his inalienable right.

For the first time, under socialism, the social and personal freedom of the citizens, including the freedom of conscience, converts from utopian dream to reality. In the Soviet Union its exercise is guaranteed by the socialist state and its constitution.

III

The Soviet legislation on religious cults is a legislatively true and real freedom, above all because it not only proclaims the full freedom of the citizen's attitude toward religion, but backs it in fact by the guarantees of the state.

In order to satisfy religious requirements, the Soviet state grants believers the free use of church buildings and items of their cult. Hundreds of

most valuable historical architectural monuments are among the many thousands of such buildings granted the believers.

Religious centers and societies have the right to lease, purchase and build premises for religious, administrative and economic purposes, and to acquire the necessary transportation facilities and other property. In the past three to four years alone believers professing various faiths have built tens of new churches and prayer houses. New mosques and Roman Catholic churches have appeared.

At the present time there are over 20,000 Russian Orthodox, protestant, Muslim, Buddhist, Roman Catholic and other churches. Believers, whatever their religion, exercise their constitutional right of freedom of conscience on a full and equal basis.

Religious associations have the right to train clergymen in specialized secondary and higher religious training institutions.

Religious centers have been granted the possibility to publish religious literature, such as Bibles, Korans, works of theology, prayer books, journals and church calendars. Thus the Russian Orthodox Church has 10 periodicals. Service books are published regularly: in recent years there have been mass editions of the Bible, three editions of the New Testament and two editions each of service and prayer books; a four-volume edition of the collection of the works of the deceased Patriarch Aleksiy; "Slova i Rechi Patriarkha Pimena" [Patriarch Pimen's Orations and Speeches], "Nastol'naya Kniga Svyashchennosluzhitelya" [Clergymen's Manual] and anniversary anthologies of the Moscow Patriarch have been published.

Every year the Muslim spiritual administrations publish lunar calendars. There have been four published editions of the Koran, books of Prophet Muhammad's sayings and albums on Muslim culture. The journal MUSUL'MANE SOVETSKOGO VOSTOKA is regularly published in four languages (Uzbek, Arabic, English and French). The book "Al Sahih al-Buhari" by the noted Muslim theologian and scientist was published, in a two-volume edition, on the occasion of his anniversary celebration.

The All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians-Baptists publishes the journal BRATSKIY VESTNIK and calendars; it has published three editions of the Bible, the New Testament and the prayer book, a hymnal, albums on the life of Evangelical Christian Baptists in the USSR, and others.

The Georgian Orthodox Church, the Echmiadzin Katolikosat, the Old Believers Moscow Arkhiepiscopate, the Presbyterian Council of Seventh Day Adventists and believers professing the Jewish and other religions have their own publications.

The churches have special workshops manufacturing religious cult items such as utensils, candles, mats and many other items fully meeting the needs

of the working people. All necessary materials and raw materials for such purposes are allocated, on a planned basis, from state stocks. This is based on requests submitted by religious organizations with the help of the Council for Religious Affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers or its representatives in republics, krais and oblasts.

Characterizing relations between the socialist state and the church in our country, it is important to point out that funds voluntarily contributed by the faithful are not taxed.

Religious associations have the right to hold all-union and local congresses and conferences to discuss their internal church problems, elect their leading senators or deal with other problems.

Granting the churches all the necessary conditions for the exercise of their normal functions, the Soviet state has passed special laws protecting the believers from violations of their legal rights. A number of party and government decisions stipulates most specifically the inadmissibility of adopting administrative measures concerning believers. Thus the Eighth NKP(b) Congress already pointed out "the entire inadmissibility of any restrictions whatsoever" imposed upon the freedom of conscience and "even a suspicion of coercion on religious problems. Individuals who violate the freedom of religious faith and services of citizens, whatever religion they may profess," the congress pointed out, "must be strictly taken to task."

Soviet legislation stipulates liability for preventing the performance of religious ceremonies, providing that they do not violate public order and are not accompanied by the violation of citizens' rights. Any discrimination whatever of believers or any coercion over their consciences is categorically forbidden. The 18 March 1966 RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree and similar acts passed by other union republics, for example, stipulate that any refusal to employ a citizen or accept him in a training institution, or the firing or expulsion from a school, or deprivation of a citizen of benefits or advantages stipulated by the law, or any other infringement of citizen's rights, based on their attitude toward religion are criminally punishable.

The Soviet laws ban the closing down of churches or houses of prayer attended by believers. Such cases had occurred in the past, primarily in the 1920's. Occasionally, today as well, some zealous administrators raise the question of closing down a house of prayer citing, for example, public opinion or the opinion of the majority of the population of one or another settlement in which such a religious center may be functioning. This approach is wrong. The special letter of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, issued following the Fourth All-Russian Congress of Soviets, at which the question arose, already explained that, "In the way that the Soviet system guarantees the rights of national minorities, it cannot allow the violation by majority vote of a minority's right to the freedom of conscience and free exercise of religious ceremonies."

Registration with the corresponding state organs is an important prerequisite for insuring the normal activities of religious societies. The act of registering a religious association places believers under the protection of the state, which protects the freedom to practice a religious cult. An illegal refusal to register, citing a variety of farfetched pretexts, causes a great deal of harm, energizes the activities of various kinds of fanatics and triggers the discontent of the citizens. Registration is the only means for the creation of proper relations between the state and the church, based on the principles of reciprocal respect for the law. A religious association may lose its registration only if it has been dismantled or is systematically violating Soviet laws.

There have been individual cases in which local organs have occasionally allowed the adoption of erroneous actions toward the church and the believers. Any such individual case is considered a gross violation of the constitutional principle of the equality of believers and nonbelievers in the eyes of the law, and of the identical rights they enjoy in our socialist community.

Naturally, the number of such cases has been low and is steadily declining. Proper measures are taken in such cases and those guilty of illegal actions are called to account. Nevertheless, this must be mentioned for preventive purposes. Naturally, such cases trigger a negative reaction on the part of the believers and the clergy. We must also bear in mind the fact that any violation of socialist legality concerning believers adversely affects educational work.

We must also take into consideration the fact that, in its speculative views on the status of religion and the church in the USSR, Western reactionary propaganda presents individual violations as the policy of the Soviet state. Such statements are an example of unfair garblings distorting the true nature of this policy. Let us recall Lenin's familiar statement that our party "has an entirely respectful attitude toward any sincere conviction in matters of religious faith, providing that such convictions are not implemented through violence or fraud" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 13, p 137). The pivotal political line followed by the CPSU and the Soviet state toward religion is one of no coercion whatever of the conscience of the citizens.

Like any other, an atheistic belief cannot be imposed upon anyone by force, through decrees or other administrative measures. All kinds of bans or administrative pressures are an inadequate means for fighting religious ideology. Profoundly exposing the social and gnosiological roots of religious beliefs and calling for conducting a scientific atheistic propaganda among believers, Lenin reminded us of the need to "strictly avoid any insulting of religion" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 52, p 140). Even at the peak of the struggle against domestic and external counterrevolution actively supported at that time by a considerable segment of the clergy, in November 1918 Lenin warned that it would be inadmissible to criticize

religious views, insulting the religious feelings of believers, thus preventing the intensification of religious fanaticism ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 37, p 186).

Lenin called for particular tactfulness in dealing with the religious feelings of the population in areas of our country where national and religious traditions and customs were closely interwoven.

Developing the views formulated by Marx and Engels in the area of scientific atheism, Lenin profoundly substantiated the means through which the masses could abandon religion. He taught how to approach the criticism of religion consistently, based on dialectical-materialistic positions. The most important Leninist requirement in the field of surmounting religion is the active involvement of believers in the building of a new life. The struggle against religion, Lenin said, must not be limited to abstract ideological sermons. It must not be reduced to such sermons; this struggle must be related to the specific practice of the class movement.

The organized and active communist upbringing of the working people and the molding of a scientific and materialistic outlook and atheistic convictions among the masses must be consistent with the principles of the freedom of conscience. Equating socialism with the coercive application of atheism means total failure to understand the policy of the communist party toward religion and the believers.

The involvement of the believers in the practical struggle for the building of socialism and communism, paralleled by steady propaganda of materialistic views among the masses, is a scientifically substantiated means for surmounting religious beliefs.

IV

The bourgeois ideologues try to accuse us of failure to insure full freedom for religious activities. Western propaganda claims that freedom of conscience should grant religious associations and their members the possibility to act as they deem suitable and to live according to "divine" law. We could answer this by stating that there is no country in the world which would remain indifferent toward violations of legislation and universally adopted norms of community life, including those hiding behind religious rules.

Thus Article 14 of the Belgian Constitution stipulates that the freedom of religion and public profession of religious cults is guaranteed "providing that no violations of the law have been committed in the exercise of such freedoms." Article 28 of the Japanese Constitution recognizes the freedom to profess a religion "within the limits compatible with social peace and order and of the obligations of citizens." The Swiss Constitution (Arts 49 and 50) stipulates that religious views do not relieve anyone from the performance of civic duties and that "the free practice of religious

ceremonies is guaranteed to the extent to which the requirements of public order and the proper mores are not violated."

In the USSR the church is separated from the state. However, the Soviet laws regulate relations between the church and state. The Soviet legislation dealing with religious cults stipulates the inadmissibility of using gatherings by believers for political actions aimed against the interests of the Soviet state or for instigating the believers to avoid the fulfillment of their civic duties or encourage them to refuse to participate in sociopolitical life. The law forbids fanatical ceremonies which harm the health of the citizens, or fraudulent actions aimed at creating superstitions (such as, for example, the spreading of rumors concerning the "end of the world," "miraculous cures" at burial sites or around so-called "holy places," the staging of such "cures," and so on).

There have been cases in which religious fanatics have set up "holy places" even on the graves of individuals with a doubtful past. For example, the grave of the former big feudal lord Khodzha-Gulam, encouraged by the mullahs as a site for pilgrimage, in Samarkandskiy Rayon, Uzbek SSR, was proclaimed "holy." The grave of one Vakhaba-Khadzhi, sentenced in his time by a Soviet court, in Khasavyurtovskiy Rayon, Dagestanskaya ASSR, was proclaimed "holy." Swindlers illegally took over two architectural monuments--16th century mausoleums--near the Abgil' Settlement in Kubinskiy Rayon, Azerbaijan SSR--and for a number of years exploited them with impunity as "holy places," collecting donations from believers.

So-called "holy places"--"Gadzhi Baba Piri" and "Tagi Efendi Piri"--are located in the cemetery of the Khosrov Settlement in Agdashskiy Rayon, Azerbaijan SSR. At the former fanatics offered the pilgrims muddy water from the ground of the "Gadzhi Baba Piri" grave to drink. Allegedly, this would cure them of all diseases, including sterility; in the latter people suffering from skin diseases are "treated" by touching a "miraculous" rock. The local organs must struggle against such manifestations of obscurantism which harm the health of the citizens. Unquestionably, this does not violate the freedom of conscience in the least. On the contrary, it is a guarantee for its real and factual exercise.

Hostile Western propaganda subjects to particular attacks one of the most important stipulations of Soviet legislation concerning religious cults, namely the separation of the school from the church. It frequently claims that, allegedly, in the USSR the children are separated from religion by force, that parents who try to raise their children "in the faith" are persecuted and subjected to repressive measures, and that children or young people who show an interest in religion are not only slighted but punished by all possible means. Appealing to public opinion, the foreign "defenders of religion in the USSR" emphasize that an irreligious education leads to the spreading of immorality, that the church alone could be a source of morality and that a highly moral upbringing could be achieved only if the child is exposed to God.

We know that the upbringing and education of children and young people in the USSR is the work of state organs, public organizations and, naturally, the family. In the Soviet Union the purpose of public education is to train highly educated and comprehensively developed, active builders of communism, raised in the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and a spirit of communist attitude toward labor, physically healthy, able to successfully work and actively participate in social and governmental activities, ready to selflessly defend the homeland and to preserve and increase its material and spiritual wealth.

Article 57 of the Foundation of the Legislation of the USSR and Union Republics on Public Education, passed by the USSR Supreme Soviet in 1973, stipulates that parents or their substitutes must raise the children in a spirit of high-level communist morality and a solicitous attitude toward socialist property. They must develop in the children labor habits, prepare them for socially useful activities and be concerned for their health and physical development. The parents must also send their children to school at the proper time, insure school attendance, forbid absenteeism from school without legitimate reasons and provide the necessary conditions enabling the children to acquire a secondary education and vocational training. Family upbringing must be organically combined with educational work done by the schools and preschool and extracurricular institutions and public organizations.

The Foundations of Legislation of the USSR and Union Republics on Public Education emphasized that all citizens are equal in the right to obtain an education "regardless of racial or national affiliation, sex, attitude toward religion and property or social status," the compulsory and free nature of all types of education for all children and adolescents, the state and public nature of all educational institutions, and the "laic type of education which excludes the influence of religion."

The last stipulation, based on the principle of the separation of the school from the church, is entirely consistent with the interest of children and adolescents: it would be stupid for a student to acquire a scientific-materialistic outlook at school while religion would pit against it its idealistic views on nature and society. N. K. Krupskaya pointed out that, "The separation of school from church was a requirement of the socialist curriculum not only for logical considerations, but for the sake of the rights of the child. . . . The child must be protected from the insinuation of truths conflicting with science." The Soviet state bears the responsibility for providing universal and equal scientific, technical, physical and moral upbringing and education of children and young people, not involving itself with religious training.

Yet the legislation on faiths does not forbid parents to observe the stipulated rights of teaching religion to their children at home. The rules stipulated by the legislation protect minor children from forced exposure to religion. This is a manifestation of the truly humanistic nature of Soviet legislation which protects the interests of the growing generation.

It must be said that the overwhelming majority of the clergy in our country have a proper understanding of the legislation on religious cults, observing it, displaying political loyalty toward the socialist system and supporting the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet state.

However, as the saying goes, every family has a black sheep. We still have religious extremists--in and around churches--pursuing careeristic selfish objectives, frequently motivated by vanity. They try to circumvent the law and create in the believers discontent with the policy of the Soviet state and the communist party toward religion and the church. We come across such cases mainly in sectarian groups of Jehovah's Witnesses, Pentacostals, "initiative" Baptists and some others.

Some of the leaders of such groups forbid the believers from participating in social life, join trade unions, visit cultural-educational institutions, listen to the radio, look at television, read newspapers or seek medical help. Occasionally they try to force the believers not to participate in the elections for Soviet organs, to avoid receiving or to destroy official documents, including internal passports, or to refuse to serve in the ranks of the Soviet Army. All such actions are violations of Soviet laws and of the rights and obligations of USSR citizens, and those guilty of committing them or encouraging their commission are subject to penalties.

The group of so-called "initiative" Baptists is guilty of particularly serious violations of the legislation on religious cults. The leaders of this group, which was organized in 1960, have behaved, from their very first steps, as frenzied fanatics, hostile toward the socialist system. They tried to promote among the faithful dissatisfaction with Soviet laws on religious cults and called for the abolition of such laws and for the permission to engage in unrestricted religious propaganda.

The leaders of this group published leaflets, letters, all kinds of appeals and pamphlets addressed mainly to Western circles. Such concoctions slandered the Soviet state and its religious policy and distorted the meaning of the legislation on cults. In particular, a pamphlet by one Oswald John Smith was published under the title of "Bring Them the News About Christ" in which the Soviet system was proclaimed a "devil incarnate," for which reason the author called upon anyone believing in Christ to wage an irreconcilable struggle against it. Let us also cite the libelous writing "Let All Become One," which slanderously claims that the alleged objective of the Soviet state is the physical destruction of all believers.

The local soviet organs and central departments patiently explained to the "initiative" sectarians the inadmissibility of such illegal activities. However, their leaders claimed that "they want to live according to God's, rather than Soviet laws." Let us note that as a result of the explanatory

work which was done, the majority of believers realized the objectives of the fanatical leadership and broke with it.

The main direction to be followed in working with believers is that of patiently explaining to them the Soviet legislation on religious cults and the USSR Constitution, which insure all possibilities for the normal functioning of religious associations and for the satisfaction of the religious needs of the believers. They must be made to realize that fanatical leaders deceive the believers and are concerned, least of all, with their interests. As to the leaders themselves, people who maliciously violate Soviet legislation, naturally, they must be prosecuted.

There have been cases of violations of Soviet laws by Roman Catholic clergymen, particularly in Lithuania. Some members of the Catholic Church are engaged in inciting activities among believers, encouraging them to demand that the church be granted functions not stipulated by our laws. Incidentally, such extremist attempts are supported by the Vatican as well. There are fanatical mullahs among the members of the Muslim clergy as well who organize illegal religious societies and restore so-called "holy sites." In a number of areas in Central Asian and Kazakhstan religious ceremonies are practiced by illegally operating mullahs. A decisive struggle has been, and will be waged with all such violations of the legislation.

The USSR Council of Ministers Council for Religious Affairs exists for the systematic implementation of the party's and Soviet Government's policy, insuring the protection of the rights of both believers and nonbelievers, and for establishing communication between the Soviet Government and religious organizations should problems to be resolved by the government arise. The council has its representatives in all oblasts, krays and republics.

The claims of the bourgeois falsifiers of the policy of the Soviet state toward religion and the church as to the "coercive uprooting" of religion in the USSR and the fact that in our country administrative methods of fighting religion have been raised to the level of state policy are nonsensical. This is not the first year or even the first decade that such groundless charges have been leveled against us. However, in terms of scope, persistence and fierceness the current anti-Soviet attacks on the policy of the Soviet state toward religion and the church exceed all previous ones.

In the worst traditions of the cold war, reactionary propaganda takes up the defense of various fanatics and church-related "personalities," depicting them as the "heroes" of a mythical "religious front," allegedly "victimized" for their convictions.

Let us say in this connection that, in our country, no one has ever been tried for his religious faith. It is only individuals who violate Soviet laws or who instigate other people to such actions that are prosecuted.

Soviet justice has waged, and will continue to wage, a struggle against such phenomena. No one, hiding behind religious convictions, has the right to avoid the fulfillment of his civic obligations or violate our social order.

It is indicative that realistic Western circles refute the fabrications of bourgeois propaganda concerning religious life in the USSR. Thus one of the appeals of the World Lutheran Alliance addressed to all countries who signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) states that, of late, erroneous concepts on the state of religion in the socialist countries have been disseminated. The appeal emphasizes that in the Soviet Union, for example, entirely normal conditions for church work have been created.

As we know, the churches functioning in our country are actively participating in the struggle for strengthening universal peace, preventing the threat of a new world war, terminating the arms race and establishing equitable relations among nations. Such noble activities are meeting with the approval of the citizens and the entire public, and are highly rated by the Soviet Government.

For example, on the initiative of the Moscow Patriarchy and other religious organizations in the USSR, a very big international encounter was held in 1977, in Moscow, on the topic of "Religious Leaders Are in Favor of Lasting Peace, Disarmament and Just Relations Among Nations," attended by representatives of all religions in the world, from 107 countries. Last year, on two occasions, spiritual Islamic administrations summoned to our country their coreligionists from many countries to discuss problems related not only to strictly religious activities, but directly pertaining to problems of strengthening the peace.

G. Mohaleky, vice president of the Christian Peace Conference (CPC) noted that, "Anyone who wished to seek proof of the freedom of conscience in the USSR could accomplish this at that conference, since here it was possible to speak entirely freely and entirely openly, with elements of criticism, about some problems of conscience, and to communicate with one another." He emphasized that Article 52 of the USSR Constitution "was not only on paper but is truly observed in practical life."

Abmat Muhammad Zabara, chief mufti of the Yemen Arab Republic, who has repeatedly visited the USSR, said: "All believers--Muslims, Christians, Buddhists, Jews and others--enjoy full freedom here in the performance of their religious ceremonies. . . ."

Reverend O. Fielding Clark, vice president of the British Committee of the Christian Peace Conference, who has visited the USSR on nine occasions, writes in his book "Christianity and Marxism" that, ". . . We find regretful and harmful the fact that the majority of British people accept unquestioningly the stereotype of the Soviet Union and its churches

provided by our mass information media. . . . The current situation in relations between the church and the state in the Soviet Union appears to be so impeccable as to be hard to believe. . . . The basic unity as members of the Soviet people and profoundly embedded socialist convictions of Christians and atheists in the Soviet Union are most basic to any attempt to promote any further development of their reciprocal understanding."

Such are the testimonies of people from the West and the East who have observed religious life in the USSR on a first-hand basis. Such is the real situation with believers in the Soviet Union.

The triumph of the Leninist principles of freedom of conscience, steadfastly followed in our country, has been confirmed by reality. Like all Soviet people, believers profoundly share the words of L. I. Brezhnev to the effect that in our country "there are no grounds to avoid a serious discussion on human rights. Our revolution and the victory of socialism in our country not only proclaimed but factually guaranteed the rights of the working person of any nationality and the rights of the millions of working people as capitalism has been unable to accomplish anywhere else in the world."

3003

CBO: 1802

DYNAMICS OF SOCIAL SYSTEMS

Moscow KODMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 80 pp 56-70

[Article by V. Afanas'yev, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member]

[Text] The ever-widening application of the ideas of a systems approach to the natural sciences, technology and the social sciences and to the theory and practice of social management makes the problem of the interconnection between these ideas and the basic principles of dialectics one of the most topical problems of dialectical-materialistic methodology in general and the methodology of social knowledge in particular. A systems approach is not an alternative to dialectical materialism but one of its essential sides and facets. Dialectical materialism, as we know, studies reality not only in its static, but above all in its dynamic condition, in motion and development. The use of the principle of development and of historicism in the study of social systems is a key problem of the methodology of social knowledge and management.

Historicism and Systems Approach

". . . Dialectical logic," V. I. Lenin wrote, "demands that we take the object in its development, in its 'self-movement' . . . in its change" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 42, p 290). This requirement fully applies to the study of systems in general and of social systems in particular.

System, the ability to form sets of organically interrelated components, is one of the most important properties of matter. Each system has its own history, its beginning and end. It experiences a process of birth and establishment, development and blossoming. The systems in inanimate and animate nature, in society as a whole and in a specific-historical society and the subsystems forming it, function in time.

As we know, Marxist dialectics is the general theory of development. The study of the development of systems is a specific area of application of this theory. Naturally, development features such as unity, continuity between the old and the new, the leap and transformation of quantity into

quality, and contradictoriness (conflict as a source of development) are inherent in the development of systems as well. It is characteristic that each new system replacing the old one is not only distinguished from the latter in terms of quality, but frequently acts as its opposite. K. Marx and F. Engels were the founders of the principle of historicism and development in the study of social systems.

Continuing and enriching their theory, V. I. Lenin called for "not forgetting the basic historical link and for considering each problem from the viewpoint of the way a certain phenomenon appeared in history, what the main stages were which this phenomenon covered in its development and, from the viewpoint of this development, consider what this object has now become" ("Poin. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 39, p 67). Rephrasing these words somewhat, we could say that the scientific study of any social system calls for knowing the way the system appeared, which were the basic stages it covered in its development, what it has become now and what its historical prospects are.

The dialectical principle of historicism was a major principle in Lenin's study of imperialism. This principle was embodied, first of all, in the fact that Lenin "derived" imperialism from capitalism, proving that imperialism is the continuation, the development of capitalism, and its separate, higher stage. Secondly, Lenin proved that imperialism is the final stage of capitalism, the eve of the socialist revolution.

It would be no exaggeration to say that the principle of historicism and motion, development, is the basic aspect of the systems approach. This does not reduce in the least the significance of its component, structural and other aspects. However, the balance, the stability of a system is relative, similar to the fact that rest and balance in general are relative. The movement and development of a system is absolute and permanent. Moments of balance and rest apply not to matter as a whole, but only to specific systems within their own framework. Even in a state of rest and balance, uninterrupted movement and changes occur within the system, even though, for the time being, they do not take the system away from its given qualitative condition.

The system appears and is established in the course of its dynamics and development; rest and balance seem to consolidate the results of the motion, as a result of which the given system lasts for a certain period of time, remaining precisely what it was. The structure, method and nature of interaction among its components play a decisive role in the preservation of a specific quality condition of the system.

The ideologues and politicians in the capitalist world absolutize rest and balance, doing this above all for the sake of proving the inviolability, the "eternity" of capitalism as a system. Once again, with certain justification, they rely on the social structure which, allegedly, is the "invulnerable protector" of the capitalist system. In this case the structure is

considered as the fixed norm, the standard, countered by the processes of polarization and division of social forces within the capitalist society and by radical quality changes.

True, the views of contemporary bourgeois sociologists show a certain leaning toward acknowledging the conflicting and contradictory nature of the contemporary capitalist society. This is natural, for there is no way to eliminate the conflicts and contradictions of this society: inflation, unemployment and curtailment of social programs in favor of military programs, and the domination of the military-industrial complex lead to the disorganization of the private ownership system and the violation of proportions and relations among the various realms of economic and social life. However, all these conflicts, contradictions and disproportions are explained by the Western ideologues not in the least in terms of the nature of capitalism itself, to which such contradictions are inherent. They look for the root of such evils anywhere except in the system of capitalist relations itself.

The bourgeois sociologists consider science and technology the main reason for the disturbance of the capitalist "balance." They consider them the demons which, while promising happiness and prosperity, trigger unhappiness and misfortune.

Naturally, technology and science are factors influencing the preservation or disturbance of the balance of the capitalist social system. However, this is not their inherent feature. They give it a certain stability since scientific and technical progress today is still insuring the growth of monopoly profit. This makes it possible, on the one hand, to maintain a growth of output and, on the other, to a certain extent, to satisfy the demands of the working people. It is no secret that in a number of developed capitalist countries, as a result of the struggle waged by the working people for their rights, their consumption level has risen. However, the capitalist social system has not gained any balance or rest, nor could it. Yet the statements made by bourgeois sociologists on the subject of its conflicts and contradictions do not exceed the framework of superficial views to the effect that there are no class struggles or deep antagonisms within the capitalist system and that the existing "disturbances" are, allegedly, transient and can be "surmounted" institutionally, through the means of social control.

Occasionally, some works, particularly those criticizing structuralism, pit the history of structure against the systems-historical and structural approaches.

This contraposition (or, more accurately, differentiation) makes sense on the gnosiological level only. A structural approach means focusing the attention on the aspect of the system characterizing its relative stability or, if one may say so, its static aspect. It is precisely this aspect that reflects the structure category. The historical approach, whose object is

the origin of the system and its appearance, establishment and development is a different matter.

Naturally, a theoretician or a practical worker has the right to use one or another approach. Everything depends on the objective he sets himself. As to the objective existence of systems, the structure and history are inseparably linked within them: there is no system without a structure or history. Consequently, the gnosiological pitting of the historical against the structural aspect is relative.

The systems-historical approach is distinct from systems-structural approach in its attitude toward time.

Time is a mandatory attribute of the social system, for which reason the study of its time parameters is an inseparable feature of the systems approach. It is a question not of time in general, but of a specific time of the system.

Any system has its beginning and end. It has its historical time. The different systems have different lifetimes and travel along different historical ways within the same time interval.

The growth of the pace of development is a major characteristic of the dynamics of social systems. We know that the primitive communal system developed exceptionally slowly. The slaveowning and feudal systems developed faster even though their history lasted a millennium. The capitalist system developed even faster. With the transition to socialism, the pace of development rose even higher. Following the victory of communism throughout the world, when mankind eliminates capitalist relations which stand in the way of progress and abolishes wars and makes it possible to use all available funds for the enhancement of material and spiritual culture and for the all-round development of man, the pace of social development will become even higher.

Since the systems-historical aspect characterizes a system in its dynamics and its establishment and development precisely in time, time acts not only as a mandatory but an important, if not most important, parameter of the system. In the structural approach time seems to take second priority, while the system is considered in its static condition, as something stable. However, this does not mean that time is disregarded in a structural approach. It exists here as well, since the static position and stability of the system are relative.

A static condition is also characteristic of some changes inherent in specific rhythms on the time scale. However, here it is a question of changes within the limits of a given quality status of the system, changes which, in the final account, prepare the quality shifts within the system and its transition to a new quality. Following the transition of the system to a new quality, the history of a given system ends and the history of the new system begins with its different structure and other systems characteristics.

The historical aspect of the system approach combines, integrates a given condition and movement and the history of the system. This aspect is universal, since each system undergoes in the course of its dynamics the mandatory stages of appearance, consolidation, blossoming and withering away. However, this aspect as well is specific, since each social system appears, lives, exists, blossoms and dies its own way. The characteristic feature here is that the more complex the system is in terms of its components and structural, functional and other qualities, the more striking and deep are the distinctions between the general and the specific in its status, dynamics and development.

The consideration of the general and the specific within the systems-historical approach of this dialectics enables us to avoid in knowledge in general, and in social knowledge and social practice in particular, a one-sided, either excessively broad or excessively narrow, approach to a system.

The systems-historical approach does not allow us to impose on social systems a certain general pattern of dynamics based only on a consideration of the universal laws of the process, even though they are necessary, mandatory. Yet neither does this approach allow us to ignore the general laws of the process and direct the attention of theoreticians and practical workers exclusively to its specific features. A consideration of the universal and the specific in the dynamics of a social system is a mandatory prerequisite for a systems-historical approach. A system communicates to the process an aspect of universality and stability. History contributes to the universal process something specific and unique, even though within the framework of common, general system laws.

Historicism and the systems approach are organically interrelated and enrich each other. Historicism separated from the systems approach, paradoxical though this might sound initially, becomes the opposite of true historicism. For, outside the system, any object, phenomenon or process appears as absolutely variable, unique, structurally and functionally unrelated to other objects and phenomena within the same system. However, the acknowledgment of absolute variability and uniqueness means a rejection of laws--stable trends and recurrence of phenomena and processes. By this token, absolutized historicism, considered outside of its ties with other aspects and manifestations of the systems approach, converts into a shallow evolutionism, in which society is presented as a simple change of different conditions, unrelated to previous or subsequent conditions.

On the other hand, the systems approach considered outside its historical context, becomes a simple photographic image of the object in its static condition and structural and functional permanency. Once again, this means a rejection of the laws, for the latter represent not only the laws applicable once and forever to a given functioning of the systems object but its dynamics and development as well.

The systems approach in its historical aspect enables us, precisely, to clarify not simply the structure, i.e., the static condition of the social object, and not simply the distinction between the given object and a number of other similar or related objects, but the link, the continuity among objects or different conditions within the same object, the conversion of one object into another stemming from it, yet qualitatively distinct.

Outside a systems approach the object, the process, the phenomenon break down into a series of aspects and events which are absolutely variable (or fixed), unrelated with a single logic or common direction. Outside a systems approach, in its historical aspect, any process is a simple sum total of conditions.

The systems approach is a different matter. Here each object or condition of the same object are considered in their interrelationship, continuity, trend and direction toward a qualitatively new object or a qualitatively new condition of the given object.

The systems-historical approach has yet another merit: it enables us to organically blend the genetic with the prognosticated interpretation of objects and processes. Genetics is, unquestionably, history. Yet it is history turned toward the past. The purpose of genetics is to find the sources, the prerequisites for the appearance of the object, to trace the stages it has covered in the course of its development, what it was and what it has become. History, in its systems context, is broader: it is not satisfied with explaining the past of the object and its stages of development, but considers it important to determine where it is going, in what direction it is moving and what the trends and prospects of its progress are. Prognosis, prediction, anticipation are essential to the systems-historical approach. It is this characteristic that is exceptionally important in the study and management of society, for to manage means to anticipate.

In this respect we cannot agree in the least with K. Popper, who denies historicism ("historicism" is his description of historicism) the function of predicting, anticipating. In the preface to his book "The Poverty of Historicism" Popper writes that the growth of human knowledge strongly influences the course of human history. It is impossible to predict the future development of scientific knowledge through rational methods. Therefore, it would be impossible to predict the course of human history. Furthermore, this makes the very theory of historical development, which should be the base for historical prediction, impossible (see K. Popper, "The Poverty of Historicism," London, 1960, 2d ed).

Let us note, above all, that not only science but many other factors influence the course of the historical process. In turn, a prediction is possible within the science itself as confirmed by abundant facts.

Prediction and historicism are inseparable, for they are based on the knowledge of the laws governing the development of the object, linking the past

with the present and the future, and a knowledge of the laws and trends running through the various stages of the dynamics of the object, and the laws which developed in the past and which have "taken" the object (system) from the past to the present, as well as the laws which "take" the system from the present to the future. Motion, the development of the social object, is always orderly, organized, moving from one stage to another and from one changing condition to another. In other words, the dynamics of the social object is always a systems dynamics, not only on the structural (what makes the object), but the functional (what the object does) and time, historical level (where the object has come from, what it has become and where it is going).

Historical laws are laws governing the dynamics of social systems. For this reason the nonsystems approach is, essentially, a nonhistoric approach. The study of systems laws and the consideration of individual phenomena through the lens of a system enables us to discover such phenomena more fully and deeply, and to define their position among the innumerable historical phenomena and relations. Marxism-Leninism considers history and history dynamics as a systems movement.

Therefore, pitting the historical approach against the component-structural approach is erroneous. It is equally erroneous to pit history against its functional system, for the functioning of the system also represents its change and development. However, this an individual, a local development which does not affect the quality of the system as such. However, it is also a preparation for the prerequisites, the conditions, the incentives for radical changes, and for turning "individual, local" changes into universal, general systemic, quality changes.

V. I. Lenin frequently pointed out the unity between functional and historical research. The dialectical method, he wrote, makes us "look at society as a functioning and developing, living organism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 1, p 192).

The systems-historical approach calls for the study of genetic links as well, the links of birth, in which one system or stage of a system triggers another system or another, higher stage of development of the given system, and development links which presume not simply a change of conditions, studied through the functional approach, but essential, substantive changes in the system triggered by the impossibility for the system to continue to exist within the framework of the current functioning forms, and which require the need for the system to reach a qualitatively new level.

K. Marx' "Das Kapital" is a model of the organic combination of the systems-functional and systems-historical approaches to the study of the capitalist social system. Studying the numerous exceptionally complex and varied mechanisms, features and characteristics of the current functioning of that system, at the same time, on the basis of the study of this "current" life, Marx discovered the trends, the common laws governing the

development of society and the irreversible progress of the capitalist system to a higher and more advanced system--socialism, communism.

The extension and, one could say, the completion of Marx' study of capitalism at its final, its imperialist stage, is Lenin's work "Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism," which organically combines the functional with the historical approach.

Appearance of the System

The history of the system is, above all, the process of its coming into being, appearance and consolidation.

Speaking of this, it is important to emphasize that no single new system appears out of a vacuum. It draws the material for its appearance from the systems preceding it and from nonsystems formations, or systems existing on a parallel basis. The new system appears on the basis of the old not immediately, not in its finished, already formed shape, but, initially, as certain prerequisites--various material, social and spiritual components, relations and links, and forms of interaction with the natural environment. As a rule, these prerequisites are splintered, frequently belonging not to a single but to a number of systems. At the same time, in the course of their dynamics and integration, they provide the beginning of the new system, which changes these previously external elements in accordance with its own nature, and "forces" them to serve it, to perform functions aimed at its preservation, advancement and development.

Arising on the basis of the old one, the new system initially acquires merely a few of its own systems qualities (the required and the adequate minimum), which in the course of its functioning and development strengthen and broaden. It is thus that ever new components and relations develop within the system's orbit. Furthermore, the new system creates, molds new, specific components which it needs to carry out its own functions and achieve its own objectives. Therefore, historical continuity exists within the development of systems.

Under certain conditions and by virtue of the effect of specific reasons, one or another phenomenon may arise. However, it is precisely this, rather than any other, system that makes it its component. It gives a specific form of existence to this phenomenon as being its own component. The phenomenon involved in the orbit of a given system assumes previously non-inherent characteristics and functions, functions consistent with the requirements of the inner nature of the system which has "adopted" it. Using its specific internal interrelations and functions, the system shapes the phenomena which have developed within it in its own image and likeness.

". . . New production forces and production relations," K. Marx wrote, "do not come out of nothing, out of thin air or the bosom of the basic idea; they develop within and in the course of the struggle with the developments

of the production process and the inherited traditional ownership relations. Since in a completely bourgeois system each economic relation presumes another relation in its bourgeois-economic form and, therefore, each given form carries within itself a prerequisite, the same occurs in any . . . organic system. As an overall entity, this organic system has its own prerequisites and its development toward integrity consists precisely in subordinating to itself all the elements of society or of creating from it the organs it still lacks. Therefore, in the course of its historical development, the system becomes integral. The establishment of this integral system shapes its aspect, its process and its development" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 46, Pt I, p 229).

Marx comprehensively described and expanded this idea of the appearance of a new social system on the basis of those preceding it in the course of his study of the establishment of the capitalist economic system. This system appeared within feudalism itself, as a specific unity of a minimum of necessary components. Initially, this included capitalist manufacturing, followed by large-scale machine output with its specific commodity turnover and transformation of manpower into a commodity. As a result of the bourgeois revolution, the capitalist system replaced feudalism. In accordance with its inner nature, it gradually yet inexorably subordinated and transformed all economic forms--rates and commercial profit, income, money and so on. It mercilessly eliminated some of them, while radically changing others and taking others again to a high level of development. Furthermore, it created its own specific components. The main among them was the universal commodity nature of production and manpower as a commodity.

Income, interest rates, commercial profits and other components of the capitalist economic system became such only when they became part of the general flow of the production process and the accumulation of added value.

It is only under developed production conditions, so typical of capitalism, that they became a means for the creation and accumulation of added value. It was precisely in the same manner that, long before capitalism, machines were developed. However, they became a component of capitalist production only in the course of its establishment and development and only within the deployed system of working machines, operating through transmission mechanisms provided by a single centralized automated system . . ." (K. Marx and F. Engels, op cit, Vol 23, p 393).

Obviously, even though certain prerequisites for the development of a capitalist production system ripen within the feudal system, such prerequisites do not as yet form the new system. The new system is the result of historical development, the result of a social (bourgeois) revolution, in the course of which the old economic system is destroyed, the components and their relations, inherited from feudalism, are reorganized on the basis of a new, capitalist foundation, new, purely capitalist components are created and new, again capitalist, relations and links are developed within the new structure, which integrates within itself both the old and new components within a single system, qualitatively different from feudalism.

The formation of the new social systems occurs through a variety of ways. One socioeconomic system changes another as a result of the social revolution. The revolution triggers basic qualitative changes in all basic parameters of the old system--components, structure, functions, forms of development, and so on.

New states appear within the framework of a single system. New administrative units are set up within the states. New cities and settlements are built. Enterprises are constructed and new labor collectives are created. New collectives develop from the older collectives. Two or more collectives form a new one. This is particularly characteristic under contemporary conditions, with the fast concentration of the production process and of other realms of social life.

It is important to note here that the formation of new socioeconomic systems takes place above all by virtue of the effect of objective social laws. In this sense the change of socioeconomic systems is a natural-historical process.

We repeat: A social revolution is the means for replacing one system with another in a class-antagonistic society. However, this revolution is the result not only of the effect and requirement of objective laws. It is also the result of the active efforts of the people, of the actions of the subjective historical factor. When objective prerequisites and conditions for replacing one system with another have ripened, the subjective factor, the activities of progressive classes, parties and organizations acquire a decisive significance.

This historical and systemic law of the increased role of the subjective factor in the course of the progressive movement of society is manifested with particular clarity in the transition from capitalism to socialism. We know that the various prerequisites for the establishment of socialism develop within capitalism itself. In the material field this includes a developed machine, semi-automated and automated production, with high-level concentration and specialization and technical facilities. In the socio-political field it involves the working class, the powerful social force whose historical mission is, precisely, the establishment of socialism and communism; it is also the Marxist party and the other organizations of the working class. In the spiritual field it includes Marxist ideology and the durable achievements of science, literature and the arts.

Under capitalism these prerequisites do not represent any kind of systematic, not to speak of integral, formation. However, they oppose capitalism as a system, they undermine its foundations and carry within them the principles which will later develop into the new, the socialist system.

The economic and political foundations of socialism--public ownership of productive capital and the state of the working class--are established as the result of the socialist revolution. They are its systems-forming axis

around which the components inherited by the new society from the old are reintegrated and new components with their interrelations are created. The new system, the new, socialist entity is established following the creation of the necessary "set" of components and their integration.

Lenin repeatedly discussed and wrote about the continuity between the old and the new system, the socioeconomic systems and the organization of the new on the basis of the old, of socialism on the basis of the production-technical, scientific and human material created by capitalism. "The objective course of development is such that . . . no further advancement other than toward socialism is possible starting with the monopolies. . . . Today socialism is looking at us through all the windows of contemporary capitalism. Socialism is taking shape directly, practically, with each major measure which is a step forward on the basis of this latest capitalism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 34, pp 192-193).

However, in order for socialism which is "looking" through all the windows of imperialism to become a real social system, a number of changes are required.

First of all, the elements, their ties and functions of the system and its components, inherited from capitalism, must experience profound quality changes. The principal among them is the reorganization of the material, the economic foundation of society and the replacement of private capitalist ownership with public ownership, with a socialist ownership and the creation of a new, socialist base.

Secondly, in the course of the conversion from the old to the new system, the victory of the new, socialist elements and structures must be insured. New, socialist integration qualities and systems laws must be asserted. It is a question of a system which puts an end to the exploitation of outside labor, a system in which the integrity of the individual and society and their harmonious interaction reach a high (yet not the highest, for this is a task of communism) level of development.

Thirdly, having integrated and transformed in accordance with its own quality the relatively acceptable components and relations of the old preceding system and having created the economic foundations of its life and formed the main integration qualities, the new system must add to its structure other units serving a great variety of purposes and create its own superstructure. In other words, the trunk of the new system must grow its own branches and leaves.

All this is a complex, difficult and lengthy matter. All this is the cause of the state of proletarian dictatorship.

The politicians and ideologues who frighten the petit bourgeois with the scourge of a proletarian dictatorship either do not know or do not wish to know that the proletarian state of the transitional period from capitalism

is considered transitional because the working class, headed by the communist party, plays a leading role in society; it is considered a dictatorship because, granting extensive democratic rights to the overwhelming majority of the population, to the working people, if necessary, this state applies coercion to surmount the opposition of the exploiting classes and to put an end to the subversive actions of forces hostile to socialism.

However, there is violence and there is violence. There is violence related to the use of weapons, terrorism, dictate, civil war and foreign intervention. This kind of violence is not mandatory in the least in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. However, there is also, so to say, peaceful violence: expropriation or restriction of private property, deprivation or restriction of the political rights of the exploiting classes, their coercive involvement in labor, and others. This second type of violence ("peaceful violence") is inevitable in the process of transition from capitalism to socialism. The triumph of socialism would be impossible without such violence or coercion of the exploiting classes (economic, political), for it would be naive to assume that the bourgeoisie would voluntarily accept the new social order.

Nevertheless, even in its "peaceful" form, not to speak of its violent form, force is not the main feature of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin spoke of this and this is confirmed by the experience in the building of socialism in the USSR and other countries. "The dictatorship of the proletariat," Lenin noted, ". . . is not only violence used against the exploiters, and not even mainly violence" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 39, p 13).

In the socialist revolution the working class faces a double task: first, to lead through its selfless heroism the entire mass of the working and exploited people, to organize it and to lead it in the overthrow of bourgeois power and in suppressing any possible resistance on the part of the bourgeoisie; secondly, to lead this mass along the path of economic construction and the building of a new, a socialist economy and culture. Lenin considered the second of these two interrelated tasks--the destructive and the constructive--the more essential, for "only the new, the higher method of public production could be considered the only guarantee for the durability and inviolability of these victories . . ." (ibid, p 18) and the most profound source of victories over the forces of the old, the exploiting system. Yet Lenin considered this second task "more difficult than the first, for in no case could it be implemented through the heroism of the individual thrust, requiring the lengthiest, most adamant and most difficult heroism of mass daily work" (ibid, pp 17-18).

Guided by the communist party, the Soviet proletarian state brilliantly carried out this very difficult project. For the first time in the world socialism was built in the Soviet Union, now converted into a developed socialist society. The building of communism is being successfully carried out.

In the course of the building of socialism the Soviet working class proved itself a creator not only of modern production but of the most progressive democracy. Its political genius led to the creation of the soviets--a democratic form of the socialist state which is loyally serving our people to this day.

We know from history that, seizing the power of the state, any exploiting class uses all possible measures to strengthen and perpetuate its rule. Such was the case of the slave owners and feudal lords. Such is the case with the bourgeoisie, which in its struggle against the working class and the toiling masses, shows no reluctance whatever to use all means at its disposal, from the police billy club and "brainwashing" to heavy weapons.

The working class acts differently. Even under the conditions of a transition from capitalism to socialism it rules allied with all toiling masses. With the victory of socialism and the defeat of the opposition of the exploiting classes, it voluntarily abandons its unchallenged power and shares it with the entire people. The state of the working class becomes a state of the whole people, while its political vanguard, while remaining the party of the working class, becomes the party of the entire people. In this case the socialist nature of the state does not change and the working class retains its leading role in society.

Violence totally exhausts its functions within the country, for there are no more exploiting classes in the society. Democracy for the majority turns into democracy for all, into a developed socialist democracy, which steadily broadens and improves.

The new USSR Constitution is the embodiment of democracy of the whole people of the developed socialist society. It grants the citizens of the Soviet state unusually broad and historically unparalleled rights and freedoms.

The establishment of the system is not in the least the final act in the systemic movement. Having appeared, the system continues to advance.

Advancement and Development of the System

The history of a system involves its growth, positive changes and advanced functioning. It also represents its development, its transition from one quality status to another (from one stage to another) and from a system of a given quality to a system of another quality.

The movement, the development of the system finds a great variety of manifestations. The components of the system and their interrelationships and relations with the system as a whole change. Some components are changed and others appear. In some cases the new components appear through the development and transformation of the old; in another, through the division of one or several existing components; in yet another, the system

assimilates, adopts something external which was not part of it previously, turning into its own component, and so on.

The internal relations and external interactions inherent in the system experience complex changes in the course of the development process. New relations appear and existing ones become differentiated. One relation may transform another or assimilate it; the existing components or relations may be regrouped and restructured, and so on. The new components, their relations and the new characteristics of existing components and their new interactions assume new functions in terms of the system.

The ways and means of the interrelationship between the components and the system as a whole with the external environment change, develop and become richer in the course of the improvement and development of the system. The information saturation of the system expands and intensifies.

Speaking of improvements in the development of the system, we must bear in mind that its components and the elements of its structure have different values not only from the viewpoint of their place and role in the operation of the system, but of prospects, possibilities. Some components lose their position and significance within the system. Others do not exceed the framework of its basic quality and have no future. Others again contain greater possibilities and become the bearers of a new, more advanced system, its prerequisites and embryos. For this reason, the study of a system cannot be limited to a consideration of its characteristics merely from the viewpoint of what it is at present. The dynamics of the system and its thrust toward the future must be found. The system must be understood from the viewpoint of its future development.

In this connection, it is necessary above all to find among the variety of the system's components that which is progressive, which is more advanced and viable, which is steadily growing and developing. Frequently within the complex variety of the system such components are relatively weak and imperceptible. However, it is precisely these that will make the future, it is precisely these that must be comprehensively supported and developed. Only in this case could we prepare the prerequisites for the appearance of a qualitatively new, a more advanced systems formation.

In this respect the analysis made by Marx and Engels of the complex system of capitalist class relations is classical. Finding within this system the progressive class--the proletariat--and discovering its great historical mission as the gravedigger of capitalism and the creator of the new, socialist society, Marx and Engels indicated the path of human progress toward socialism.

Any, particularly social, system is very complex. It contains the remnants of the past, the present, which accounts for its qualitative specificities, and the elements of the future.

Each social phenomenon, Lenin pointed out, always contains "the remains of the past, the foundations of the present and the embryos of the future" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 1, p 181). These embryos of the future conflict with the foundations of the present. The new, the progressive is born as a result of the resolution of this conflict.

For example, socialism includes components remaining from capitalism and reorganized under the new conditions, strictly socialist components and components of the new, the communist condition of society. The development of socialism is a process of the gradual conversion of the elements of socialist quality into components of communist quality, the conversion of the structure and functions of the socialist social system into the structure and functions of the communist social system.

Openness is one of the most essential features of a social system.

The open nature of the social system is manifested in the constant exchange between matter, energy and information, on the one hand, and the surrounding natural and social environment, on the other. The openness of the social system consists of its contradictoriness, the steady appearance and equally steady resolution of ever new and more complex problems, the conflict and struggle between the old and the new, the rejection of the old, the obsolete, the retention of the promising and the assimilation of whatever enables the system to endure, strengthen, improve and progress.

A social system is life itself, a development, even though not unlimited. As we know, the class-antagonistic system is historically transient. Nevertheless, even its life and development cannot be compared with the life and development of individual social phenomena, whether individuals, objects, ideas, and so on. Each individual social phenomenon is of short duration. Its life is historically short. People die. Objects age both physically and morally, and die (machines, buildings, installations, and so on). The social system itself, however, lives incomparably longer than its components. It is incomparably more complex, richer and more varied than they are. This is because the social system (socioeconomic system, class, production facility and even a collective) has its own, its systems mechanisms of functioning and development, or in other words its reproduction which does not allow it to perish, but enables it survive the short existence of its constituent components.

The social system (society as a whole, the production system as a whole and its individual areas, the social combinations, and so on) is a self-reproducing system, steadily renovating itself. The reasons for its self-renovation are found within it, within its specific contradictions. This system can acquire, accumulate and "bequeath" its own achievements in the field of economics, social relations and culture. "Social legacy" is the most characteristic feature of the social system.

The main characteristic of the development of society is that it is always interrelated or, more precisely, it always represents a development of a

system whose main component is people—conscious beings who set themselves specific objectives and strive to achieve them. The most important realm of conscious and purposeful activities of man is labor, production. Furthermore, labor is the only means for the existence of the social reality itself, of systems of social order of different levels of complexity and organization, whose sum total, unity and organic interaction make up society. It is above all in labor and in the course of production activities among people that specific social relations and the social form of dynamics develop, which, precisely, constitute a means for the existence of the social matter, the essence of man and society.

Most generally, a system of social order is an interaction between man and nature he has mastered and "humanized," between him and the part of the natural environment which man has drawn within the orbit of his social and, above all, production activities. The link between man and the means, objects and results of his toil is a basic, a fundamental link, the main feature of the structure of the social system. Relations among people, relations among social systems and collectives, are dependent on this relation, on the relation between man and productive capital or, in other words, on the form of ownership. By virtue of this feature the development of society always operates as a joint development of human and material components of social systems, as the joint development of their structures and functions, as an interaction with the environment.

Finally, the history of systems is progress, which cannot be reduced in the least to a movement from the simple to the complex or from the lower to the higher. Paradoxical though it might seem, the regression, the breakdown and the death of one or another social system (applicable to the class-antagonistic society) is progress from global, from universal positions. For example, with the splintering and division among the peoples, nations and states, feudalism eliminated slave ownership, including the brilliant, powerful and seemingly inordinately integral Rome. However, the death of slave ownership and the establishment of feudalism were major steps along the path of social progress.

The development of production forces is, unquestionably, a mandatory and an important indicator of social progress. Yet it is not the only indicator, not to say criterion of progress, for production (essentially from the viewpoint of its end objectives) develops and progresses not for the sake of production, but for the sake of satisfying human needs. The fact that under the conditions of an exploiting, capitalist in particular, society it develops directly in the interest of the exploiting class, for the sake of capitalist profit, is a different matter.

Yet another important criterion of progress is the evenness and coordination of development of the various areas within the social system. Once again, this criterion and parameter is an attribute of socialism, developed socialism in particular. Yet in this case both even and coordinated development of the various areas and sectors of the national economy presumes,

at the same time, the accelerated, the priority development of areas and sectors which largely determine overall social progress. This applies above all to sectors which are leading in contemporary science and technology--power industry, electronics, chemistry and some others. Here again disproportions and contradictions exist, triggered both by objective circumstances and subjective errors. Yet one of the important qualities of the socialist system is, precisely, the fact that here conditions exist for the identification and systematic elimination of disproportions.

It is important in this respect to distinguish between systems and systems development. The development of a systems means that it does not remain static, that changes, transformations, occur within it. However, this development may take place without a system, when one component develops to the detriment of another, when disproportions arise in the process of the dynamics of the system, when changes in the system harm rather than benefit man, when the system has an adverse effect on the natural environment, and so on. A systemic, an overall development, means order, purposefulness and coordination of changes, when one link changes in proportion to another and when all them, together, serve man and his perfecting and development.

In the course of their objective dynamics, the systems of social order may and do develop in two basic aspects: unilaterally (with no variants) and multilaterally (with variants).

In a unilateral development all objective laws of a given a system lead to the new condition of this system or to a qualitatively new system. Thus the social development of capitalism can lead only to socialism and to no other social system. The task of the subjective factor in this unilateral motion is to create conditions for the implementation of precisely this movement, this exclusive variant.

In the case of a multilateral movement, a system may have at least two conditions for future development, each of which has a certain extent of probability of realization. In this case the task of the subjective factor is to assess the variants, to choose the one which contributes to the progress of man and mankind and to struggle for its implementation. Such is, for example, a society in a stage of transition from capitalism to socialism. Here the problem of "who--whom?" has not been resolved as yet. Either the victory of socialism or the restoration of capitalism are possible. Resolving this problem positively, the forces fighting for socialism assert the existence of the new system and insure its full victory. Something similar is being experienced by the countries liberated from colonialism, the developing countries. Capitalism or socialism are their possible ways of development. Depending on the ratio of forces and the outcome of the struggle for one or another social orientation, one of them gains the upper hand and the country follow: either the capitalist or the socialist way.

The progress of a system toward its end result may be fast and radical in some cases, and slow, evolutionary, in another. For example, we are

familiar with the American and the Prussian ways of development of capitalism in agriculture.

The guiding principle of historical determinism, which includes above all the determining role of economic relations is retained regardless of all variants of social dynamics, even though it is far from always rectilinear. History is made by people, classes and parties with their specific characteristics and differences, conflicting objectives, intentions and passions and feelings. All this determines the complexity and contradictoriness of social progress without eliminating it in the least. Progress is inexorable and unavoidable.

5003

CS01 1802

AFGHANISTAN: STANDING GUARD OVER THE PEOPLE'S GAINS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Mar 80 pp 71-78

[Article by P. Demchenko]

[Text] Of late the attention of the world's public and the press has been focused on events in Afghanistan and on occurrences around it. Clearly manifested in these events today is the clash between two trends: on the one hand, the aspiration of the new Afghan Government, formed at the end of December, to defend the right of the Afghan people to be masters of their fate and normalize political life and economic activities; on the other, the attempts on the part of foreign and domestic reaction to undermine the present regime, disturb the economy, create disturbances and riots, and, in the final account, suborn it to the interests of the imperialistic and militaristic circles.

The country is not merely the target of political and economic subversion on the part of the forces of imperialism and its accomplices. Open armed provocations are mounted against it from Pakistani and Chinese territories. Gangs of saboteurs and foreign agents, weapons, ammunition and seditious publications are sent across the border.

American imperialism and the J. Carter Administration are trying to use the decision of the Soviet Union to send to Afghanistan a limited military contingent to help that country repel external aggression as a pretext for charging international tension, restoring the cold war atmosphere and rallying the reactionary forces in the capitalist and developing countries against the Soviet Union and against all members of the socialist comity.

Why has Afghanistan become the arena of such an acute political struggle? Before answering the question let us recall some facts from the history of the country and of Soviet-Afghan relations.

Located in a place in Asia where the biggest mountain systems come together --the Himalayas, Hindu Kush and Pamir--for a number of decades Afghanistan successfully defended its right to independence from the expansion of the British colonizers settled in India. The mountains and deserts covering

virtually the entire territory of the country were the allies of the patriots in the struggle against foreign domination. Even though unable to occupy Afghanistan, England was able to limit its foreign political sovereignty.

It might have seemed that it would take a long time for the Afghans to free themselves from the mortal grip of British imperialism. However, the Great October Socialist Revolution, which radically changed circumstances in that part of the world as well, strengthened the positions of the Afghan patriots, who gained their independence through adamant struggle.

In March 1919 the RSFSR Government was the first in the world to recognize the full sovereignty and independence of the Afghan state. Surrounded by a hostile ring, the Land of the Soviets tried to prevent imperialist intervention in Afghan domestic affairs and to give Afghanistan all possible aid. An exchange of correspondence took place between Amanulla Khan and V. I. Lenin. In one of them, the founder of the Soviet state wrote that, "From the very first days of the glorious struggle waged by the Afghan people for their independence, the Russian workers' and peasants' government was not slow in recognizing the new order of things in Afghanistan, solemnly recognizing its full independence and assigning a mission for the establishment of a permanent and strong tie between Moscow and Kabul. . . . The Russian workers' and peasants' government has instructed its mission in Afghanistan to open talks with the Government of the Afghan people for the purpose of concluding trade and other friendly agreements" (see "Velikiy Otktyabr' i Narody Vostoka" [The Great October and the Peoples of the Orient], Moscow, 1957, p 222).

The Soviet-Afghan Friendship Treaty, which became the base of good-neighborly relations between our countries, was signed in Moscow, in February 1921. This was the first equal treaty concluded between Afghanistan and a great power and, at the same time, the first friendship treaty concluded the Soviet Union with a foreign country.

Soviet-Afghan relations continued to develop in subsequent years in a variety of fields of economic, cultural, political and defense cooperation. A qualitatively new stage developed in such relations following the April 1971 Afghan liberation and national-democratic revolution. It marked the beginning of radical socioeconomic changes. In December of the same year a friendship, good-neighborly relations and cooperation treaty was concluded between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan.

However unexpected the events of the April revolution might have been to the outside world, they had been long ripening in Afghanistan.

Since the beginning of the 1960's, yielding to popular pressure, the Afghan ruling circles were forced to grant some political concessions. A new constitution was enacted in 1964. It stipulated the separation of the legislative from the executive and judicial powers, and granted voting

rights to women. The curtain was raised for the creation of political parties. Parliamentary elections were held and some members of the opposition were elected.

It was precisely then that the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) was born, rallying the representatives of the progressive intelligentsia and the most conscious groups of workers and officers. Its founding was officially codified by the constituent congress held on 1 January 1965 in N. M. Taraki's small one-story house in a Kabul suburb. The April 1978 revolution brought this party to power. The country was proclaimed as the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, while its government and revolutionary council, granted legislative functions, were headed by N. M. Taraki, CC PDPA secretary general.

The Afghan people welcomed with enthusiasm the revolutionary changes in Kabul. The very first decrees of the new authorities proved that they intended to lead the people to the creation of a modern society based on the principles of social justice and that they intended to uproot feudalism and eliminate the exploitation of man by man.

This was an exceptionally difficult task, particularly in a country such as Afghanistan, where medieval traditions and religious influence remain strong, with an underdeveloped economy, a small industrial proletariat, a rate of illiteracy reaching almost 90 (according to other data, 80) percent and a countryside considered one of the poorest in the world.

Even though over the past 10 to 15 years a few industrial production centers had been developed, the Afghan working class remains very weak. The country has a few enterprises of the factory-plant type. They include an automotive repairs plant, built with Soviet aid, employing 1,200 workers and employees, a house-building combine in Kabul and a plant for nitrogen fertilizers in Mazari-i-Sharif; a big hydroelectric power plant in Naghul is generating electric power and there is a gas-producing industry. The size of the proletariat employed at modern enterprises is assessed as no more than 30,000-35,000. This is a small figure. However, the workers' collectives have proved to be one of the most united and revolutionary detachments of Afghan society.

The revolutionary changes in the country began quite confidently. The new government drafted a rather daring program for economic and social development and struggle with illiteracy. One of its main items was a radical land reform which gave the rural poor the hope for a better future and which triggered the hatred of the landowners and the tribal nobility for the new system. The actions of the central authorities were backed by an unparalleled energizing of social life: the ranks of the youth and women's organizations expanded rapidly. Trade unions and committees for the defense of the revolution at enterprises and rural areas came to life.

However, it soon became clear that in the course of its development the revolution was encountering a number of difficulties, external above all.

The new regime in Kabul became the target of concentrated attacks on the part of imperialist forces and the local reaction. The United States and a number of other countries curtailed their economic and trade relations with Afghanistan. Centers for emigres, escaping the Afghan revolution, began to be organized in Pakistan, converting into centers for the recruitment of agents and the arming and training of saboteurs in the service of imperialist circles. An attempt to promote mutiny by a number of nomad tribes, organized from the outside, was made in the northeastern part of the country, under the pretext that a government "hostile to Islam" was ruling in Kabul. Subversive actions were committed in Herat and Kandahar. The Beijing hegemonists joined the subversive activities against Afghanistan. The circumstances in the country were complicated by the increased tension on the Afghan-Pakistani and Afghan-Chinese borders as a result of foreign reactionary intrigues. This aggravated the class struggle and, naturally, hindered the making of domestic changes.

The initial successes and the enthusiastic reception which the broad masses gave the leaders of the republic led to the accelerated promotion among the masses of socialist slogans which a considerable segment of the people not always understood or understood far from completely. Bureaucratic administration and haste in the implementation of a number of progressive initiatives among an unprepared population made themselves felt. Thus it was proclaimed that the land reform had been essentially completed in the country and that the land of the landowners had been distributed among the poor. However, it turned out that a number of peasants, even after receiving certificates of landownership, had not taken the land, fearing that the landowner who had escaped abroad with his armed guards would come back and seek revenge. Furthermore, the mullahs, particularly in areas where the influence of the central authorities is traditionally weak because of geographic and weather conditions, frequently proclaimed the taking of "someone else's" land a "sin." As a result a number of plots remained uncultivated.

Relations between the authorities and the religious leadership were clearly worsening. A considerable segment of the clergy assumed either an expectant or a hostile position toward the government.

By the autumn of 1978 the political circumstances in the country, aggravated by the foreign political situation, was further complicated by discord which broke out in the government and the PDPA leadership. As we pointed out, the party was founded in January 1965. However, it was not able to preserve long the unity of its ranks. Approximately one-and-a-half years later the party broke up into two wings: Parcham (Banner), headed by Babrak Karmal, and Khal'k (People), headed by N. M. Taraki. The division was terminated in July 1977 with the convening of a unification conference, which elected a 30-member central committee (15 from each faction). N. M. Taraki became Central Committee general secretary, while B. Karmal became Central Committee secretary and Politburo member.

This was a period of active preparations for anti-feudal and for national-democratic action. This encouraged the party to restore its unity and eliminate differences which, frequently, were of a subjective nature. Following the April revolution, N. M. Taraki assumed high positions in the state. B. Karmal became PDPA Central Committee secretary and deputy chairman of the Revolutionary Council and the Council of Ministers. At that period the party's prestige was quite high and its ranks grew rapidly.

"Soon afterwards, however," says Nur Ahmad Nur, CC PDPA Politburo member, "sinister events developed. Party unity weakened and, essentially, the party began to break down. Repressive measures were taken against Comrade Karmal and his fellow workers. A tremendously powerful blow was struck against professional party cadres. Some were forced to go into exile or into clandestinity. Others were arrested and a few paid with their lives."

B. Karmal and a number of other PDPA Central Committee members and ministers lost their positions. Subsequently, fabricated charges were leveled against B. Karmal and other comrades. Subsequently a number of his fellow workers, such as S. A. Keshtmand, M. Rafi, A. Kadyr, a hero of the April revolution, and some others were imprisoned in the Pule-Charhi Jail.

The repressive measures were not restricted to the Parcham people alone. They were more extensive and greatly harmed both the country's leadership and the party, which found itself substantially weakened and splintered precisely when all revolutionary and patriotic forces had to be united in the face of foreign and domestic dangers.

In September 1979 Hafizulla Amin, who had rapidly reached the peaks of power as a result of systematic party purges (at that time he was already prime minister), in fact made a coup d'etat in the country. He removed N. M. Taraki from all of his positions and, soon afterwards, eliminated him physically.

Having usurped the power, H. Amin launched a campaign of mass reprisals against the patriots and, above all, the members of the People's Democratic Party, the intelligentsia and the religious leaders. The party and state apparatus were being drained of their blood and weakened. Reforms were replaced by quasi-revolutionary phraseology. Juggling with socialist slogans, essentially, H. Amin discredited progressive ideas and emasculated the revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses. He surrounded himself with a handful of people loyal to his person and tried to turn the party into an appendage of the security organs.

The circumstances in the country were worsening and the foundations of the system were weakening. Amin himself continued to make extreme revolutionary speeches. Meanwhile, his representatives were making secret contacts with representatives of Washington and Beijing.

At the same time, the open intervention in Afghan affairs by foreign reactionary forces was intensifying. An ever larger number of groups of

saboteurs who terrorized the population were moving into the country from Pakistan and China. Playing up religious feelings, they gained supporters among the youth and, subsequently, trained ever new counterrevolutionary detachments at specially organized bases. Documents now made public show that a general offensive on Kabul was planned at that time. Tens of shock detachments were being formed and trained in the course of these preparations. Large shipments of weapons, leaflets and food were being moved into Afghan territory, particularly in the provinces of Paktia, Badakhshan, Konarha, Laghman and Nangarhar.

"In fact, Amin was leading the country to catastrophe," stated A. Keshtmand, editor in chief of the newspaper HAKIKATE INKILABE SAUR ("Truth of the April Revolution"), addressing a group of foreign journalists. "Threatened with reprisals, a number of party activists went into clandestinity and formulated plans for replacing Amin and his supporters. Several alternatives were drawn up with the support of the military. One of them was to be carried out in the middle of December. Subsequently, the action was postponed for 27 December. It was successful and the Amin regime was overthrown."

The first big task of the new system was to reorganize the leading organs in the republic and to restore unity within party ranks. It was essentially resolved by the middle of January. The Kabul press published the names of the membership of the Revolutionary Council and the government. The CC PDPA Plenum, which preceded this, expelled from the Central Committee some members close to Amin and coopted a number of new members. Currently the PDPA Central Committee consists of 36 members and 8 candidate members. Changes have been made in the PDPA Politburo as well, which now consists of seven members. Babrak Karmal, also elected CC PDPA general secretary, became chairman of the Revolutionary Council and the cabinet.

The majority of the present membership in the leading party organs are active participants in the April 1978 revolution. Until recently some of them held high positions in the country. Others worked in clandestinity, while others again were in jail or in exile.

The PDPA programs, statements and documents are realistic, reflecting the national-democratic nature of the changes being made in the country. This is confirmed by the basic slogans formulated by the PDPA leadership: "Freedom to the People! Work to the Unemployed! Land to the Peasants!" as well as the task set by the country's leadership of organizing a broad national front in the country, rallying the various sociopolitical and religious forces and organizations. For example, B. Karmal pointed out that "our immediate objective under the present circumstances is not to build socialism. We deem it our national historical mission to strengthen and develop the progressive social and political foundations of the republic." This conclusion is based on a realistic assessment of the circumstances in the country and signifies a rejection of the previously prevailing rhetoric and groundless illusions. "The most important objective

facing us in the new stage of the revolution," Karmal has stated, "is to insure the triumph of the true revolutionary principles and correct the errors made."

One of the first measures adopted along this line was amnesty to political prisoners, thanks to which over 6,000 people were set free in Kabul alone and about 15,000 in the country at large. Then, in an effort to put an end to the conflict with the Muslim clergy, in a special address to the people the Revolutionary Council asserted its intention to respect religion and the clergy. All mullahs and tribal leaders outside Afghanistan were offered the opportunity to return to the homeland. Unless guilty of crimes against the people, they were guaranteed freedom, inviolability and the right to engage in religious activities.

A number of measures were announced guaranteeing the interests of the peasantry and the restoration of normal economic activities in the countryside, disturbed in a number of areas as a result of bandit raids, the unfinished agrarian reform and this year's inordinately severe winter. The government expressed readiness to grant the peasants seeds, fertilizer and farm equipment and, whenever necessary, financial aid. It was decided to raise the purchase prices of cotton and sugar beets. The right of the peasants to own the land and to pass it on to relatives and heirs was fully recognized.

Laws are being drafted on all such matters, aimed at strengthening support for the new system and trust in it on the part of the overwhelming majority of the population--the peasantry--which largely determines not only the condition of the Afghan economy, but the political atmosphere in the country. The B. Karmal Government is paying attention to all population strata. "We must," Karmal noted, "be concerned with improving the life of every family, whether it is that of a peasant, nomad, worker, artisan, teacher, employee or merchant. Every patriot must feel free and safe in his home."

The problem of security remains one of the most urgent. As before, gangs of interventionists coming from across the border continue to operate in a number of provinces. This problem is being resolved both through the usual means--by strengthening the organs in charge of maintaining order--as well as through emergency measures. The Revolutionary Council has called upon the people to fight murderers, saboteurs and thieves, and "to create voluntary detachments, which together with army and police subunits must guard roads, bridges, mountain passes and transport caravans. They must protect town and country and the honor and dignity of the country."

Yet the fact should not be ignored that in a number of provinces, and occasionally in Kabul itself, there is still a feeling of tension and unexpected conflicts break out. The desire of the authorities to organize a calm and efficient pace in the country and launch the economic mechanism at full strength is encountering obstacles. Obviously, the reasons for this

are several. The main one, however, is the external intervention of imperialist forces and the opposition to the basic objectives of the April revolution on the part of domestic reaction allied with them. Currently these forces occasionally assume the role of "defenders of olden times" and isolationism, juggling with religious slogans, trying to influence the most backward segment of the urban and rural bottom strata, and lead behind them the merchants and the petit bourgeoisie.

The foreign and domestic reaction began to form a united front against the new regime in Afghanistan virtually from the moment of the April revolution. Landowners, displeased with the agrarian reform, the high nobility and some of the clergy joined the opposition. It is precisely they that the ruling circles of Pakistan, China, the United States and many other countries are trying to use for their own purposes.

The activities of the counterrevolutionary forces developed in two directions. First, the setting up of subversive organizations within the country, attracting the members of the most backward population strata and people hurt by the regime. The second was the organization of bases and camps for the training of subversive groups mainly on Pakistani and Chinese territories. Activities on Chinese territory are concealed from foreign journalists. Subversive work against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan conducted in Pakistan was within the field of vision of the world's press, not in the least because the leaders of the Pakistani Government themselves made efforts to publicize it for the sake of receiving greater help from the United States and other countries.

Several tens of camps and subversion centers are located on Pakistani territory, where saboteurs are being trained and armed for crossing into Afghanistan. Today it is known for certain that Pakistanis, Egyptians and Saudis, as well as Chinese and Americans are among the instructors in such camps. The leaders of six reactionary parties who escaped from Afghanistan have found shelter there as well.

The United States and its imperialist allies, the reactionary circles in a number of Islamic countries, China and all those who are trying to complicate the circumstances in Afghanistan have launched a subversive anti-Afghan campaign along a number of lines, ranging from supplies of weapons and sending interventionists, to conducting false radio propaganda in the languages of the ethnic groups inhabiting the country.

In the summer and autumn of 1979 foreign interference assumed a particularly threatening nature. Diversionary acts originating on Pakistani territory were launched in the area of Jalalabad, where a big irrigation system and an electric power plant, both built with Soviet aid, are located, and in the provinces of Paktia, [Paktika] and Konarha. The number of saboteurs ranged into the thousands as reported by the Afghan press. Furthermore, subversive propaganda was waged in Afghanistan, where inflammatory publications and leaflets were being disseminated.

Under these circumstances, on the basis of the 1978 Soviet-Afghan Treaty and Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, the Afghan Government turned, once again, to the Soviet Union with a request for military aid for the elimination of the external menace. Starting with the April revolution Afghanistan had repeatedly formulated such a request. Taking into consideration the sum total of circumstances, in December of 1979 the Soviet Government decided to send to Afghanistan a limited military contingent. "The ceaseless armed intervention and far-reaching conspiracy of external reactionary forces," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said, "created a real danger of the loss of independence of Afghanistan and its conversion into an imperialist bridgehead on the southern border of our country. In other words, the time came when we could no longer fail to respond to the request of the Government of friendly Afghanistan. Any other step would have meant letting Afghanistan be torn to pieces by imperialism and allowing the aggressive forces to repeat here what they had been able to accomplish in Chile, for example, where the freedom of the people was drowned in blood. Any other action would have meant standing idly by while a hotbed of serious threat to the security of the Soviet state would develop on our southern border."

Let us not forget that the Soviet-Afghan border stretches for over 2,000 kilometers. Insuring its security is a matter of close concern for our government, which could not impartially see the way, having lost their bases in Iran, the Pentagon and the CIA made no effort to conceal their plans for coming closer to our country by setting up a friendly system in Kabul.

The Soviet military contingent sent to Afghanistan is limited in terms of strength and tasks. Its functions are defined by agreement between the parties, based on the task of protecting the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in the face of external aggressive actions directed by China, the United States and Pakistan. It will be immediately withdrawn from the country the moment external interference is terminated completely, interference which, unfortunately, is still continuing. "... We shall be ready to undertake the withdrawal of our forces the moment all forms of interference from the outside, directed against the government and people of Afghanistan, have ceased totally," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said. "Let the United States guarantee this, together with Afghanistan's neighbors, and the need for Soviet military aid will be eliminated. In turn, as we know, the Afghan Government has clearly voiced its intention to maintain relations of peace and friendship with its neighbors and, particularly, with Iran and Pakistan. Naturally, we welcome this position."

Ignoring the true facts and the unequivocal and clear declarations of the Soviet Union, the American Government mounted a hysterical anti-Soviet campaign and undertook a number of new and very risky steps aimed at aggravating the international circumstances. A concentration of American military forces is taking place, accompanied by lies about a "Soviet

threat" in the basin of the Indian Ocean. Such concentration had been initiated earlier. Its immediate task was to exert pressure on the anti-imperialist positions of Iran, assumed as a result of the people's revolution. Aircraft carriers and other U.S. Navy ships were moved here from the Far East and the Atlantic, along with a detachment of marines. China as well is increasing its aid to anti-Afghan forces. It is supplying big shipments of armaments, ammunition and equipment of various kinds, aimed at the conduct of military operations against Afghanistan.

The dangerous machinations against Afghanistan are continuing. As in the past, attempts are being made to promote trouble in the country and to disturb its peaceful life. At the end of February a counterrevolutionary outbreak, prepared by foreign agents, took place in Kabul and a number of other cities. It relied on terrorizing and frightening the population. Even though the bandits benefited from the reactionary clergy, they were unable to involve in this adventure a considerable number of people. The reactionary action failed in the face of the "discipline of security forces, the working class and the youth," according to the correspondent of L'HUMANITE. The authorities arrested a number of agents, including 16 Pakistanis and an American and an Egyptian spy.

The schemes of the enemies of Pakistan are being defeated. The introduction of a limited contingent of Soviet forces was a reliable protection from imperialist intervention. This enabled the new Afghan leadership to address itself to the solution of constructive problems, the implementation of plans aimed at insuring the normal and peaceful life of the people and to pay greater attention to their vital needs and interests. The Afghan people are profoundly grateful to the Soviet Union for coming to the aid of its southern neighbor at a time of difficulty for Afghanistan, and help it to defend the gains of the revolution.

The circumstances in Afghanistan remain complex. With Soviet support its government is taking the necessary measures to fully stabilize the situation, restore normal political and economic life in the country and insure its progress to a bright future.

S003
CS01 1802

PEOPLE'S REVOLUTION IN IRAN

Moscow KOMBINIST No 5, May 80 pp 79-89

[Article by Nureldin Kianuri, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Iranian People's Party]

[Text] The revolution in Iran, the people's antishah and anti-imperialist revolution, is one of the great world events of the last third of a century.

Its international significance lies in the fact that despite the calculations of imperialism and all its efforts, the Iranian people's uprising courageously overthrew the bastion of American imperialism and reaction that had been created by the bosses and masters of the toppled regime. To the great astonishment of the imperialist world, the army that had taken 25 years to create and upon which tens of billions of dollars of the people's resources had been expended ceased to exist during the revolution. The army's regular personnel, who had been carefully selected and subjected to various tests of loyalty to the regime and who enjoyed exceptional privileges, proved to be demoralized. Tens of thousands of American advisers and spies were forced to flee the country. The regime, which had contributed in every way to the enrichment of imperialism, ceased to exist. The Iranian revolution liquidated the main stronghold in our area of aggression against the neighboring peoples' national liberation movements and of espionage against the Soviet Union. There is no question that the blow to imperialism dealt by the victory of the Iranian revolution will still have consequences for the future.

The Iranian people's revolution turned a new page in the world revolutionary movement's book of valuable experience and made its contribution to it. In all its characteristics it is on a par with the other workers' anti-imperialist revolutionary actions that followed the Great October Revolution, became more frequent after World War II, and engulfed the whole world in the 1960's and 1970's. Like the other revolutions of our era, the Iranian one revealed the acuteness of the contradictions both within Iranian society and between Iranian society and the predatory policy of world imperialism.

Although the Iranian revolution as a whole developed and triumphed under the leadership of the Shiite clergy, it was essentially an anti-imperialist, anti-monarchist and consequently democratic revolution and an important event for all progressive humanity.

The 1970's turned a new page not only in the history of the national liberation movement, but also in the fall of imperialism, which is the last stage of capitalism. Although it was in these years that the leaders of China completely betrayed the cause of socialism, threw off their mask of hypocrisy, and made their country a stronghold of the most blatant reaction, and though they were linked with imperialists, fascist dictatorships, every kind of Pinochet and Sadat, the USA and Israel, this decade was marked by intensified social contradictions in the capitalist world, a major change in the balance of power in the international arena, and a reinforcement of the deprived peoples' struggle against the yoke of imperialism and reaction, which struggle led to important victories.

In the beginning of this decade the huge predatory armies of the United States and its accomplices suffered a crushing defeat in Indochina and especially in Vietnam, thanks to the unparalleled resistance of the heroic Vietnamese people relying on the support of all progressive, peace-loving humanity and the all-around support of the socialist camp and especially of the Soviet Union. This outstanding historic victory weakened the positions of imperialism in Africa, Asia, Latin America and even in Europe.

In Africa the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau threw off Portuguese rule, which had been supported by all the imperialist powers, and chose the socialist way for their countries. In Ethiopia the people's revolution broke up the conspiracies of imperialism and local reaction, and its people chose the socialist path of development.

In Europe the fascist regimes in Portugal, Spain and Greece fell to the ground.

Qualitative changes in southwestern Asia began with the defeat of the counter-revolution in the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, with the revolution of April 1978 in Afghanistan, and with the victory of the Iranian revolution.

The Iranian revolution is a link in the same chain of qualitative changes in the world in the grip of imperialism. The thrust of the Iranian revolution was concentrated on the foundations of imperialism and its political, economic, military and cultural domination.

And like the other revolutions, the Iranian one unmistakably confirmed the general laws of the worldwide revolutionary process.

Objective Developmental Conditions of the Iranian Revolutionary Movement

In the last period, especially in the beginning of the 1970's, the internal contradictions of Iranian society and the contradictions between Iran and the imperialist states grew steadily worse. The political and economic consequences of the shah's regime and the imperialist domination of the country were such that the impoverishment of the Iranian people steadily increased despite the unprecedented growth of national income due to the high rates of oil extraction and the rapid rise of oil prices. The living conditions of the absolute majority of Iranians not only did not improve, but worsened every day.

The military policy of the shah's regime laid a heavy burden on Iran's economy. Out of the \$100 billion the government realized from sales of oil for 3 years (1972-1977), nearly \$40 billion were spent on purchase of armaments and almost as much on maintenance of an army of 400,000 men armed to the teeth. Meanwhile tens of millions of urban and rural workers of Iran were deprived of the elementary necessities. There were not enough food products, housing or clothing and the people could not get medical care or education.

The mounting pillage of Iran was unprecedented. It was commonplace for the imperialists to obtain yields of 400-500 percent on their invested capital. The capitalists of the western countries in collaboration with the local entrepreneurs lent an abnormal one-sided character to Iranian industry by making it increasingly dependent upon the imperialist economic system. The enterprises that had been created in the country were importing semi-finished products from the capitalist countries. The number of branches of western banks increased, and the increased investments in banks, which were supposed to be Iranian, actually belonged to the very big foreign financial and industrial monopolies. And finally, the merger of the Iranian entrepreneurs' capital with that of the imperialist financiers directly intensified this dependence and created an insuperable obstacle to development of the national economy.

Iran's agriculture declined because of the treacherous policy of the venal regime. The servile regime opened Iran's doors to the American monopolies selling food products, and about \$2 billion a year went back to the United States in payments for imported foodstuffs. In the course of these transactions hundreds of millions of dollars fell into the hands of the leaders of the regime, from the shah himself and his family to intermediaries of various kinds. The monarchy's anti-peasant policy ruined millions of peasants, so that a stream of people deprived of agricultural employment flocked to the cities. This flow of homeless and jobless peasants remained in the cities with no means of livelihood and became an explosive force threatening the antinational and antipopular regime.

Dissatisfaction with the regime spread to other classes and strata of the population. The condition of Iran's working class steadily deteriorated under ruthless exploitation and the mounting pressure of high prices caused by inflation. The Iranian workers saw how the wealth was concentrated in the hands of a tiny minority and how the vast majority of the people were increasingly impoverished.

In order to suppress this growing dissatisfaction and to provide for further plunder of the people, and also to perform police functions in this area, the shah created the SAVAK security service at the direction and with the direct aid of the imperialist intelligence organizations (especially the CIA of the United States and Israel's Mossad). SAVAK soon became one of the most dreadful organizations for the repression of a people that ever existed in the capitalist world. The activity of SAVAK, created expressly for this punitive purpose, was actually one of the reasons for the further spread of popular dissatisfaction.

The process of corruption affected the whole government organization and the nation's entire public life. Plunder of national resources became a normal and legitimate phenomenon in the operations of the government organization. Western culture brought in by the Americans was substituted for the national culture. Decadent American ideology infected all activities of the Iranian upper classes. Bribery, debauchery and use of narcotics, to which the members of the Pahlavi dynasty were also addicted, assumed horrifying proportions.

The former regime was quite unable to put out the fire of dissatisfaction of the broad masses of the urban and rural population, especially that of the workers, intelligentsia, youth, middle classes and the priesthood. Intensified repressions by SAVAK did not extinguish the opposition but inflamed it still further. Arrests, tortures, trials, executions and secret murders of thousands of fighters for independence and freedom only made increasingly broad strata of the indignant people realize more clearly that the causes of their misfortunes lurked in imperialist domination and the shah's puppet regime. It became evident that hatred of imperialism, especially U.S. imperialism, the rotten and corrupt monarchic regime, and the capitalist system inseparable from imperialism was growing every day.

The revolutionary movement in Iran grew stronger every day and involved the entire people in the course of its development. Despite the false propaganda about the so-called "revolutionary measures" of the now deposed shah, the exploiting class of big capitalists and landowners and the monarchic regime dependent upon it became increasingly isolated and completely lost the support of the popular masses on the eve of the revolution. This was the main reason for the victory of the Iranian revolution over one of the best armed and most bloodthirsty repressive regimes of our era.

Two Developmental Trends in the Iranian Revolution

Two political trends arose in the Iranian revolutionary movement as soon as it began to develop. One was the radical, irreconcilable people's movement and the other was the opportunistic trend of the liberal bourgeoisie. As the revolutionary movement grew, these two factions each vied for the leading position and took on increasingly definite forms.

The radical faction expressed the interests of the indigent sector of the population, the classes and strata that had suffered the oppression of the rapacious monarchic regime. The battle was fought within this faction by the urban and rural laborers, workers, peasants, impoverished peasant emigrants to the cities, the lower strata of the urban petite bourgeoisie, the working intelligentsia, youth and the militant priests, most of whom came from the ranks of the people. These forces wanted to eradicate imperialist domination from all social activities, political, military, economic and cultural. The aims of their struggle were to overthrow the shah's rotten and corrupt regime, to form a republic, to deprive the bloodthirsty shah of power, and to convict and punish the criminals of SAVAK and all the people's oppressors. These forces demanded an end to the pillage of the

people by the big capitalists and landowners, confiscation of their stolen wealth and its return to the many millions of the popular masses, the true owners of this wealth. They wanted to radically reform society in order to restore the people's violated rights and to eliminate the causes of robbery and oppression by capitalists.

The Iranian people's hatred reached its limit. They well understood who their internal and external enemies were. Their resolve hardened every day to take part in the battles with these enemies until the final victory. It was this readiness of the people to fight that was expressed by the radical trend.

The second trend was represented by the wealthy strata of the population who joined the fighters' ranks because they too were dissatisfied with the domination of imperialist capital, the predatory policy of the monopolies connected with the shah's regime, and the unbearable repressions. The reasons that motivated these strata of the population to join the battle did not coincide with the main demands of the embattled people. The well-to-do strata of the liberal bourgeoisie were dissatisfied with the dominance of the imperialistic monopolies in Iran's economy, and they demanded "more equitable" shares in the plunder of the national resources. Since they were also dissatisfied with SAVAK's actions against the liberal bourgeoisie, who had gained their share of participation in the national administration, these strata of society favored "more equitable" political and economic cooperation with the big capitalists associated with the imperialist monopolies. They demanded freedom to expand their entrepreneur activity and their participation in political affairs. They opposed the mass purchases of armaments at the shah's will, but they did not entirely reject military cooperation with imperialism because they thought it guaranteed preservation of the capitalist system and protected them in their struggle with the people's revolutionary forces.

And so the liberal bourgeoisie, in fighting for freedom and the overthrow of the oppressive regime, were actually trying to use the revolutionary movement in the interests of their own class, that is they were fighting to establish a constitutional monarchy within the framework of the capitalist system. In promoting the slogan of "regulating" contacts with the western countries and trying outwardly to lend them a "more equitable character" the liberal bourgeoisie never advocated a complete break with imperialism. Throughout the whole 25-year rule of the shah's despotic regime, while the staunch fighters for the people's cause who remained alive were either jailed or forced to emigrate, the liberal bourgeoisie, the leaders of organizations like the National Front or the Movement for Freedom, and some religious figures who collaborated with the shah's regime in their time enjoyed a certain freedom of activity. It was not by chance that U.S. imperialism tried to block the revolutionary movement with their aid. But the majority of the Iranian people were no longer as submissive as before. The popular masses understood the opportunism of these pseudorevolutionaries and supported Khomeyni, who many years before had raised the banner of irreconcilable opposition to imperialism under the United States' lead and to the corrupt monarchic regime.

Khomeyni's Outstanding Role

The role of the Ayatollah Khomeyni, who has been called an imam since the victory of the revolution, lies in the fact that he was able to unite the revolutionary people's hopes and aspirations in the struggle with the shah's regime and, despite the exploitation of the masses of many millions deprived for centuries by the ruling class with the aid of the priests who served it, he helped to direct a large part of the religious forces following the Shiite theologians to the path of revolution against the actual enemies, the robbers of the people.

Khomeyni's merit also lies in the fact that he resolutely and consistently resisted the artifices of the liberal bourgeoisie and the conciliatory, capitulating faction of the priesthood. He headed the Iranian people's struggle and led it to victory, and they undertook the unequal battle selflessly and with unexampled heroism.

Realizing the causes of the Iranian people's misfortunes, Khomeyni became the symbol of the people's revolutionary movement of Iran by displaying such traits as determination, implacability and courage.

The NPI [Iranian People's Party] fully appreciated the importance of Khomeyni's policy and declared itself in firm support of it. Our party specified five main political-social points in its policy, which reflect the interests of the broad strata of the Iranian population at the present stage of the anti-imperialist, democratic revolution, and its policy is based upon these five points, which are as follows:

--A decisive and uncompromising effort to rid Iranian society of its political, economic, military and cultural dependence upon the rule of imperialism headed by the United States;

--A final and irrevocable rejection of the corrupt system of government and the despotic, monarchic regime;

--An effort to secure political and economic freedoms for the people;

--A policy of radical changes in the economic structure of society in order to eliminate the domination of the capitalists and big landowners and to improve living conditions for millions of workers;

--An effort to combine and unite all the people's true revolutionary forces to achieve the national goals of the entire people.

Khomeyni's historic slogans included an appeal for unification of all the forces of the Iranian people. Great demonstrations were held under these slogans as well as strikes involving all industrial centers, oil fields, railroads and government institutions. Street battles were fought not only in the big cities but also throughout the small villages and towns, sweeping away like a raging torrent the shah's tanks and machine guns firing upon the unarmed people.

The uprising of 10 and 11 February 1979 can be considered the culmination of the victorious revolution of the Iranian people and the start of a new era in our nation's history.

The uprising in February 1979 was the first time in the history of the Iranian revolution that the army actively joined the revolutionary movement and jointly with the armed revolutionary forces reduced the last bulwark threatening the revolution, namely the shah's guard, which was ready to crush the revolution without mercy. And so the shah's American army did not perform its task, and the insidious plot of American imperialism to prop up the shah's regime was a failure.

The American imperialists made every effort to save the army with the aid of the liberal bourgeoisie and to use it for their own ends some time later, as they did in 1953 when they overthrew Dr Mosaddeq.

The heroic uprising of the armed revolutionary forces and the people on 10 and 11 February 1979 completely checked this insidious and dangerous plan and led to the victory of the revolution.

The Provisional Revolutionary Government. Two Centers of Power

The appearance of two centers of power should be noted in the series of subjective and objective factors that developed after the victory of the revolution. On the one hand, there were the organizations of Khomeyni partisans like the Revolutionary Council, the revolutionary committees and tribunals, the corps of guards of the Islamic revolution, and the Union of the Destitute. On the other hand, the liberal bourgeoisie used their resources and their people to take over the government organization, and though they declared they were following Khomeyni's directives, actually they made every effort to obstruct the development of the revolution in depth and to divert it from the anti-imperialist path of the people, including use of their contacts with big capital for the purpose. But in spite of the existence of two powers, the pressure of the revolutionary forces and Imam Khomeyni's directives to eliminate the remnants of imperialist rule and the former ruling circles of the shah's regime compelled the liberals along with all those who had opposed the revolution to take some political and economic measures, as well as some to purge the government organization of counterrevolutionary elements.

The American advisers were driven out of the country, various unjust agreements and treaties with the imperialist countries were abrogated, and purchases of armaments in the United States and the NATO countries as well as contracts costing tens of billions of dollars were canceled. Hundreds of accomplices and minions of the shah's regime were arrested, convicted and executed, and their fortunes were turned over to the destitute. A great many of the enterprises of the private sector, the private banks and the insurance companies belonging to the condemned and the partisans of the fallen regime who had fled the country were nationalized. Many adherents

of the shah's regime holding key positions in the army, police, military police and government institutions were discharged. These measures, implemented against the fierce opposition of the liberal bourgeoisie, were important achievements of the Iranian revolution.

Meanwhile, despite the popular masses' demand to do away with the legacy of the monarchy as soon as possible, the representatives of the liberal bourgeoisie in the government organization continued to block all measures to resolve the difficulties that had arisen, while trying to undermine the revolutionary process under various pretexts. They also tried secretly to enter into an agreement with the American imperialists and to prepare political and other conditions for joint actions with them primarily designed to save American imperialism from the shock of the revolution and to direct oppression of the people into another channel. To these ends the liberal bourgeoisie began to operate hand in glove with the counterrevolution, which appeared in a new guise and even penetrated the revolutionary ranks, using various means for this purpose: Terrorist acts were committed against the leaders close to Khomeyni (while they were blamed on the forces of the left), a fratricidal war was started, religious disputes were aggravated, diversions at factories and oil fields and fires in granaries were arranged, and dummy newspapers, parties and political groups were founded, even with a religious coloring like the Republican Party of the Mohammedan People of Iran, as well as liberal organizations (the Radical Movement of Iran etc.). By such means the representatives of the liberal bourgeoisie, the internal reaction and the external imperialist forces tried to shatter the unity of the anti-imperialist forces, and mainly to divert the Iranian revolution from its anti-imperialist course into an anticommunist and antisocialist channel. They wove their nets of conspiracies and intrigues in all regions of Iran. All these actions were attributed to the forces of the left and later readdressed, so to speak, to the socialist countries, whereas actually these countries are the true friends of the Iranian people and the Iranian revolution.

The intention of the imperialists headed by American imperialism is becoming increasingly clear: Having sustained a telling blow from the Iranian revolution, they have been pursuing the policy of impairing the revolutionary actions of Khomeyni and his partisans, and for this purpose they are exerting all kinds of influence upon the liberal bourgeois government that depends upon them.

The liberal bourgeoisie's collaboration with the counterrevolution reached its peak in August 1979. The aim of the conspiracy was to use the distress of Iran's national minorities for counterrevolutionary purposes, especially in Kurdistan, where it was planned to start a revolt with the aid of the United States, Israel and reactionary Arab circles and then, with the support of the counterrevolutionary, liberal and compromising elements in the government organization and other organizations, to spread it to other explosive areas of the country and the whole country and to undermine the Iranian revolution from within. This conspiracy was very cleverly prepared, and the events in Kurdistan were presented as if the leftist forces had to do with

them and almost the socialist countries. The press, supported by imperialism, and the pro-Peking pseudo-revolutionaries undoubtedly played a part in contriving this conspiracy and also in interpreting the events in Kurdistan. From the start of the military actions in Kurdistan the leftist organizations were subjected to fierce attacks. The liberal bourgeoisie took advantage of this, the newspaper MARDOM, the central organ of the NPI, was suppressed and the party's headquarters in Teheran and its provincial branches were shut down. The bourgeoisie explained all these actions against the NPI by the party's alleged participation in the events in Kurdistan. But the NPI knew about the liberal bourgeoisie's conciliatory and treacherous policy from the start of the rise of the revolutionary movement in Iran and exposed its intrigues and agreement with the counterrevolution. The analysis our party's Central Committee made of all these events clearly indicated the intrigues of the imperialists and the liberal bourgeoisie and exposed the roles of the imperialists and the counterrevolution in the conspiracy. Our party recommended a peaceful solution of the Kurdistan problem by negotiation.

It must be recognized that Khomeyni's insight played a large part in the defeat of this treacherous plan. He understood the nature of the plot and his correct actions contributed to the very swift conclusion of the fratricidal war. In spite of the government's opposition, he gave the instructions to negotiate with the Kurdish revolutionary forces in order to solve the Kurdistan problem and to remedy the distress of the people in that province.

Removal of the Bazargan Government: a Victory of the People's Forces

The failure of the conspiracy in Kurdistan is to be considered a great victory of the Iranian revolutionaries, and it struck a major blow at the counterrevolution and the liberal bourgeoisie. It became quite clear that all the charges that the NPI, other leftist forces and especially the socialist countries had participated in the plot were lies and that actually the threads of the plot extended to the internal counterrevolution, the United States and Israel. It became evident that the nationalities problem cannot be solved by arms and repressions and the legal demands of the destitute national minorities must be met. The NPI's warnings about the danger of the conspiracies of the counterrevolution in league with the liberal opportunists were also borne out. After 40 days the ban on publication of the newspaper MARDOM, the NPI's central organ, was lifted and the party's normal activity was resumed. Our party's importance as a major force supporting the gains of the Iranian revolution became evident.

With the fall of the government of Bazargan, who is a big land-owner himself and opposed any democratic rural reforms, all Iran was seized by a powerful upsurge in the struggle for agrarian reform for the benefit of the peasants with little or no land and for abolition of ownership of land by landlords. Unquestionably victory in this battle would be a new step in the progress of the Iranian revolution.

But the counterrevolution and the liberal bourgeoisie did not give up their attempts to reverse the wheel of revolutionary reforms. The shah's invitation to Washington and the Iranian prime minister's meeting in Algeria (without notifying Khomeyni) with Brzezinski, the initiator and leader of all plots against the Iranian revolution, were events that revealed the nature of the conspiratorial policy. In his proclamations in October and November 1979 Imam Khomeyni confirmed the clear orientation of Iran's domestic and foreign policy in the direction of the people's irreconcilable and consistent anti-imperialist struggle and condemned any actions compromising with American imperialism which, by his definition, is enemy number one of the Iranian people and all the underprivileged of the world.

Khomeyni's message to the people of Kurdistan determined for the first time in Iran's history the possible ways of revolutionary solution of the nationalities problem, namely official recognition of the national minorities' right to administrative and cultural self-government as part of a unified Iran and elimination of the causes of their disastrous situation.

The intensified anti-imperialist trend of the revolution was naturally accompanied by intensification of the role of the people participating in it and by involvement of tens of millions of Iranians in it. The surge of the people's struggle against the sinister plans of American imperialism delivered another telling blow to its positions not only in Iran but also in the whole region.

It is for this reason that the United States and its henchmen in NATO and Peking are actively demonstrating hostility to the aims of the Iranian revolution and have intensified their activity against Iran. American imperialism, in addition to coercive political measures, is resorting to an economic blockade and other forms of pressure (freezing Iranian assets and cutting off exports to Iran) and making extensive military preparations in the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean.

These political and economic pressures and military preparations, including arming the reactionary forces within the country, are undoubtedly for two purposes. The main one is, after breaking the resistance of the Iranian revolution and doing away with it, to change the political situation in Iran to its own advantage and to replace the present revolutionary government with a regime ready to serve U.S. interests. But imperialism and the counterrevolution realize that it is not easy to defeat the Iranian revolution under the present circumstances, and so they tirelessly weave the nets of new plots.

The events of December 1979 in Tabriz are to be considered one of their plots. With the aid of the liberals and with the support of one of the famous religious leaders, Ayatollah Shari'atmadari, the counterrevolution tried to convert Tabriz into a main center of tension and to spread tension from there to other regions of Iran. Thanks to the people's vigilance the Tabriz plot, headed by the reactionary Republican Party of the Mohammedan People of Iran, ended in failure.

The subsequent course of events indicated that some officers devoted to the shah's regime participated in them who are still in the army and who support the connection with Bakhtiar, the last premier of the shah's regime, who fled from Iran.

The NPI was the first political organization to expose the antirevolutionary nature of the events in Tabriz and to point out the United States' participation in this conspiracy.

The latest attempts of American imperialism and the Iranian counterrevolution to divert the Iranian revolution from its national and anti-imperialist course were in connection with the events in neighboring Afghanistan. The internal and external enemies of the Iranian revolution, resorting to misinformation and malicious slander, tried to represent these events as if the effort of the counterrevolutionary groups associated with American imperialism and its Chinese and Pakistani henchmen to overthrow the revolutionary government in Afghanistan had the same significance as the revolutionary Islamic movement in Iran under Khomeyni's leadership. Using these events, they tried again to change the orientation of the Iranian revolution's foreign policy against its irreconcilable enemy, American imperialism, and to arouse hostility in the Iranian people to the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, which have supported the Iranian revolution and are the most reliable defenders of the militant revolutionary peoples of Iran. Under the cry of "the Mohammedan people of Afghanistan in danger" the imperialists are trying to threaten the Soviet Union's security and to save the United States from the shocks of the Iranian revolutionary movement. It should be noted that some actually revolutionary elements of Iran, who did not know all the circumstances of the conspiracy of Hafezollah 'Amin, who tried to draw Afghanistan into the camp of American imperialism, were influenced at first by this poisonous imperialist propaganda. But the course of events revealed the duplicity of the hostile propaganda and indicated the truth, and now we see that the Iranian revolutionaries better understand the significance of this counterrevolutionary and imperialist plot covered by the false banner of "defense of Islam" in Afghanistan and devised by Washington and Peking with the help of their partisans like Sadat, Khaled and Zia-ul-Haq. More and more Iranians are now realizing that behind this smoke screen American imperialism is trying first of all to locate its military bases in the area near Iran. The United States is sending its naval forces, including aircraft carriers, into Iran's coastal waters while activating the levers of an economic blockade of Iran and preparing counterrevolutionary forces for criminal acts. It is no accident that the Mohammedan students, followers of Imam Khomeyni's course, who are engaged in exposing the crimes and conspiracies of American imperialism in Iran on the day before the conference of the so-called "Islamic states" in Pakistan was convened evaluated this assemblage as a plot of American imperialism and as a betrayal of the interests of the destitute Mohammedans.

From the very beginning the NPI exposed this dangerous imperialist plot and pointed out that the imperialists and reactionary circles are the worst enemies of the revolutions in Afghanistan and Iran. The antifeudal and anti-imperialist revolution in Afghanistan, like the people's anti-imperialist

and antimonarchist revolution in Iran, delivered a heavy blow to the enemies of the popular masses, to the imperialist camp, and to the united front of the Peking hegemonists with imperialism and reaction. Therefore any attempts to weaken the revolutionary foundations of Afghanistan are a direct blow to the Iranian revolution as well.

The Iranian Revolution Is Expanding and Strengthening

Despite all the intrigues of imperialism and counterrevolution, political and economic pressure, military threats from without and constant conspiracies from within, despite the rotten legacy left by the fallen regime and the treachery of its remaining henchmen, despite the errors in the leadership of the revolution, and despite all the enormous difficulties the forces of the Iranian revolution are expanding and strengthening. Ratification of the constitution, with all its weaknesses and deficiencies, is an important step in this direction.

But our people are vigilant and they know the Iranian revolution is still threatened by grave danger. American imperialism and the reactionary forces of the region will not be slow to resort to new attacks to undermine the Iranian revolution and restore the past. Groups of various descriptions associated with Peking and having great material resources at their disposal are trying to divide the forces leading the struggle against American imperialism and its henchmen in Iran. Their antirevolutionary activity also affects a number of organizations and young inexperienced groups with leftist inclinations that incorrectly approach evaluation of the potentials of the revolutionary movement at the present stage. They harm the revolution by following a sectarian policy.

Under these circumstances the main problem today is unification of all forces in defense of the revolutionary gains in order to prevent a return to the past. The NPI constantly appeals to all national, patriotic and anti-imperialist forces to collaborate under the slogans of "Unity of Words" and "Unity of Actions."

A consistent and tireless effort to form a unified people's front uniting all consistent partisans of Khomeyni's anti-imperialist course and revolutionary democracy, the true partisans of scientific socialism, is the most important task of the revolutionaries of Iran. The NPI is making every effort to form this front.

5186
CSO: 1802

UNITED STATES: CORRUPTION IN THE HIGHEST REHELONS; LAWYER'S NOTES

Moscow KROMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 80 pp 90-100

[Article by B. Nikiforov]

[Text] Unquestionably, the United States is the leader of the "free world" in the field of crime. In 1975, 11 million crimes were committed in the United States--10 percent more than in 1974, which in turn yielded an 18 percent increase over the previous year's indicators, something unparalleled in the history of American criminal statistics (see "Uniform Crime Report for the United States--1976," Washington, 1977, p 37; U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 6 September 1976, p 62). Since then, over a three-year period--1976, 1977, 1978--every year over 11 million crimes have been recorded--the same number as in the record-setting 1975.

These figures reflect by far not the entire American criminality, but only so-called "major crimes"--premeditated murder, rape, robberies and thefts. As to the other types of crime, federal statistics provide only unintelligible information on related apprehensions, in fine print, at the end of statistical yearbooks.

"FBI statistics," the American publicist Jessica Mitford believes, "is cleverly structured in such a way as to draw attention on the crimes committed by those considered dangerous to the establishment: the poor, the residents of ghettos and political free thinkers. These are sensationalist crimes written about in the press, frightening and demoralizing the people, forming solid positions for politicians ready to vote for increased FBI appropriations" (J. Mitford, "Kind and Usual Punishment. The Prison Business," New York, 1975, pp 63-64). In fact, car thefts (a "major crime," as classified by the FBI) are committed not by those who have cars and, one may assume, it is not such people who engage in vulgar thefts or robberies. It is precisely this that explains the seemingly strange readiness with which both the FBI and the American press make such a stir on the growth of the crime rate, "supplying" respective indicators as though it is a question of major national accomplishments.

Unquestionably, the situation with general crimes in the United States is more than serious. This should be mentioned. Ever since, starting with

the 1968 electoral campaign, crime was proclaimed the governmental problem number one. It has nearly doubled. It is more likely, however, that federal criminal statistics and the bourgeois press in the United States are trying to focus the attention on the criminality of the "lower classes" not only for the sake of turning public opinion against them. They are also trying, thus, to distract the masses from what is taking place "on the top." Naturally, this is a ploy, a complex maneuver, aimed at preventing, or slowing down the process of disillusionment of the working people with the American way of life. However, the events occurring in this area have an important juridical-sociological aspect as well.

The "comforting" idea that criminality is the exclusive property of the "lower classes," exceptionally convenient to the ruling classes, developed in its time and, partially, continues to exist to this day not in the least because it reflects any reality whatever. It is universally known that the tremendous fortunes accumulated by the Rockefellers, Carnegie, Mellons and Du Ponts originated in violence and fraud. The fierce competitiveness in the age of "free capitalism" triggered an aspiration toward profits imperious to moral sermons or the punitive threats of the law.

As a poll conducted by the HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW among the representatives of the business world has indicated, many of them agree with the fact that an American business leader tends to ignore all ethical laws the moment it is a question of their direct pertinence to his work. Profit is his main interest. "The privileged would rather risk total destruction," writes the known American economist J. Galbraith, "rather than part with a substantial share of their advantages" (TIME, 4 April 1977, p. 50).

If anything is changing here, as we shall see, it is the forms and scale of criminal activities in business and the state apparatus. Corresponding facts are becoming ever more extensively public and are drawing the ever greater attention of the public and the specialists.

At the joint ceremonial session of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet and RSFSR Supreme Soviet, in honor of the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out that, "The scandalous exposure of sinister political machinations, corruption, misuse of power and gross violations of the law on the part of leaders of the highest place are exploding like bombs in one or another country, proving the decomposition of the ruling class. A record growth of criminality completes the picture."

The most important result of the transition of American capitalism to its monopoly stage was the establishment of the state-monopoly system. Under the conditions of this system not only did the monopolies enter all realms of governmental activities, but the state itself, from a passive recorder, became the subject of active economic control. In the final account, such

interference has been and remains in the interest of those same monopolies. The most important among these interests is the preservation and strengthening of bourgeois power. Hence the aspiration of the state not only to demagogically conceal the true nature of occurring social processes, but to depict itself as the defender of the national interest.

The so-called "anti-trust legislation," whose origins are believed to be the 1890 Sherman Act, which proclaimed as criminal and punishable with a fine or a prison sentence associations or conspiracies aimed at restricting trade, is a typical example of such efforts.

However, the real class orientation of the law in judicial decisions occasionally appears more clearly than it does in the text of the laws. Using the broad definitions of the Sherman Act, the U.S. Supreme Court has begun to interpret it in the sense that it has in mind not all, but only "unreasonable" contracts and associations. The courts willingly adopted this approach and between 1911 and 1940 the Sherman Act was almost never applied. As a result the institution of governmental criminal investigations of various types of associations, trusts and companies became largely compromised.

In the 1940's the concept of "white-collar crime," perpetrated by "individuals worthy of respect, holding high social rank, committed in the process of their professional activities," appeared and spread within American sociology. The meaning of this term, suggested by Professor Satterland, who gave it its name ("white-collar crime"), was, according to Prof. H. Mannheim, "to draw attention to the tremendous area of criminal behavior usually ignored."

Satterland studied a wide variety of monopoly criminal activities: violations of anti-trust legislation, laws against false advertising, legislation on labor relations (protecting hired labor from coercive measures on the part of employers) and, finally, violations of patent and authorship rights. Essentially, capitalist competition is a "game without rules," for which reason its aspiration to exceed even the most generous juridical limits and to violate them is unsurmountable.

II

Bearing in mind the variety of "objects" and forms of criminal activity of American corporations, it is easy to conceive of the scale of the harm they cause. The scale is truly tremendous, for no more than an insignificant percentage of such crimes is exposed.

Violations of criminal laws perpetrated by the biggest U.S. industrial and commercial corporations greatly damage the country's population, the toiling classes above all. "The consequences of white-collar crime," Satterland wrote, "affect society not immediately but over a long period of time" ("Sotsiologiya Prestupnosti (Sovremennyye Burzhuaznyye

Theorii)" [Sociology of Crime (Contemporary Bourgeois Theories)], Moscow, 1966, p 58. Frequently American jurists describe such crimes as "victimless crimes." In fact, their characteristic is that they harm millions of people who, as a rule, do not realize it. Yet this does not alleviate their lives. It has been estimated, for example, that as a result of a single price-fixing* monopoly conspiracy--the so-called "California agreement" on prices of electrical equipment--the losses inflicted on the rank-and-file consumer were comparable to the losses resulting from the criminal activities of all breaking and entering in the United States over one year. Realizing that the financial harm caused by "white-collar crime" cannot be determined, the President's Committee on the Application of the Law and Prosecution nevertheless assumes that it considerably exceeds the damage caused by "traditional" crimes, such as robbery and property theft.

However, "white-collar crime" causes its greatest harm to public morality. In the opinion of the President's Committee it has a nefarious influence on "the entire moral climate of society." Thinking along this line, it reached the conclusion that "white-collar" crimes provide a model for behavior which has a fatal influence on the ethical foundations of law and order, thus encouraging other business sectors and "physical persons," young people in particular, to engage in the commission of all kinds of other crimes, "rationalizing" that everyone should grab what he can.

Virtually every manifestation of "white-collar crime" contains mercenary fraud and mercenary abuse of faith, harming many people, and forcing a number of individuals to accept detrimental economic conditions. Had it been a question of isolated instances of this kind, such as, for example, "isolated facts" of fraud, which may be found, even though in small quantity, in the judicial practices of any country, we would have had no grounds to consider such phenomena within the context of the legal status of the citizens. Yet, as we saw, the American specialists themselves spare neither colors nor words to prove the mass nature and criminality of this type of crime and the harm it causes.

The nefarious influence of "white-collar crime" on the moral climate of society is caused not only by the fact of the commission of a crime in business but its virtually permanent impunity. This is explained by the fact that such crimes are not considered threatening to the state. They threaten neither its existence nor its policies. The U.S. ruling circles consider as more dangerous the attempts on the part of progressive elements to expose "white-collar crime." Undertaken on a more or less broad scale, they will inevitably result, and partially have already resulted, in the breakdown of the "stabilizing" myth of the "honest businessman" and the debunking of the inspiring example of the "captains of industry and commerce," supported by favorable propaganda.

*Price fixing means an agreement among monopolies to establish a specific price level--raised for the sake of extracting additional profits, or else reduced in order to eliminate competition.

On a more basic level, the reason for the impunity enjoyed by businessmen-criminals is the fact that both the judiciary and the administrative personnel display toward them a mixed feeling of fear and admiration. Fear because antagonizing businessmen could lower their contributions to the next electoral campaign chest,* the inevitable result of which is electoral defeat. Admiration because legislators, judges and legal authorities are "culturally homogeneous" with the violators. Therefore, in the concept of such people the entrepreneurs who violate criminal laws do not show in the least the characteristics of the popular stereotype of the criminal. The rule here is that the criminals are never "we," but always "they."

This was the basis for the 1961, then sensational, already mentioned, "electric case" in California, involving a conspiracy by 29 corporations to fix the prices of electrical equipment. All 46 defendants were found guilty and the damage caused by their actions was assessed at \$500 million. Of the 30 defendants sentenced to jail, 7 factually served 30 days each. For the first time in the history of American justice, highly placed representatives of big business, including several corporation vice presidents, were put behind bars. However, even though the judge considered that higher executives should be held liable for the crime as well, not one of them was tried.

The incredibly "stern" sentence on the "electric case" gave some people the joyful hope that it had a warning power. "Were we to succeed, even if only once every ten years, to pass such sentences in a few trials," stated at that time a spokesman for the Department of Justice, "this would almost virtually rescue our economy from a malignant tumor . . ." ("Task Force Report: Crime and Its Impact--An Assessment," Washington, 1967, p 110). The "energetic" application of the Sherman Act on the "electric case" was followed by calm. Thus at the end of the 1966 fiscal year only 18 of the 115 civil cases handled by the Department of Justice were anti-trust.

As to the "malignant tumor," one could easily have predicted that "white-collar crime" would blossom and progress despite any and all juridical acts as long as the base and superstructural phenomena creating it remain. Big business, Professor Galbraith says, is as inescapable as fate and we must stop believing in the miraculous power of anti-trust laws and let them die peacefully.

Judging by all available facts, a number of corporations share this viewpoint. Or, rather, they fail to take anti-trust laws seriously. Proclaiming, in December 1976, the sentence on the case of 47 businessmen prosecuted in accordance with the Sherman Act for the price fixing of cardboard containers, Federal Judge Parsons explained apologetically that, "I did not find this easy. However, the belief prevails that highly placed individuals do not bear responsibility for their crimes." The price-fixing

*In the United States in the majority of cases judges and prosecutors are elected--the author.

conspiracy of 23 companies, controlling 70 percent of a nearly \$2 billion industry, had existed for over nearly 40 years and the "cardboard case" is considered the biggest following the "electric case." As a result, 15 defendants were sentenced to jail from . . . 5 to 60 days. "We hope," stated a spokesman for the Department of Justice, repeating what was said by the spokesman of the same department 15 years previously, "that this sentence will be a warning to the entire American business" (NEWSWEEK, 20 December 1976, p 44).

Despite the similarity between the "cardboard" and the "electric" case, which in its time triggered a sensation, once again it made no impression on the public. On the one hand, Americans have long become accustomed to such crimes. On the other, the lack of attention which the American press paid to the "cardboard case" had other, more "natural" reasons: information on the case was drowned in greater sensations.

American corporations, which have been able to extend their activities with the help of the state beyond the borders of the country, see no reasons to abstain "as visitors" from a criminal practice which has proved its advantages at home.

. . . As the prosecutor in the Tokyo District Court went on reading the charges in the case of former Japanese Prime Minister Tanaka, the traditional Japanese smile gradually disappeared from the face of the defendant. Tanaka was charged with the fact that, as prime minister, he had received from Lockheed, the American aerospace company, a bribe of nearly \$2 million. In exchange, he helped the Lockheed agent to sell to the "Japanese Airline" Tristar air buses. Tanaka received the money from the agency through his secretary through several means, using methods borrowed from detective novels--in telephone booths, bus stops, hotels or embassy back yards. The prosecution charged that, in a talk with Tanaka, in Hawaii, in September 1972, Nixon, the then U.S. President, told him that he, Nixon, would be quite happy if the airplane which would take him to Japan from the United States were Lockheed's Tristar. According to the prosecution, Tanaka repeated this to Ooano, the biggest stockholder of JAL, and one month later the company decided to purchase the Tristar, declining the offers of the Douglas and Boeing companies (see NEWSWEEK, 7 February 1977, p 22).

Naturally, the main culprits in the scandal, the leading personnel of Lockheed, were not prosecuted. The Tanaka case is merely one of the examples of "activities" of an American company abroad. . . . At the other end of the world, on the same "basis" one of the "beneficiaries" of Lockheed was Prince Bernhardt, the consort of Juliana, the queen of the Netherlands, whose "friendship" with company resulted in the loss of all his official positions and "retreat to private life." Information on "goodwill offerings" by the company to a number of Italian members of parliament reached the press.

The Lockheed story is not an isolated example of criminal activities by American monopolies abroad. According to available information, Westinghouse, Hughes Aircraft, Lytton Industries and others are engaged in similar undertakings.

The bribers are continuing to pile up wealth. However, they are not gaining advantages only. The doors of telephone booths are transparent, the secret becomes obvious and events are beginning to develop which frighten the bourgeoisie more than anything else. The influence of "white-collar crime" on public morality is encouraging a number of people to engage in "restless action," and leads to political losses--the social alienation from bourgeois society of large population groups. In the first case, "individuals who have taken the road of professional crime," Professor Reckless writes, "become convinced that the methods they use to enrich themselves are not different in any way from those used by the businessman, the political figure or any other person who succeeds in our decadent society through cunning and shrewdness, using such methods to the benefit of his own affairs" (W. Reckless, "The Crime Problem," New York, 1950, p 117). In the second case, population disobedience to the requirements of law and order triggers an escalation of coercion on the part of the bourgeois state, which in turn "could lead to an increase in the deep alienation of very big population groups from the legal stipulations of society," and so on, one after the other, "until," cautions Professor Allen, "the fundamental conditions for the existence of a free society are threatened or destroyed. In a period in which so many are showing readiness to disobey the requirements of law and order, the habitual shortcomings of criminal law and its practical application toward which, for so many decades, we have shown such tolerance, assume a new, sinister meaning" ("Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures," Pt II, Washington, 1971, pp 621-622).

This is realized not only by deeply thinking theoreticians but by some business people as well. This is made clear by a curious document which appeared at the end of 1976 as an announcement in the American press. In this announcement published by IBM, a computer manufacturing corporation, addressed to the entire American business community, the corporation emphasizes that its most important task today is to restore the trust of the public in it, undermined by commercial bribery and other abuses, and which has declined by a factor of almost four over the past 10 years--from 55 percent in 1966 to 16 percent at the present. Justifications that "we are like all the others," the appeals states, are a means for declining responsibility and must be countered by a strict code of "business behavior" which must be implemented at all costs. "The restoration of the good reputation of business is a task which demands today the constant attention on the part of each one of its participants. This is the best means for insuring the survival of business tomorrow. Essentially," IBM entreats with a note of despair, "this may prove to be the only means" (U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 13 September 1976, p 3).

The demoralization of American business is merely one of the manifestations of the intensification of the ideological-political crisis of bourgeois society mentioned by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the CC CPSU Accountability Report to the 25th party congress. Within the system of state-monopoly capitalism not only business becomes the real content of politics, but politics is converted into business. In one case, in order to succeed in the competitive economic struggle, political levers are activated, frequently through criminal methods. In another, criminal methods are used in the competitive struggle for power, which is considered a kind of political "profit." As a result, political corruption assumes a new content. It is no longer simply the use of political influence for criminal self-enrichment, but the use of criminal methods for the acquisition or preservation of political influence itself. Naturally, such events are not visible to outsider potential voters whose notorious "free will" becomes the subject of the behind-the-scenes manipulations.

All this was of little concern to the members of the closest retinue of the then U.S. President who in June 1972, in the heat of the electoral campaign organized the breaking and entering into the headquarters of the Democratic Party in Washington's Watergate Hotel, to install listening devices and, subsequently, took a number of energetic measures to conceal the crime.

As a result of the Watergate scandal high figures in the administration were sentenced to jail, while the President himself was forced to resign.

Both in terms of the characters and the political consequences, Watergate is unique, unprecedented. Nevertheless, listening to the thundering of the American press on the subject of this event, one found it hard not to develop the impression that this involved a certain "super task" as well. If it is true that, drawing attention to something, one could thus draw public opinion away from a number of other things, this offered full proof of the statement. However noisy American propaganda might have been on the subject of Watergate, this could not change the true nature of this political scandal as one of the manifestations of the "ever more obvious" corruption "in the higher echelons of the governmental machinery" mentioned by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 25th CPSU Congress.

This is confirmed by the numerous data published in that same American press without, naturally, any kind of political summation. They pertain to the recent past, the present and even the immediate future and cover various areas and levels of activity of the state mechanism. "It Did Not Start with Watergate," was the title of the work by the known American journalist Lasky. However, it did not end with "Watergate." In the case of former Vice President Agnew criminal proceedings were instigated based on abuse data: "Criminal conspiracy," bribery and extortion he engaged in in his former positions, particularly as governor of Maryland. American justice was not so openly rough with him ("resign or else . . .") as the

American press occasionally presents matters. Here, as in other delicate cases of this kind, a delicate procedural mechanism was used--a "deal": in exchange for a resignation and for "not challenging" the charges of avoiding paying his income taxes, Agnew was sentenced to pay a fine of \$10,000 and turned loose. The juridical term was "unsupervised probation."

Incidentally, a word on enterprising governors. In that same Maryland, where Agnew previously ruled, Governor Mandel (along with five coconspirators) was charged with swindling and extortion. According to the indictment Mandel was accused of benefiting from the from the commercial enterprises of his friends in exchange for which used his influence in their favor on the legislative institutions of the state. The case lasted 11 weeks, after which it became clear that one of the jurors had been offered a bribe. The jury was dismissed and everything was started from scratch. In the final account, Mandel was found guilty and sentenced to four years in jail.

The case of Otto Kerner, twice (in 1961 and 1968) elected governor of Illinois and, subsequently, a federal appellate judge, presented a dramatic example of corruption at the higher echelons of the executive branch. Kerner became widely known as chairman of the President's Committee on Civil Disorder, which reached a number of radical conclusions, including the fact that American society is clearly split into a prospering (white) and poor (black) parts. Suddenly, like a thunderclap from a clear sky, in 1973 a federal court found Kerner guilty of "criminal conspiracy," swindling, avoiding payment of income taxes and perjury and sentenced him to three years in jail (see TIME, 24 May 1976, p 40).

The case on Capitol Hill appears to be no better and even worse. A federal grand jury in Washington considered the question of passing on to the court data on the ties between some 30 congressmen and South Korean interests, represented in Washington Seoul intelligence agent Pak Ton Sun. According to information which reached the American press and quite eloquent photographs published in some periodicals, here again it was a question of that same generous bribe taking and shameless bribe offering--in vulgar cash or through the use of the professional services of "ladies." All in all, 30 congressmen were investigated. This large number should not be considered seriously. Only three of them were reprimanded for "accepting" money and one, a California democrat (former congressman) R. Hanna, spent a year in jail for accepting bribes. The 36-point indictment in this case was dropped for "sincere" testimony given to Congress in mid-August 1979.

At the beginning of 1977 the popular weekly U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT published a table eloquently entitled "Officials for Sale," showing that in eight years, starting with 1969, 15 congressmen were prosecuted with results as follows:

<u>Congressman</u>	<u>Year Indicted</u>	<u>Charges and Results</u>
Brewster, dem, MI	1969	Accepted illegal gifts: fined \$10,000
Macnealy, rep, NY	1970	Nonpayment of taxes: released on "probation" and fined \$5,000
Dowdy, dem, Tex	1971	Perjury: sentenced to 6 months in jail and fined \$3,000
Gallagher, dem, NJ	1972	Avoidance of payment of taxes: sentenced to 6 months in jail and fined \$10,000
Brasco, dem, NY	1973	Participant in a conspiracy and receiving bribes: sentenced to 3 months in jail and fined \$10,000
Podell, dem, NY	1973	Member of criminal conspiracy and "conflict of interest": sentenced to 6 months in jail and fined \$5,000
Wally, rep, Penn	1973	Swindle and obstruction of justice: given probation and fine of \$11,000
Henry, rep, Florida	1974	Found innocent of the charge of perjury
Hansen, rep, Idaho	1974	Violation of the financial regulations of the electoral campaign law: 2-month jail sentence replaced by a \$2,000 fine
Roncallo, rep, NY	1974	Found innocent on charges of criminal conspiracy and extortion
Henshaw, rep, Calif	1975	Bribery
Jones, dem, Okla	1975	Failure to declare electoral campaign contributions: fined \$200
Wyatt, rep, Ore	1975	Violations of laws and campaign finance regulations: fined \$750
Hastings, rep, NY	1976	Swindling and false statements: sentenced to 5 years in jail
Helstocki, dem, NJ	1976	Charged with bribery

As it is impossible to discuss in detail all the items in this table, let us take as an example one of the congressmen. Congressman Helstocki, democrat, was prosecuted on charges of bribery and obstruction of criminal justice. The prosecution claimed that for a fee Helstocki submitted draft bills to Congress in favor of foreigners illegally residing in the country, fearing deportation. He was defeated at the November 1976 elections. However, two months later the federal district court postponed the trial of the case for an indeterminate time, having decided that the bills submitted by Helstocki could not be used as proof against him because of congressional immunity.

A number of similar examples may be found among other categories of officials. According to the Department of Justice, on the basis of federal legislation on official abuses alone, since 1970 about 1,600 people have been prosecuted. In 1976 alone 337 individuals were prosecuted, compared with 255 in 1975. Adding to this data on the higher echelons of state and local officials, the final figures will be considerably higher. The scale of the phenomenon may be judged by the fact that the Department of Justice now has a section for the struggle against "official corruption," which includes a separate group of 20 specialists in the investigation of "particularly sensitive" cases involving members of Congress. A great deal of hope is being placed on this section, for it is believed that "the entire reason" here lies in the impunity of elected or appointed bureaucrats who have violated the laws. However, local members of the department do not share this optimism. While not stating this openly, they nevertheless pointed out quite clearly at the nutritive corruption medium. This includes areas of contact between big commercial and political business and the drawing closer of these functionally different, yet socially ever more similar areas. "The system which requires a governmental approval of contracts, changes in zoning rates and property assessments for tax purposes organically creates grounds for the corruption of the state apparatus." This is the belief of Skinner, a federal district attorney in Illinois, a state made notorious by widespread political corruption (U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 28 February 1977, pp 36-37).

Naturally, this situation cannot fail to alarm those who must look into the future of politics. Therefore, they "take measures." This includes the recent decision passed by Congress to substantially increase the salaries and other payments to senators and congressmen. The naive idea that whoever gets more would need less is clearly visible among the reasons for this measure. However, the experience gained in the struggle against "white-collar crime" proves the opposite. Incidentally, public opinion reaction to such measures was unequivocal. "The American electorate," wrote reader J. Hammer to the editors of U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, "must always remember the method used by our Congress in recently raising the salaries of its members. In the past pickpockets were tried. Now they are elected to the Congress."

Other "preventive measures" in this area obviously rely on the trust of the public. For example, on the basis of a new and considerably stricter code

of ethics for congressmen, an attempt is being made to force them to inform the proper officials of that institution, in the greatest detail, of their outside income and "interests" (see NEWSWEEK, 14 March 1977, p 32). Could it be that the initiators of all these measures believe that, tomorrow, in their quarterly or other reports the congressmen will indicate the amounts of bribes received, fearing disciplinary penalties for "contempt of Congress" more than they today fear criminal punishment for bribery or other official abuses? Such assumptions proved to be thoughtless and reality, replacing assumptions with facts, refuted them quickly. At the beginning of February 1980 the American radio reported that the FBI has proof to the effect that a number of congressmen, including U.S. Senator Williams, Congressman Lederer and others, were unable to resist the acceptance of general gifts from personators who were, in fact, FBI agents, for abusing their position "in the interest of the contributors." The contributors or, simply stated, the bribers, pretended to be Arab "businessmen."

The ideological-political crisis of bourgeois society is a multi-tiered phenomenon whose individual elements interact and reciprocally influence each other. Corruption within the state machinery is an expression of the weakened moral norms and is contributing to the further development of the process. It encourages the growth of commercial and general penal crime and is frequently manifested in criminal abuses of power which, essentially, represent that same "white-collar crime" in the business of politics, undermining bourgeois democratic institutions, bourgeois political parties and the democratic process. Under the conditions of the domination of the state-monopoly system, the monopolies are trying to gain advantages in the competitive struggle, involving in it the corrupted state apparatus. In turn the latter uses the monopolies for the toeing of the proper line, using in the political struggle the same methods which have proved their adequacy in the area of economic competition. Today it is not only dollars that give power, but power provides abundant dollars as well.

That is precisely why the prospect for earning sufficient political "profits" in domestic or foreign policy leads to the fact that the bourgeois state and its leaders and representatives are ready to violate all human laws. Should such profits be substantial, there is no crime they would not commit even if threatened with the gallows.

5003

CSO: 1802

COMRADE KAPSUKAS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 60 pp 101-108

[Article by P. Grishkyavichus, Communist Party of Lithuania Central Committee first secretary]

[Text] The great traditions of the struggle waged by the heroic generations of revolutionaries of the Leninist guard inspired the Soviet people to new accomplishments for the triumph of communism. As the years pass the significance of the tremendous ideological, political and spiritual legacy they left shines ever more brightly. We always remember Comrade I. I. Brezhnev's words to the effect that one must "take the essence of the characters tempered by the revolution, take their revolutionary zeal, their profound communist convictions, their infinite loyalty to the great cause of our party, their flaming romanticism and unabated hatred for the enemies of the revolution; we must take all this and apply it to the solution of the various problems of the building of communism facing us today."

One such revolutionary was Vintas Simanovich Mitskyavichyus-Kapsukas (Mitskevich-Kapsukas)--the loyal student and fellow worker of V. I. Lenin, active propagandist of the ideas of scientific socialism, one of the founders of the Communist Party of Lithuania and member of the Comintern Executive Committee.

Mitskyavichyus (literary pseudonym and party name: Kapsukas) entered the path of the proletarian revolutionary at the very turn of the 20th century, when the great dawn of the first revolution was rising over Russia.

V. S. Mitskyavichyus was born on 7 April 1880 in Budvechyay Village, Vilkavishkakiy Rayon in Lithuania, to a family of peasants. As a high school student the adolescent began to actively participate in sociopolitical life. Pursued by the czarist authorities, he was forced to leave the country. In 1902-1904 Mitskyavichyus attended Berne University. The young revolutionary eagerly studied Marxism. He became the supporter of the political line of Lenin's ISKRA and promoted the idea of the overthrow of the autocracy.

The year 1903 was a turning point in Kapsukas' life. He entered the ranks of the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party and shared the beliefs of its left-wing.

In the 1905-1907 Russian revolution Kapsukas was a firm fighter against autocracy. The moment the first news of the Bloody Sunday in Petersburg was received he published the hectographed newspaper KOVA ("Struggle"), which described extensively workers' strikes and protest demonstrations in various cities and called for joint actions by the working people against czarism.

In the summer of the revolutionary year 1905 Kapsukas was one of the most energetic organizers of the agricultural workers' strikes in Kovenskaya Guberniya. This was a new phenomenon in the Lithuanian workers' movement.

As a member of the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party Central Committee, Kapsukas participated in preparations for the armed uprising in Lithuania in December 1905. He did a great deal to involve the peasantry in the revolutionary movement. In his theoretical studies he dealt extensively with the agrarian problem: they provide a thorough analysis of agrarian relations and an angry rebuttal to the defenders of the interests of the big landowners and, particularly, of the A. Smetona, the future fascist dictator of Lithuania. "The land must be expropriated from the landowners with no compensation whatever," Kapsukas wrote in 1906 (Vintsas Kapsukas, "Sochinieni" [Works], in Lithuanian, Vol 3, Vil'nyus, 1961, p 37). In the article "The Social Democrats and the Agrarian Problem," he reached the conclusion that peasants without or with little land "will join the general revolutionary movement only when we begin to fight for their immediate interests as well" (ibid, p 253). Thus the author defended Lenin's idea of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry in the democratic revolution.

It was precisely at a peasant meeting that V. Kapsukas was detained for the first time by the czarist police, in December 1905. After his last detention for revolutionary activities, in May 1907, he spent over six years in czarist jails. Like many revolutionaries, in as much as he could, he spent this time to broaden his Marxist education.

The hard conditions of prison life, particularly in Vladimir, greatly damaged Kapsukas' health--he contracted tuberculosis of the lungs--without breaking his revolutionary spirit.

In March 1913, after a partial amnesty, Kapsukas was sent to Siberia. However, he soon escaped from exile and settled in Krakov in the spring of 1914. Here he headed the foreign bureau of the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party, set up in 1912, and established personal contacts with Lenin and the other members of the Bolshevik party central committee. Kapsukas paid great attention to the unification of the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party with the RSDWP. As early as December 1908 the Fifth (All-Russian)

RSDMP Conference instructed the Central Committee "to take further steps to fulfill the wishes of the London congress on the unification of the SDPL with the RSDMP."

In the revolutionary newspaper VIL'NIS ("Wave"), which Lenin described as a press organ with a PRAVDA leaning, Kapsukas published materials explaining the position of the SDPL. Let us note, incidentally, that it was in that paper, in 1914, that Lenin's work "Draft Law on National Equality" was published. This was his first work published in Lithuanian. The contacts between Lenin and the Lithuanian revolutionaries and social democrats in Krakow contributed to the maturing of the cadres, who subsequently became the organizers of the Lithuanian Communist Party.

Lenin discussed the outbreak of World War I in the programmatic document "The War and the Russian Social Democrats." Lenin's manifesto on the attitude toward the war became a program for action for all revolutionary social democrats. On behalf of the SDPL foreign bureau, in November 1914, Kapsukas as well drafted a declaration on the attitude toward the war. It published under the title of "Declaration of the SDPL Foreign Bureau" (see V. Kapsukas, "Soch.," Vol 6, 1963, pp 19-21). The document properly rebuffed the members of the Lithuanian bourgeoisie who stated from the rostrum of the State Duma their support of the policy of war pursued by the czarist authorities. Despite the positions held by the social chauvinists in Russia and the West, the declaration stated that the Lithuanian Social Democrats "do not expect that the Lithuanian proletariat will be saved by the policy of conquest pursued by both German and Russian imperialism," that they defend class positions "which unite the Lithuanian proletariat in the struggle against czarism for the sake of the final triumph of socialism" (ibid, p 21).

The war found Kapsukas in Peronino. With a great deal of difficulty he was able to reach Switzerland and, from here, in December 1914, Great Britain. Settling in Scotland, he worked among the Lithuanian exiles--miners and metallurgical workers--edited the newspapers SOTSIAL-DEMOKRATAS and RANKPYAL'NIS ("Toiler") and maintained close contacts with the political emigres--Russian Bolsheviks and Polish and Latvian revolutionary social democrats.

Kapsukas' anti-militaristic activities irritated the British authorities. In order to avoid detention, in the summer of 1916 he secretly left for Canada from where he crossed into the United States. In Philadelphia he edited the weekly KOVA ("Struggle") and the journal NAUTOJI GADINE ("New Era").

As an emigre, Kapsukas displayed most lively interest in the revolutionary struggle of the Russian proletariat. He did a great deal to energize the Lithuanian workers' movement as its structural component.

At the onset of World War I, when the threat of the occupation of Lithuania by the troops of the Kaiser's Germany arose, about 300 workers, employees,

peasants and students were evacuated from their native areas. Many of them settled in Petrograd, Moscow, Voronezh, Tula, Yekaterinoslav, Nizhniy Novgorod and other cities.

On Kapsukas' suggestion the 21 November 1916 Conference of Lithuanian Revolutionary Social Democrats, held in Petrograd, passed a decree on joining the Petrograd organization of the RSDWP. It formed a Lithuanian rayon in the city and elected a rayon committee, a representative of which became member of the Petrograd Bolshevik party committee. The process of formation of Lithuanian Bolshevik organizations was initiated (initially rayons, followed by sections at local party committees). At that time the active leaders of the Lithuanian Bolsheviks were K. Rimsha, K. Poshela in Tartu, Yu. Kumsha, Yu. Opanakis, the proletarian poet Yu. Yanonis in Petrograd, V. Ryakashyus in Moscow and B. Matusyevichyus in Voronezh. Many of them subsequently played a noted role in the revolutionary Lithuanian events of 1918-1919. V. Kapsukas welcomed joyfully the news of the fall of the czarist autocracy. In June 1917 he arrived in Petrograd and immediately joined the ranks of the Bolshevik party (at the beginning of the 1920's, as an active leader of the revolutionary social democrats, his party membership longevity was acknowledged as of 1903). The party set Kapsukas to work in the Lithuanian rayon of the Petrograd RSDWP(b) organization as an editor of the weekly TIYESA (PRAVDA), which the Lithuanian Bolsheviks had begun to publish as of 12 April 1917. Here he worked hand in hand with another noted Lithuanian revolutionary, Z. Angaretis. They gave the paper a firm Bolshevik direction and actively struggled against bourgeois ideology and opportunistic elements. In 1917 12 of Lenin's works were published in TIYESA.

The all-city conference of Petersburg Bolsheviks elected Kapsukas delegate to the sixth party congress with full voting rights. In his speech at the congress he reported that the Lithuanian organizations of the Bolshevik party had about 2,000 members and assured the delegates, ". . . In the future, working hand in hand with the Russian revolutionary social democrats, we shall be able to rally under the banners of the revolutionary social democratic movement the tens of thousands of Lithuanian workers scattered throughout Russia."

Kapsukas' words were no different from his deeds. In September and October 1917 he visited Moscow, Khar'kov, Nizhniy Novgorod, Voronezh, Yekaterinoslav and Tula addressing meetings of Lithuanian refugees and calling upon them to struggle, together with the Russian workers, for the victory of the revolution. Returning from his trip, in the 3 November 1917 TIYESA issue, Kapsukas wrote: "Lithuanian social democratic organizations have been established everywhere and have established contacts with the local RSDWP (Bolshevik) organizations. . . . Such was the case in Petrograd, Kronstadt, Revel', Moscow, Nizhniy Novgorod, Tula, Voronezh, Khar'kov, Yekaterinoslav, Rostov-na-Donu and Irkutsk."

On 10 September 1917, at a meeting of the Petrograd organization, the Lithuanian Bolsheviks elected members of the Provisional Central Bureau of

Lithuanian Sections of the RSDMP(b). On 16 (23) October 1917, in Lenin's presence, the RSDMP(b) Central Committee approved the Provisional Central Bureau of the Lithuanian Sections, consisting of Kapsukas, Angaretis and Dumsha.

The daily mass-political and organizational work done by the bureau and Kapsukas, its leader, yielded results: many thousands of Lithuanian refugees took active part in the October Revolution.

V. Kapsukas was granted the honor of being a delegate to the Second Congress of Soviets. In his speech he warmly supported Lenin's Decree on Peace. When the White Guard forces of Kerenkiy-Krasnov mounted their offensive against revolutionary Petrograd, the Military-Revolutionary Committee assigned him, along with other revolution commissars, to the Gatchino front.

The victory of the October Revolution was a turning point in the revolutionary workers' movement and the national-liberation movement of the oppressed peoples the world over. To the people of Lithuania as well, occupied since 1915 by the Kaiser's Germany, it opened real possibilities for social and national liberation. On 2 (15) November 1917, the government of the young Soviet republic proclaimed the "Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia." A People's Commissariat for Nationalities Affairs was set up to insure the practical implementation of Soviet national policy. It included national commissariats. By decree of 8 (21) December 1917, Kapsukas was appointed commissar for Lithuanian affairs. Angaretis became his deputy. By March 1918 44 departments of the Commissariat for Lithuanian Affairs had been set up in various Russian cities. With the help of these departments over 4,000 Lithuanian soldiers enrolled in the Red Army and, together with Russian, Ukrainian, Latvian and other workers and peasants, worthily defended the gains of the October Revolution.

Following the conclusion of the Brest Peace Treaty, the urgent task arose of creating a communist party of Lithuania in the occupied area and to mount a national-liberation struggle against the German conquerors. These efforts were comprehensively supported by the RKP(b) Central Committee through the Provisional Central Bureau of Lithuanian Sections. In the article "The Tasks of Our Comrades in Lithuania," published in TIYESA on 27 July 1918, Kapsukas wrote: "Our task in Lithuania as well is to create an autonomous proletarian communist party, united with similar communist parties in other countries, rather than with its 'own' bourgeoisie and various petit bourgeois Menshevik social-patriots. . . ."

In the autumn of 1918 Kapsukas visited Vil'nyus twice as a consultant to the Soviet delegation on establishing the border between Russia and Germany. He met with P. Rydukiyevichyus and other leaders of the communist party which was being organized, and gave them the necessary advice and recommendations.

When the grounds were ready for the creation of a communist party, the revolutionary Marxist K. Bydukyavichyus, K. Kernovich and P. Meylus, together with the communists who had returned from evacuation, convened the First Congress of the Communist Party of Lithuania. The congress met on 1-3 October 1918, clandestinely, in German-occupied Vil'nyus. The congress proclaimed the founding of the communist party, adopted a number of resolutions and elected its leading organ--a central committee.

On 13 November 1918 Soviet Russia abrogated the predatory Brest Peace Treaty. Under the guidance of the recently created communist party, the Lithuanian working people mounted their struggle for a soviet system. Taking into consideration the ripening revolutionary events, the RKP(b) Central Committee assigned to Vil'nyus, to do party work, a group of leading personalities. Leaving Revel', in the course of his travel, on 20 November 1918 Kapsukas wrote the RKP(b) Central Committee the following: "In the present responsible aspect of our work in occupied areas, we feel particularly strongly the need to maintain closest possible contacts with the RKP (Bolshevik) Central Committee. . . ."

At the beginning of the December 1918 Kapsukas, Angaretis, Taikhovskiy and Dimanshteyn were coopted into the Communist Party of Lithuania Central Committee. At the same time, in Vil'nyus, Kaunas, Shyaulyey and Panevezhia --the main cities in the area--the working people elected their soviets of workers' deputies. At its 8 December 1918 Vil'nyus meeting, the Communist Party of Lithuania Central Committee formed the Provisional Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government headed by V. S. Mitakyavichyus-Kapsukas. The manifesto of the provisional revolutionary government, drafted by Kapsukas and coordinated with the RKP(b) Central Committee, was published on 16 December. It read: "In the name of the rebelled workers and poorest peasants of Lithuania and in the name of the Lithuanian Red Army we proclaim overthrow the authority of the German Military Occupation, the Lithuanian Tariba and all other bourgeois national councils and committees. The entire power will be assumed by the soviets of workers' and of landless and small landowning deputies of Lithuania." The manifesto announced the creation of a Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, which will march in the future "hand in hand with Soviet Russia and with all other countries who have taken the path of a world socialist revolution," and presented a program for the activities of the soviet government.

The RSFSR Sovnarkom decree, dated 22 December 1918, signed by Lenin, stated: "In answer to the request of the Lithuanian Soviet Government, the Council of People's Commissars declares the following:

"1. The Russian Soviet Government acknowledges the independence of the Lithuanian Soviet Republic. The Russian Soviet Government acknowledges as the supreme authority of Lithuania that of the Lithuanian soviets and, before the congress of soviets, the authority of the Provisional Revolutionary Workers' Government of Lithuania, headed by Comrade Mitakevich-Kapsukas."

All these documents are of major historical significance in the life of the Lithuanian people. They marked the restoration of their statehood on a new, soviet social base. This was made possible thanks to the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which broke the chains of social and national oppression.

Throughout the tempestuous period of the struggle for the victory of the soviet system in Lithuania and against the foreign intervention, Kapsukas was in the thick of events, heading the revolutionary mass movement.

Between December 1918 and January 1919 soviets were created on most of the territory of Lithuania. They engaged in extensive economic and social changes. The big factories and plants and landed estates were given to the workers and the soviet organs. With the help of the workers' trade unions production was organized. Free and universal education was proclaimed. On 11 March 1919 the republic's soviet government passed a decree, signed by V. Kapsukas, opening a university in Vil'nyus. In order to strengthen the front of the struggle against the foreign intervention and the local bourgeoisie, in accordance with the decrees passed by the congresses of Belorussian and Lithuanian soviets, on 27 February 1919 the republics united and a joint government was formed--the Council of People's Commissars of the Lithuanian-Belorussian SSR. Kapsukas was made its chairman.

The armed struggle against foreign intervention and the counterrevolution continued throughout the spring and summer of 1919. However, the forces were uneven. Despite the heroism of the Lithuanian units of the Red Army and the Moscow workers' and Red Army units who came to their aid, along with the Latvian soviet subunits, by the end of August 1919 the soviet system was suppressed on Lithuanian territory. Bloody reprisals were launched against the participants in the socialist revolution. A bourgeois dictatorship was established in Lithuania with the open support of the interventionists.

However, the struggle continued. The reactionary offensive repeatedly met with a decisive rebuff on the part of the working people. The general strike of Kaunas workers, in September 1919, the mass strike of agricultural workers in Suvalkii (the southwestern part of Lithuania), in October 1919, the rebellion of the soldiers of the Kaunas garrison in February 1920, the new general strike of Kaunas workers in June 1920 and other actions proved the militant feelings of the Lithuanian proletariat and the selfless work done by the communists in clandestinity.

Residing in Smolensk, Kapsukas and other Lithuanian Communist Party leaders published newspapers and pamphlets which were clandestinely shipped to Lithuania and distributed among the communists and Komsomol members.

In the course of the entente's 1920 campaign against Soviet Russia, the Red Army dealt a major defeat to the Pilsudski forces. On 14 July 1920 G. Gay's cavalry corps liberated Vil'nyus. Kapsukas and a number of other

communist party leaders moved to Vil'nyus where they published the newspaper KOMUNISTAS and other publications which were disseminated in Lithuania.

By the end of August 1920, in accordance with the Soviet-Lithuanian 12 July 1920 Peace Treaty, the RSPSR Government yielded Vil'nyus and the Vil'nyus area to bourgeois Lithuania. By persuasion of the RKP(b) Central Committee, despite the danger, Kapsukas remained behind to engage in clandestine party work. On 9 October 1920 Vil'nyus and the Vil'nyus area were occupied by the forces of the Polish General Zeligowski. Kapsukas continued his clandestine work in the occupied city and guided the Communist Party of Lithuania Vil'nyus Okrug Committee.

The defeat of the socialist revolution in Lithuania and the cruel bourgeois reprisals could not fail to influence the moods of the communists working in clandestinity. The less stable began to withdraw from the revolutionary movement, while a certain instability affected others. The Lithuanian Communist Party was experiencing a crisis. The solution to the crisis was indicated by the Third Congress of the Communist Party of Lithuania, which met in clandestinity in October 1921 in Koenigsburg (East Prussia). The work of the congress was chaired by Kapsukas, who had arrived clandestinely. In the Central Committee Accountability Report covering the period of the soviet system in Lithuania, Kapsukas admitted that the republic's soviet government he headed had made errors in the implementation of the agrarian policy by refusing to divide the landed estates among peasants with no or little land. On the basis of the decree of the Second Comintern Congress on the agrarian problem, and Lenin's work "The Left-Wing Infantile Disease of Communism," on Kapsukas' suggestion the Third Communist Party of Lithuania Congress passed a resolution emphasizing that the victory of the socialist revolution in Lithuania calls for involving in the struggle not only the proletariat but the poorest and the petty peasantry.

The third congress elected Kapsukas member of the Communist Party of Lithuania Central Committee. During the final day of the congress, German police rushed into the house where the meetings were taking place and arrested the delegates, including Kapsukas. The danger arose that detained could be given to the Lithuanian bourgeois police. However, thanks to the assistance of the Soviet Government, after serving a two-month sentence for illegal stay in the country, they were expelled from Germany and went to Moscow.

In Moscow Kapsukas worked as a teacher at the Lithuanian sector of the Communist University for Western National Minorities and edited the journal KOMUNARAS. At the same time he actively participated in the activities of the Communist Party of Lithuania Central Committee Politburo. In February 1923 Kapsukas was given a major assignment by the Comintern Executive Committee. In 1926 he became head of the Polish-Baltic land secretariat. At the Fifth Comintern Congress, in 1924, he was elected candidate member of the Comintern Executive Committee and, at the sixth congress, in 1928,

member of the executive committee. He participated in a number of conferences and congresses of the Polish Communist Party and its components--the Communist Party of Western Belorussia and Western Ukraine and the communist parties of Estonia and Latvia and spoke on the activities of such parties at executive committee plenums and Comintern congresses. He published articles in the journal COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

V. Kapsukas was a brilliant journalist, writer, literary critic and scientist. He is the author of numerous studies on the history of the revolutionary movement in Lithuania. Kapsukas' literary legacy includes about 2,000 articles published in no less than 80 periodicals. The associates of the Lithuanian Branch of the CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism have prepared and published a 12-volume collection of his works. Kapsukas summed up the experience of the history of the 1918-1919 revolutionary events in Lithuania in his monograph "The First Proletarian Revolution in Lithuania and the Soviet System." His work "The Lithuanian Bourgeoisie" is a criticism of bourgeois-nationalist ideology and fascist regime in Lithuania. Kapsukas' memoirs and stories are contained in the book "In Czarist Jails."

The working people in Soviet Lithuania deeply revere the memory of the noted revolutionary. In 1955 the oldest educational institution in the republic--Vil'nyus University--was named after him and the city of Marijampol was renamed Kapsukas. A monument to Kapsukas was erected in one of the squares of the Lithuanian capital in 1962. A printing press in Kaunas, a number of streets in the republic's cities and a number of kolkhozes have been named after him. Kapsukas' life and activities have been the themes of museum exhibitions.

The centennial of V. S. Mitskyavichyus-Kapsukas' birth will be celebrated on the eve of the 40th anniversary of the restoration of the soviet system in Lithuania, on 21 July 1980. Soviet Lithuania is steadfastly following the path of prosperity, construction, all-round development of economy and culture and the shaping of the new man--the builder of a communist society. The Lithuanian people owe their achievements to the Soviet system, the fraternal family of peoples of our great multinational country and the socialist way of life.

The ideology of Marxism-Leninism has been established in our area forever. We have always learned and are learning from Vladimir Il'ich Lenin how to work, struggle and adamantly march toward our objective--communism. We draw our forces from the inexhaustible and vivifying source: the Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

The entire development of Soviet Lithuania, as that of each republic in the Soviet state, is proof of the triumph of the Leninist national policy and of the infinite opportunities which have been opened to each nation within the indissoluble Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Today, under the leadership of the CPSU and its Leninist Central Committee, together with the entire Soviet people, the working people of the Lithuanian SSR are struggling for the implementation of the historical decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and the 10th Five-Year Plan.

The memory of the fiery revolutionary and loyal son of the party V. S. Mitskyavichyus-Kapsukas is perpetuated in the communist constructive toil of the Lithuanian people. His life, revolutionary activities and infinite loyalty to the Leninist ideas and literary legacy are an example which calls for living, working and struggling as did Lenin.

5003

CSO: 1802

OUTSTANDING LEADER OF THE FRENCH COMMUNISTS

Moscow KOMPUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 80 pp 109-118

[Article by E. Arsen'yev on the 80th anniversary of the birth of Maurice Thorez]

[Text] The French people have raised many outstanding leaders who have embodied the best features of the fighters of the international workers' and communist movements of the 20th century. Unquestionably, Maurice Thorez belongs to the most outstanding among them. For 34 years, until his sudden death in 1964, he headed the Communist Party of France, one of the biggest and authoritative communist parties in the capitalist West.

Son and grandson of a miner, Maurice Thorez began his labor life early. The October Revolution, which triggered in him an ever-present revolutionary enthusiasm, helped him to make a definitive choice of careers. In March 1919 he entered the socialist party and, together with other internationalists, struggled for its affiliation with the Third International. He welcomed as the victory of internationalism the decision of the December 1920 Tours Congress, at which the CPF was founded.

From that moment on his entire life belonged to the party. He grew and matured together with the party. From his very first steps in the labor movement he taught how to think and act soberly, not to remain in the tail end of events without, however, yielding to anarchist feelings, which, as assessed by V. I. Lenin, greatly harmed the French workers' movement.

He was elected member of the CPF Central Committee in 1924, at the Lyons Congress; in 1925 he was elected member of the Politburo and CC CPF secretary; at the age of 30 he was elected secretary general of the party. In the last months of his life he was chairman of the CPF.

Starting with 1932 M. Thorez has been invariably elected a deputy to the French National Assembly.

All of Maurice Thorez' activities are closely linked with the French and international workers' movement at its new stage, inaugurated by the

October Revolution, in the period of the organization of the Communist Party of France and its transformation into the battle vanguard of the French working people. Together with his fellow fighters and friends Marcel Cachin, Paul Vaillant-Couturier, Jacques Duclos, Benoit Frachon and many others, Maurice Thorez played an outstanding role in linking the French workers' movement with the ideas of scientific socialism and the dissemination and propaganda of Marxism-Leninism.

He was leader of the new, Leninist type, a true son of the French working people, tempered in the class struggle for the revolutionary reorganization of the world, having earned tremendous authority and respect among the communists and working people in the country and in the world communist movement. The more time separates us from the years when we heard the voice of this outstanding revolutionary, the clearer becomes the importance of his activities to the French and international workers' movements. His name and personal example inspire, as in the past, the communists in the struggle for democracy and socialism, for strengthening international solidarity with all liberation movements and for friendship with the USSR.

It is precisely for this reason that the class enemy is not abandoning its efforts to cast aspersions on the name of this impeccable person and communist, to cast aspersions on the ideas for which M. Thorez fought together with the party. However, these efforts are vain. The French working people—with the CPF in their vanguard—are continuing the great cause to which Maurice Thorez dedicated his life.

In the Struggle for a Party of a New Type

Throughout his life M. Thorez tirelessly toiled on the creation and consolidation of a party of a new type, a battle vanguard of the working class, armed with revolutionary theory.

Lenin, who made a profound study of the experience of the revolutionary movement in France, had faith in the forces and possibilities of the French working class, who had given a number of examples of heroic struggle for social liberation. The letter of the Presidium of the Second Comintern Congress to all members of the French Socialist Party stated that, "It cannot be that the revolutionary French working class, with its amazing revolutionary traditions, culture, readiness for self-sacrifice and splendid temperament, would fail to create a powerful communist party at a time when the expiration of the bourgeois system has clearly begun" (V. I. Lenin was among the signatories of this letter). Meanwhile, referring precisely to the French example, two years later Lenin pointed out that the reorganization of the old type of parliamentary and reformist party into a truly revolutionary party is an exceptionally difficult matter.

Indeed, following the Tours Congress, the CPF continued to suffer from many of the social democratic vices. Ideological discord reigned in the party. Factions with their own centers remained. Furthermore, toward the middle

of the 1920's, the party's leadership was seized by a sectarian group which scorned work among the masses. As a result, the party's influence declined and at the beginning of the 1930's its membership had been reduced to 40,000 people. Maurice Thorez and his fellow workers, relying on the Leninist ideas and Comintern aid and support, deserve great credit for the fact that the French working class was able to surmount these difficulties and to create a communist party which was able to properly withstand even most severe trials.

M. Thorez invariably followed Lenin's behest that only a party which "has been able to link itself inseparably with the entire life of its class and through it with the entire mass of the exploited and to instill total trust in this class and this mass" could hope for success (see "Poin. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 41, p 187). To achieve this it was necessary to break with the social democratic concepts of the party as a debate club or an organization whose objectives were exclusively geared to the electoral struggle. As M. Thorez wrote afterwards, an open struggle was launched in 1930-1932 leading the entire mass of the communists for a rebirth of the party, the restructuring of its political and organizational work and the strengthening of its unity. "Down with the Dummies!" and "The People Are Beginning to Openly Express Their Views" are the titles of articles written by Thorez calling upon the communists to become the leaders of the masses, articles which met with a lively response among them.

M. Thorez always saw to it that the working class indeed played the main role in the party and that workers be represented in all its leading organs, among the communist deputies and in the editorial rooms of the party press. As early as the mid-1920's, following his election as CC CPF secretary, the party took a course toward strengthening its influence at enterprises and creating party cells in plants, factories, offices and schools, i.e., where the fiercest class struggle was factually being waged. This line was entirely justified. Since then party work at enterprises has remained the focal point of attention of the French communists. At its 23d congress (May 1979) the CPF had 10,000 organizations in enterprises.

Emphasizing that the CPF is a party of the working class both in terms of the objectives of the struggle and its social composition, M. Thorez always worked for the party to unify the best elements in the toiling people. The French communists are proud of the fact that their party was joined by outstanding men of science and culture such as Anatole France, Henri Barbusse, Paul Eluard, Paul Vaillant-Couturier, Frederik Joliot-Curie, Paul Langevin, Pablo Picasso, Louis Aragon, Fernand Leger and others. M. Thorez maintained close friendships with many of them.

M. Thorez played a decisive role in strengthening the party on the basis of the Leninist principles of democratic centralism and in the creation of a party with a single will. He energetically struggled against all manifestations of factionalism and group forming. He frequently emphasized that the party cannot be an association of individual factions and clans.

At the same, M. Thorez ascribed essential significance to the initiative and political activity of all CPF organizations, the development of criticism and self-criticism and the participation of party members in the formulation and implementation of the decisions of party congresses and of other leading organs. He said that "criticism and self-criticism are the very life of the party. They are the breath without which it could not exist" (M. Thorez, "Izbrannyye Stat'i i Rech'i" [Selected Articles and Speeches], Politizdat, Moscow, 1966, p 75).

M. Thorez believed that the education, training and selection of party cadres is a matter for the entire party and for all its committees and organizations. Need we mention that M. Thorez himself--a "professional revolutionary"--as he described himself in his autobiography "Son of the People," fully possessed these qualities which he considered decisive for party workers.

Maurice Thorez' most attractive personality features were the concentrated expression of the fact that he was a true popular tribune. His fiery speeches at party congresses and meetings and in parliament, and his sharp articles in the press were imbued with the spirit of the class struggle and met with profound response among the working people. He could not stand high-sounding phrases which concealed meaningless thoughts and drastically criticized the amateurs of theatrical gestures and demagogy. His inviolable rule was unity of word and action.

He enjoyed the party's undisputed prestige and respect. However, occasionally he found himself in the minority in the discussion of one or another problem. He worked for the unification of the communists around the party course and called upon them openly to acknowledge their errors in order to promptly draw the necessary lessons. Thorez firmly rejected the attempts of the class enemy to present the nature display of trust in and respect for the party leaders as a cult of personality. "We have collective leadership," he said at the 1956 CPF Plenum. "It is imperfect. However, the unquestionable truth is that the political bureau is a collective organ. . . ." "The formula 'Maurice Thorez' party' is faulty . . ." he said at the same plenum.

Like the Bolshevik party, the French communists and, personally, M. Thorez strengthened the communist party in the course of a tireless struggle on two fronts: against right-wing and left-wing opportunism, guided by the Leninist thought that any weakening or ignoring of socialist ideology means the strengthening of bourgeois ideology.

Opportunism operated in the French labor movement in a variety of clothing: "left-wing" communists, sectarians, liquidationists, Trotskyites, supporters of the "dampening" of the class struggle, preachers of "national communism" Exposing opportunism and its specific carriers, M. Thorez exposed its social roots, which he considered to be the petit bourgeois influence on the working class, and the attempts of the class

enemy to lead the working people away from the revolutionary path and to force them to reconcile themselves with capitalist reality.

M. Thorez also noted that the difficulties of this struggle are occasionally related to the party's successes as well, for opportunism can, in particular, be expressed in the pursuit of immediate and imaginary advantages to the detriment of the basic interests of the workers' movement and the abandonment of an independent class policy for the sake of such advantages. This would mean, he emphasized, the transformation of the party into something like an appendix to social democracy, led by the bourgeoisie.

M. Thorez firmly rebuffed this opportunistic trend. He always indicated the inadmissibility of a conciliatory attitude toward revisionists, who, citing the "freedom of expression of thoughts," are essentially fighting against the party line. "We do not grant people whose actions within the party are coordinated with the attacks mounted by our enemies outside the party the right to the 'freedom' to disseminate within our ranks their subversive anti-communist views," M. Thorez said. "We would rather accept the freedom of putting these people outside the party" (op cit, p 386).

Unity Between Revolutionary Theory and Practice

A person of broad Marxist and general culture, M. Thorez considered that one of the party's unavoidable tasks is the profound mastery of revolutionary theory and its creative development and skillful application in accordance with specific historical conditions. He constantly turned to the works of the Marxist-Leninist classics and was able to read them in the original. In an effort to benefit from the entire wealth of Lenin's works M. Thorez learned Russian. He always saw in Leninism an inexhaustible source of creative thinking of permanent significance to the international workers' movement and a theory and method for the revolutionary transformation of the world.

"No single Marxist worthy of the name," M. Thorez said at the 11th CPF Congress, "could ignore the very rich contribution made by Lenin, who deepened and developed Marx' theory. . . . Marxism-Leninism and dialectical materialism are our compass. It enables us to follow a path which is not always smooth without losing sight of the main objective: the total liberation of the French working class. . . ."

M. Thorez' work itself was an example of unity of revolutionary thought with practice, proving his outstanding talent as the leader of the workers' movement and major Marxist-Leninist theoretician.

Better than anyone else M. Thorez did a great deal to develop and enrich Marxist theory on the basis of the experience of the French workers' movement and in accordance with French national and historical characteristics and traditions. Yet he never absolutized them, considering it necessary to

rely on the joint experience of the entire international workers' movement. "Each communist party," M. Thorez wrote, "taking into consideration the conditions of its country, is making its contribution to the enrichment of our theory and, at the same time, sees to it that the theory is not distorted under the pretext of taking local characteristics into consideration, characteristics which should neither be ignored nor exaggerated" (op cit, pp 381-382).

The contribution which the French communists and M. Thorez personally have made to the development of the Leninist theory of the allies of the working class is widely known.

Heading the party in 1930, M. Thorez favored the making of a decisive turn in its policy on the question of work among the masses. The CPF boldly took the path of rallying all democratic and anti-fascist forces in the struggle against fascism and the threat of war and gained the extensive support of the working people for the slogan raised by Thorez of "Popular Front in the Struggle for Bread, Freedom and Peace."

As M. Thorez frequently emphasized, the Popular Front, to whose creation the communist party made a decisive contribution, was not an electoral maneuver or a parliamentary coalition. Both then and in subsequent years, noting the importance of a political agreement with other left-wing parties, M. Thorez pointed out that one cannot rely only on an "alliance at the top" and that the alliance among leftist forces could be strong only if it is based on the powerful support of the working people and is strengthened in the struggle for the class interests of the working people and for peace, democracy and socialism. Thanks to the Popular Front France became a country in which fascism was given a decisive rebuff. This was of tremendous international significance and helped to strengthen the positions of the anti-fascist forces the world over. At the same time the working people were able to achieve major social gains: a 40-hour work week, paid leave, collective contracts, higher wages, and so on.

In all this Maurice Thorez tirelessly called upon the communists, while promoting unity of action with the other democratic forces, in no case and under no pretext to abandon their principles and autonomous class policy or the dissemination of their views and independent efforts to organize the class struggle of the working people. Despite all the intrigues of the class enemy and the opportunists, the party steadfastly followed this line and strengthened its positions: by the end of 1937 the CPF had over 340,000 members and had become the biggest political party in France. The Seventh Comintern Congress supported and highly rated the CPF policy on the question of the Popular Front.

In his speech at the 17th CPF Congress, in May 1964, the last for M. Thorez, he expressed his deep faith in the Leninist ideas of the unity of the workers' and democratic movements.

M. Thorez' contribution to the development of the question of the means of transition to socialism, on the basis of a specific study of political circumstances in France and the new ratio of forces in the international arena which developed after World War II, was an example of his political innovativeness. M. Thorez frequently returned to this idea and developed it. At the 11th CFF Congress (1947) he stated that "the French people, rich in great political traditions, will find their own way. However, history teaches us that there is no way without struggle." M. Thorez noted that in the peaceful or violent way to socialism, it will be a question of a sharp class struggle and of the need to insure within it the leading role of the working class and its vanguard--the communist party. He cautioned against illusions, pointing out that the gravity of the struggle will depend above all on the opposition of the class enemy.

He firmly opposed the attempts of the opportunists to use the question of the variety of ways and means of transition to socialism in order to question the significance of the general principles of socialism and the experience of the socialist countries. He pointed out that more favorable conditions for the struggle for a peaceful way to socialism arose, above all, precisely thanks to the existence of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. ". . . If the path to socialism to us, the proletariat of the Western countries, will be easier," M. Thorez wrote, "we owe this to the sacrifices of the fighters of the October 1917 revolution, the heroism of the Communist Party and all working people of the Soviet Union and the daring and sagacity they displayed in the course of the long period of building socialism. . . ."

M. Thorez' views on the cooperation among democratic parties in France in the transition to socialism are also of significant theoretical and practical interest. Analyzing the social structure of French society and the deployment of class forces, the French communists reached the conclusion that such cooperation (communists and socialists above all) is possible not only in the period of struggle for democratic changes and against the power of big capital, but in the building of socialism as well, with the condition that the socialists make a total break with the policy of class conciliation.

These conclusions were of major importance in uniting the progressive forces of the country in the struggle for democracy and social progress. M. Thorez frequently recalled Lenin's thought that, ". . . In the way that victorious socialism is impossible without total democracy, we cannot prepare ourselves for the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie without waging a comprehensive, systematic and revolutionary struggle for democracy" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 27, p 253).

Both in the period of the Popular Front and in the postwar period, together with the entire communist party, M. Thorez firmly stood up in the defense of the democratic freedoms earned by the working class against reactionary encroachments and for broadening the rights of democratic parties and trade

unions. As members of the cabinet, in 1945-1947, the communists and, personally, M. Thorez succeeded in passing a number of measures aimed at the democratization of socioeconomic life and at improving the situation of the working people.

In accordance with Lenin's thought, M. Thorez called for responding to each manifestation of oppression and arbitrariness wherever they occurred and whatever class the affected. He called for rallying the broadest possible masses in the struggle for democratic objectives.

He considered exceptionally important to be always guided by a class approach to the problems of democracy. He tirelessly exposed all attempts by revisionists and reformists to impose the idea of "pure" democracy and to consider it as nonclass category and the bourgeois state as neutral and above class.

Opposing any underestimating of democratic freedoms by the working class under capitalist conditions, M. Thorez emphasized that true popular rule is possible only under socialism. He admired the achievements of socialist democracy in the Soviet Union and considered them a powerful incentive in the struggle of the working people in capitalist countries.

Many of M. Thorez' works on problems such as the general crisis of capitalism and its manifestations in France, the nature of the contemporary working class and the position of the French working people, and the policy of the CPF in the fields of ideology and culture remain valuable and topical, and so are his writings in defense of dialectical materialism and in the substantiation and development of proletarian internationalism.

Fighter for Peace, Patriot, Internationalist

M. Thorez made a tremendous contribution to the cause of the peace and independence of the peoples. The struggle for peace and against the forces of aggression and reaction, he waged together with the party, developing on a national base, was always profoundly international. It was inseparably linked with solidarity with the Soviet Union and with the struggle of the peoples for independence and freedom and against fascism, imperialism and colonialism. A spirit of solidarity with all revolutionary and liberation forces was inherent in the very character of M. Thorez, and any manifestation of national exclusivity and narrow mindedness was profoundly alien to him.

Thus despite cruel reprisals in 1923 the CPF organized mass actions in France against the occupation of the Ruhr. M. Thorez was among those who were promoted by the party to responsible positions in those difficult times. As early as 1925, M. Thorez headed the central committee for action against the colonial war in Morocco and contributed to the organization of the first political international solidarity strike in the country.

In the period of the Popular Front, heading the CPF, M. Thorez made an outstanding contribution to the struggle against war and fascism. He condemned the Franco mutiny in Spain as an aggressive act committed by international fascism and actively participated in giving international aid to the Spanish republicans. The cause of the Republic of Spain is our own cause, it is the cause of France, the cause of freedom and peace, said M. Thorez, expressing the position of the CPF and exposing the policy of "nonintervention," which he accurately identified as a surrender to fascism.

The French communists have not forgotten the truly internationalist lessons of the struggle against direct and "sliding" aggression committed by imperialism in fact and concealed behind hypocritical calls for "nonintervention" and "neutrality." As in M. Thorez' time, today they stand on a clear class position in terms of the Afghan revolution, exposing imperialist intrigues and showing their solidarity with the people of Afghanistan and the help given to them by the USSR.

M. Thorez exposed the attempts of the ruling French and British circles to conspire with Hitlerite Germany and to direct its aggression against the Soviet Union. He condemned the Munich conspiracy as the betrayal of the interests of peace and of France. Under circumstances of anti-Soviet hysteria, the French communists adamantly continued their struggle for strengthening the cooperation and alliance between France and the USSR, considering this the most important guarantee for European peace and security.

The appeal by M. Thorez and J. Duclos on 10 July 1940 to mount a nationwide struggle for the national salvation of France and against Nazism, rang out like like the tocsin in a terrible year. "France, which is losing its blood, wishes to live free and independent. . . . Never will such a great nation be a nation of slaves. . . . It is only around the working class, ardent and generous, full of faith and courage, for the future belongs to it, it is only around working class, headed by the communist party, the party with a clear conscience, honest and heroic that a front of freedom, independence and rebirth of France can be created." The CPF honorably fulfilled this task, performing a patriotic and international exploit which helped to assert it as the leading French political party.

M. Thorez frequently emphasized that the victory over fascism became possible thanks to the Soviet Union and its decisive contribution to the common struggle. "The October Revolution," he said, "rescued France and the entire world from fascist barbarism."

At the beginning of 1949, at the peak of the cold war, when American militarists were literally blackmailing the nations with the atom bomb and when, as M. Thorez said, "World peace was hanging on a thread," he was one of the first to draw the perspicacious conclusion that a new world war is not inevitable and could be prevented.

Naturally, H. Thorez firmly cautioned against complacency and underestimating the danger of war. He called for determining the reasons for the threat of war and for exposing the slanderous and provocative campaigns of the warmongers, repeating Jean Jaures' memorable words: "Capitalism carries within itself war like clouds carry a thunderstorm." He pointed out the direct link between the policy of war and the policy of attacking the rights and living standard of the working people.

The aggressive nature of imperialism has not changed, he said. However, there are forces in the world which, through joint action, can wreck aggressive intrigues: the powerful world socialist system, the main bulwark of peace and progress, the international workers' movement and the national liberation forces. This conclusion contributed to the development of a mass movement in the defense of the peace with the support of the international working class. It remains entirely topical today, when the effect of the forces of peace and socialism on the development of world events has increased incomparably. Applying the Leninist style of turning to the masses, H. Thorez tirelessly called for the development of a powerful movement to defend the peace, and it was thanks to this approach that the communists have frequently been able to defeat the intrigues of French imperialism and rebuff the forces of war, aggression and imperialist "Atlantic."

The struggle against imperialist colonial adventures, including colonialist ideology promoted by it, is a separate page in the activities of H. Thorez and the battle history of the CPF. In an atmosphere of chauvinistic passion, the communist party was the only political party in France to firmly take the side of the oppressed peoples. Colonialism is the source of extreme reaction both in the colonies and in France itself, H. Thorez pointed out, actively opposing the colonial wars waged by French imperialism in Vietnam (1947-1954) and Algeria (1954-1962), and the Suez Canal adventure (1956). The CPF mounted effective campaigns of solidarity with the peoples of Indochina and North Africa and with all freedom fighters.

These combat traditions were further developed through the solidarity of the CPF with the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people against American imperialism and in support of the National Unity Government in Chile and the liberation movement of other peoples.

Whatever type of events may have occurred in the world, H. Thorez proceeded from the fact that a confrontation is taking place in the world between the working class and the bourgeoisie, between socialism and capitalism and that international reaction has not abandoned its attempts to interfere in the affairs of the socialist countries, and that the principles of proletarian internationalism demand effective support in times of danger and in the struggle against any attempt to export the counterrevolution.

A convinced internationalist, H. Thorez was a passionate patriot. He warmly loved his country and the French people. "We are furthering the cause

of France," said he at the 17th CPF Congress, in May 1964. "The history of our party is studded as with landmarks with important initiatives launched for the sake of the interests of the country and actions of a national nature. This has earned it the trust of the people." At decisive times of French history the Communist Party frequently acted as the saviour of its national independence and honor, as the true heir of the best revolutionary democratic traditions of the encyclopedists-enlighteners, Jacobin revolutionaries, communards and all those who have struggled for freedom and progress. M. Thorez called for remaining loyal to this great heritage and for developing it, fighting the counterrevolutionary and capitulationist traditions of Versailles and Vichy. Defending the independence of France and opposing its subordination to U.S. hegemonistic policy, M. Thorez exposed the Marshal Plan as a weapon of economic and political enslavement. He objected to the participation of the country in the aggressive NATO bloc and the creation of American bases on French territory. Under his guidance the CPF mounted an energetic campaign against the anti-national plan of the creation of a European defense community and succeeded. This is particularly instructive today, when the supporters of an Atlantic policy are once again trying to impose upon France, one way or another, a plan for "common defense," which would make it dependent on NATO.

Thorez was a loyal friend of our country, a friend on whom one could rely even in most difficult times. He did not conceive of internationalism without solidarity with the Soviet Union and invariably emphasized the significance of the USSR as the first socialist country and main bulwark in the struggle for peace and against imperialism. "From the very beginning, we were on the side of the October Socialist Revolution." This loyalty to the cause of the Great October was M. Thorez' guiding star throughout his life. Even in the most complex circumstances he did not weaken the struggle for strengthening the friendship between the French and Soviet peoples and for developing cooperation between our countries, considering this the proper way for strengthening France' international positions. The Communist Party of France deserves unquestionable credit for the fact that in the past 10 to 13 years Soviet-French cooperation has been actively developed and turned into a permanent and dynamic factor of peace and detente.

In the midst of the cold war M. Thorez expressed the feelings of the broad popular masses by making his historical statement in the National Assembly that "the French people will never fight against the Soviet Union." M. Thorez deemed it necessary to rebuff "actively and immediately" attacks on the Soviet Union and to expose the anti-Soviet campaigns of right-wing circles. In 1950 at the 17th CPF Congress he confidently stated that, "We have refuted the dirty slander about the Soviet Union, constantly disseminated by the warmongers with a view to concealing their criminal maneuvers. These scoundrels dare to claim that the Soviet Union threatens the peace, whereas in reality the entire policy of the socialist countries . . . is a constant struggle for peace and the independence of the peoples."

M. Thorez attentively studied the experience of real socialism. He was warmly and sincerely pleased by the achievements of the Soviet people. He

pointed out that despite its entire variety, the CPSU experience is, to the CPF, "of valuable aid in resolving all most important problems at all its stages of development." Opposing any mechanical duplication whatever and clichés in politics, he never pitted the experience of the CPF against that of the socialist countries, justifiably believing that there neither is nor could there be an anti-Soviet socialism.

M. Thorez' internationalism was vividly manifested in his struggle for the unification of the international communist movement. As member of the Comintern Executive Committee since 1928 and of the Comintern Executive Committee Presidium since 1935, M. Thorez played a noted role in the collective elaboration and creative implementation of the common communist political line. After the Comintern was disbanded, under the new historical conditions, M. Thorez called for defending the ideas of unity within the communist movement with even greater energy, and for comprehensively developing cooperation and a comradely exchange of views in a spirit of proletarian internationalism. That is precisely why he sharply condemned the divisive line of the CPC leadership and its adventurism in the theory and politics and betrayal of the interests of Marxism-Leninism.

M. Thorez showed constant concern for the development of fraternal ties of cooperation and solidarity between the CPF and the CPSU. Was this an "unconditional alignment" with Moscow, as claim the enemies of the CPF? Naturally, it was not. Relations between the CPSU and the CPF and the other fraternal parties have always been based on the principles of proletarian internationalism and respect for independence and equality. The common class interests of the CPSU and the CPF, loyalty to the ideas of scientific socialism, coinciding positions and unity of views on basic problems of our time, with possible differences in the approach to one or another problem, and mutual desire to strengthen fraternal relations of friendship and solidarity were the features confirmed at the meeting between the delegations of the CPSU, headed by L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, and the CPF, headed by G. Marchais, CPF secretary general, in January 1980. History and contemporaneity and the joint struggle for common objectives, past and present, laid the solid foundation for cooperation between the CPSU and the CPF, to whose development M. Thorez made an invaluable contribution. The French communists today "speak Thorez' language" on the basic problems of our time, i.e., they hold class, internationalist positions, develop their friendship with the communists in the USSR and the other socialist countries, and strengthen their solidarity with all fighters for peace, democracy and socialism.

The Soviet people sacredly preserve the memory of Maurice Thorez, the outstanding revolutionary-internationalist, the great son of the French toiling people.

5003
CSO: 1802

CAUSE OF THE PARTY AND THE PEOPLE

Moscow KOMBUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 80 pp 119-128

[Review by V. Vasil'yev and P. Pavlov of the book "Izbrannyye Rech'i i Stat'i" [Selected Speeches and Articles] by Yu. V. Andropov, Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 318 pages]

[Text] All the successes which the Soviet people have achieved in the building of communism and the struggle for the interests of socialism, for peace and social progress and for wrecking the aggressive intrigues of imperialism are inseparably linked with the activities of the CPSU.

The party is successfully fulfilling its role as the leader of the toiling masses and the guiding force of the Soviet society thanks to its inflexible loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and to the great cause of Lenin, whose 110th birthday anniversary will be solemnly celebrated by the Soviet people. It was with Lenin that the victorious proletarian revolution entered the 20th century, a revolution which opened a new era in universal history. The peoples of the members of the socialist comity are marching under the banners of Lenin and Marxism-Leninism. The irrepressible movement of mankind toward freedom, justice and social progress is growing.

Loyalty to the founding Leninist principles of Soviet domestic and foreign policy and a creative and scientific approach to the solution of the practical problems of the building of communism are manifest in the collective thinking of the communists, the decisions of party congresses and Central Committee plenums and addresses and works by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, and of other leaders of our party and Soviet state.

The collection of selected articles and speeches by YU. V. Andropov, CC CPSU Politburo member and chairman of the Committee for State Security, covers topical problems of CPSU domestic and foreign political activities.

The collection, whose materials cover an extensive period of the author's works written in the course of a variety of leading positions, opens with the report submitted by Yu. V. Andropov at the ceremonious session in

Moscow on the occasion of the 106th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birth. The report emphasizes the live connection between Lenin's ideas and works and the theoretical and practical activities of the party under contemporary conditions and the revolutionary struggle of the working people the world over. "Time has no power over Leninism. It has no power because, accurately reflecting the objective laws of history and relying on all previous achievements of progressive social thinking, Leninism constantly absorbs the new features brought by the flow of time. Leninism is continuous creativity and the study and summation of social change. It is the continuing self-renovation of revolutionary theory under the influence of revolutionary practice" (p 5).

Inherent in the activities of the Leninist party are strict scientificity and a systematically revolutionary character and an organic link between the creative development of theory and the practical activity of the masses, the vital tasks of the building of communism in our country and the progress of world socialism and the entire international communist and workers' movement. Naturally, problems of the leading and guiding role of the CPSU in all communist construction sectors and its inseparable ties with the masses occupy an important position in the author's articles and speeches. These are basic problems of the revolutionary movement and the building of a new society, around which a most acute ideological struggle is being waged between communists and the opponents of socialism and between Marxist-Leninists and various types of revisionists and apostates from the great doctrine of the working people of all countries.

The historical experience of the CPSU factually proved the objective need for the leading role played by the Marxist-Leninist party in insuring the success of the revolutionary struggle and basic socioeconomic changes. As the author notes, this was proved by the fact that the party led the working people of our country to the building of socialism--the highest accomplishment of social progress today.

Everything gained and created by the Soviet people is inseparably linked with the activities of the Leninist party. In the future as well, its role will continue to grow in the process of historical creativity. "The higher our society rises on the ladder of social progress, the broader the scope of our constructive activities and the greater the scale of domestic and international problems to be resolved," the author states, "the greater the role of the party becomes as the leading and guiding force of society and as the political vanguard of the working class, of all working people, of the entire nation" (p 10).

The concept of the increased role of the party under developed socialist conditions is the starting point in the study of the tasks of party organizations in the field of organizational and educational work and the management of economic and cultural construction in the light of the decisions of the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses and Central Committee plenums, analyzed in Yu. V. Andropov's articles and addresses.

The party's implementation of its leading and guiding role greatly depends on the high conscientiousness and activeness of every party member called upon to be its political fighter. It is precisely this most valuable quality that characterizes the nature of the members of the Leninist party. The collection reminds of the strict requirements facing the party members, whatever their position or sector of work. "In our country, in the Land of the Soviets, a communist has always been, and will remain, the leading figure in town and country. As Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev has emphasized, he has never had, nor does he have, any benefits or privileges, other than the single privilege, single right and single duty to be the first to lead the attack in trials of war and in times of peace, dedicate more force and energy than others to the common cause and struggle and work better than others for the triumph of the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism. Today, as in the past, the communists are leading, giving examples of selfless toil and intolerance toward carelessness and negligence and the violators of labor discipline and socialist morality. Actively fighting for one's convictions and awakening in the people new strength, firing their hearts with faith and resolve and leading the people are the duties of the communist" (pp 282-283).

The Soviet people consider the party's cause as their own. This trust in CPSU policy, as the author points out, is explained by the fact that the party has no interests other than those of the people. Expressing the most profound interests of the working people and relying on Marxist-Leninist theory, the party confidently leads the Soviet people along the scientific way to the building of communism. Its policy meets with the unanimous approval and complete support of the Soviet people, firmly convinced of the fact that the tasks they face will be implemented, despite their entire complexity and scale. This is because we have both the objective and subjective conditions to do so and because, in our country, to use V. I. Lenin's words, there is a party under whose leadership we are capable of even the greatest accomplishments" (p 236).

The works in the collection convincingly show the tremendous scale and successes of the constructive work done by the Soviet people in implementing the assignments which were clearly and scientifically substantiated in the decisions of the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses. The party members and the working people of our country accepted as their battle program the decisions of the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's speech at the plenum, which provided a profound analysis of the results of the constructive activities of the working people of town and country over the first four years of the 10th Five-Year Plan, earmarked assignments for the further development of the Soviet economy and indicated the specific ways and means for their implementation.

The purpose of the development of the Soviet economy is the ever fuller satisfaction of the material and cultural needs of the working people. Improving living conditions is the main task of all party economic activities. The Soviet people can say with full justification that the

assignments earmarked by the 25th CPSU Congress on upgrading the living standard of the working people are being carried out. In the first four years of the five-year plan real per capita income rose 14 percent. housing construction is continuing to develop at a high pace and every year over 10 million people are moving into new premises.

Does this mean that we have no economic concerns or unresolved problems? Naturally, it does not. It was stated at the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum that results in economic construction and, consequently, in the social area, could have been greater. Mention was made not only of some objective difficulties but of shortcomings related to the fact that far from everywhere has there been a total change toward upgrading work effectiveness and quality. The attention of all party members, all labor collectives and party and economic managers is directed to unused possibilities, the mobilization of internal reserves and the achievement of better end results. Such a profound, comprehensive and critical approach in assessing accomplishments, and strictness and exactingness toward omissions and unfinished projects are examples of the Leninist style of management.

The party does not conceal the fact that not all problems have been resolved as yet. We have supply shortcomings. We are short of high-grade goods and difficulties in securing housing have not been eliminated. However, every honest and conscientious citizen knows that such problems are being systematically resolved and that further progress depends on the work of every Soviet working person and each labor collective. The development of our economy and the growth of the prosperity of the people are the direct consequences of the quality of our entire work. "We live the way we work. If we want to live better we must work even better, urge on the laggards and not tolerate shortcomings" (p 307).

The author deals extensively with problems of the further improvement of socialist democracy. Lenin taught that the victory of socialism and its development and the successful building of a communist society would be inconceivable without the broadest possible democracy. Socialism is democratic by its very nature, for it cannot exist or develop without involving the broadest possible population masses in active political creativity and the management of society and the state. The experience of our country has fully confirmed this.

Socialism has eliminated forever exploitation and social oppression. The total elimination of national oppression and the unification within a single USSR of the socialist nations and nationalities in the country was our great achievement. This makes it possible to say that "the national problem as we inherited it from the past and as it exists in the capitalist countries and will remain one of the gravest and most dangerous problems, has been fully and definitively resolved in our country. This is the legitimate result of the building of socialism in the USSR and the implementation of the Leninist national policy" (p 198). The Soviet state was the first to insure in practice the political equality of women. The fact

that all citizens have been guaranteed access to education and culture, which for centuries remained the privilege of a rich minority, is a tremendous achievement of socialism. The Soviet state was the first to guarantee to all members of society real political rights. It is precisely socialism that involves in state management and in participation in handling social affairs millions of working people who act through the party, the soviets, the trade unions, the public organizations, the press, together with nationwide discussions of most important laws and decisions, and the entire socialist way of life. "All these are tremendous accomplishments of the Soviet society and tremendous successes in the development of socialist democracy. That which has already been accomplished on this level has long placed socialism ahead of even the most democratic bourgeois countries" (p 12).

The Soviet people justifiably believe that the new USSR Constitution has become an important political-legal and programmatic document which opened broad possibilities for the building of communism in our country. Not much time has passed since the adoption of the constitution. However, the beneficial influence which it has on all sides of social life and the way it has organically become part of the living practice of the building of communism is already quite clear. The entire Soviet people were the drafters of the Fundamental Law of their state. Now, following the enactment of the constitution, they are actively implementing its stipulations.

"Naturally," the author points out, "we do not believe that the mechanism of socialist democracy which exists in our country has reached a limit in its development and advancement" (p 265). Broadening the guarantees of the rights of the Soviet citizens, the constitution clearly indicates the basic directions of this process, which will continue with the further development of socialist social relations and the enhanced conscientiousness of the members of the Soviet society.

One of the most important directions in the further development and advancement of socialist democracy, as stipulated in the decisions of the 24th and 25th party congresses, is the increased role and significance of the soviets. Lenin said that "this is a type of democracy unequalled in any other country" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 35, p 238). Further progress in the building of communism also requires the upgrading of the role which the trade unions, the Komsomol, the creative unions and other public organizations and labor collectives play in all governmental and social matters. The Soviet people do not look only at the fact that their constitutional rights and freedoms have been broadened and enriched. They can also see how the guarantees for the exercise of such rights and freedoms are being strengthened and how the democratic principles governing relations between the individual and the state are becoming deeper.

The Soviet people find no contradiction whatever between their rights and their obligations. "We proceed from the fact that the individual gains

true freedom whenever its activities follow the common direction of social progress" (p 264). It is precisely this that is characteristic of mature socialism under whose conditions the basic interests of society and the individual coincide.

The socialist way of life and socialist norms of morality have become long and firmly established in our country. "However, this does not mean in the least," Yu. V. Andropov states, "that we have created an ideal world inhabited by ideal people" (p 309). Unfortunately, we still come across phenomena alien to socialism such as malicious violations of labor discipline, drunkenness, hooliganism, bribery, theft of socialist property and other antisocial actions which hinder the normal life and work of the Soviet people.

The communist party and Soviet state pay great attention to uprooting crime and preventing delinquencies. Along with the use of punitive measures, as stipulated by the laws, constant efforts to prevent crime are mainly emphasized. Naturally, the struggle against antisocial actions and crime is a task facing not only the state organs but the entire society. It is the civic duty of all honest Soviet people and labor collectives. The more actively this task is implemented, the faster shall we uproot this evil.

The dialectics of development of the socialist society is such that the broadening of rights and freedoms is organically linked with upgrading the responsibility of the individual to society and the observance of civic obligations. Whoever scorns them and violates the laws harms both himself and those around him, not to speak of the interests of the collective and society at large.

"It is necessary," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out in his speech on the draft of the USSR Constitution, "for every Soviet person to clearly realize that the main guarantee of his rights is found, in the final account, in the power and prosperity of the homeland. Therefore, every citizen must feel his responsibility to society and conscientiously fulfill his duty to the state and the people."

Our party and its Central Committee pay prime attention to problems of ideological and political-educational work, considering the communist education of the working people an important front in the struggle for communism. Successes in this work greatly determine the course of the country's economic, sociopolitical and cultural progress and the strengthening of its prestige and positions in the world arena.

Summing up practical experience and formulating a specific program for action in this area, in its decree "On Improving Further Ideological and Political-Educational Work," the CPSU Central Committee notes that capitalist propaganda, with which today the propaganda of the Beijing revisionists is openly interacting, is engaged in a steady fierce onslaught against the minds of the Soviet people. One of the most important tasks of

ideological-educational work is to expose the falsehood and lies of bourgeois propaganda and the predatory methods of the enemies of socialism in their attempts to poison the minds of the masses. A number of articles in the collection deal with this problem, the problem of imperialist ideological subversion.

"Ideological subversion," the author states, "takes place in areas covering political, philosophical, legal, moral, aesthetic, religious and other views and ideas, i.e., in the realm of ideology, where the battle of ideas is fought. Therefore, a number of features characterizing the ideological struggle are inherent in ideological subversion. However, this is not a conventional ideological struggle which objectively stems from the factual existence of two opposite systems. Ideological subversion is, above all, an imperialist subversive activity against socialism. Its purpose is to weaken the socialist system. It is waged through special means and, frequently, represents open interference in the domestic affairs of the socialist countries. This violates the universally recognized norms of international law and the socialist laws. The fact that it is waged in the ideological field does not change its subversive and illegal nature. It is this that, in the first place, determines the sharp and uncompromising nature of our struggle against ideological subversion in all its manifestations" (p 297).

In his time Lenin pointed out that, unable to stop the dissemination and the influence of the Marxist doctrine, the enemies of socialism are resorting to the most insidious means. "When the bourgeois ideological influence on the workers declines, is undermined and weakens," he pointed out, "everywhere and always the bourgeoisie has resorted and will resort to most desperate lies and slanders" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 25, p 352). This Leninist conclusion not only exposes the reasons which motivate our enemies to use subversive means in ideology, but directly points out the most essential among them.

The Soviet people are justifiably proud of the fact that one of the greatest achievements of socialism is the sociopolitical and ideological unity of our society. Imperialism too can see this, for which reason it directs ideological subversion, above all, toward undermining the unity of our society and the closing of its ranks around the Leninist party. It tries to turn the people against socialism or, at least, to dislocate them ideologically, to incite in them feelings of egotism, mistrust and uncertainty, to promote indifference to politics, to befog and poison their minds with nationalistic prejudices and to weaken their communist convictions. It is precisely the morally dislocated and politically spineless individual, victim of all kinds of disinformation, sensations and rumors who become the victim of ideological subversion.

The materials in the collection prove that there are no social and class foundations in the Soviet Union which would trigger anti-Soviet activities. However, this does not mean in the least that individuals whose views and

actions are conflicting with our morality and laws could not appear under socialism. Such views and actions may be triggered by a variety of reasons such as insufficient ideological training, religious fanaticism and nationalistic vestiges, personal difficulties and moral decadence, unwillingness to work, or simply an exaggerated feeling of hurt or mental disturbance.

The organizers of ideological subversion, which has been essentially raised in a number of imperialist countries to the level of state policy, realize that, acting only from the outside, they would be unable to implement their subversive plans. That is why they seek with feverish haste in our country and in the other socialist countries renegades who could be adapted to perform this work. In this case, it is a question of those who are described in the West as the "fighters" for human rights. What are the "rights" they fight for?

Removing the verbal skin covering bourgeois propaganda, we will easily see that these renegades and their Western protectors would like to obtain the "right" to slander Soviet reality, disturb the public order and undermine the very foundations of the socialist society. The Soviet people have never granted anyone such "rights," nor will they. Whenever such "fighters" for rights formulated their ideas in the labor collective, whether a collective of workers, rural workers or members of the intelligentsia, invariably they are met with a firm rebuff. Incidentally, this confirms, yet once again, that such renegades are serving only the interests of their foreign protectors. They subsist on tips they receive from abroad as payment for formulating various types of slanderous fabrications on our Soviet reality. The bourgeois mass information media have taken up and for years dragged around the list of the same individuals which the imperialist special services are trying to turn into their paid agents.

Invariably we try to help, dispel their doubts and reconvince people who err. Different actions are called for whenever some renegades, or as they are also known in the West, "dissidents," begin to violate our order through their actions. Legal measures must taken toward such people. They must be punished in accordance with the stipulations of the Soviet laws. "There also exists various types of renegades who take the path of malicious slander of Soviet reality and, occasionally, direct complicity with the imperialist special services. Some people in the West consider their "activities" as "defense of human rights." However, the Soviet people have never granted, nor will they ever grant, anyone the right to harm socialism for whose triumph they have sacrificed so many lives and in the building of which they have invested so much toil. Protecting society from such criminal actions is both just and democratic. This is fully consistent with the rights and freedoms of the Soviet citizens and with the interests of society and the state" (p 310).

The entire course of events in the world arena convincingly proves the CPSU's loyalty to Lenin's ideas in both domestic and foreign policy. "We

are proud," the author emphasized, "of the fact that the Great October Revolution, our communist party and our Soviet state, as V. I. Lenin wrote, 'have raised the banner of peace, the banner of socialism in the eyes of the entire world.' Our party has been loyal to this banner for over 60 years" (pp 310-311).

The foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state is a class policy in terms of principles and objectives. It is a class policy above all because it is based on the interests of the building of socialism and communism.

"Our foreign policy is a class policy also because," the author states, "systematically, persistently and sincerely pursuing a policy of peace, the party at the same time stands firmly on the positions of proletarian internationalism and solidarity with the struggle of the peoples for freedom and social progress. There is no contradiction whatever in this. We do not expect that under the conditions of detente the monopoly bourgeoisie and the governments executing its will will take the side of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat or the national-liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples. The Soviet Union does not ask the West to do so. However, no demands should be of the Soviet state to abandon its solidarity with those fighting exploitation and colonial oppression" (p 17).

The collection reflects the party's activities aimed at strengthening all-round cooperation with the fraternal socialist countries, united by "common objectives and interests and unity of ideals and policies" (p 16). The close political and economic cooperation within the Warsaw Pact and COMECON is a reliable base for the success of each country and of the entire socialist comity and for insuring peaceful conditions for the constructive toil of the fraternal peoples. The coordinated policy of the socialist countries has become an important factor of social progress and peace.

The author considers the favorable changes in the world arena which characterized the 1970's, particularly their first half. These positive processes were described as detente. The principles of peaceful coexistence, on the basis of which mutually profitable political, economic and cultural relations were developed, assumed an ever stronger position in relations among countries with different social systems. The threat of a nuclear-missile war was put off.

History has assigned mankind the task of making detente irreversible. This was expressed most clearly and consistently by the true Leninist Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, the leader of our party. The Soviet Union and the entire socialist comity energetically undertook the solution of this problem.

The peoples of all countries actively supported detente. Even some conservative politicians in the West developed the understanding that there neither was nor could there be any sensible alternative to detente. In recent years, however, a withdrawal from the positions of political realism, leading to a drastic list to the right, has begun to be felt ever

more clearly in Washington's policy. The most militant reactionary forces related to the military-industrial complex would like to go back to the time when imperialism was imposing by force on other countries and peoples a suitable order. Obviously, some U.S. circles have proved unable soberly to accept changes in the world and to understand the objective nature of the processes occurring within it.

Some people overseas would like to remake the world according to their own measurement and their interests. Appeals are being heard for the accelerated growth of military strength on the basis of which it would become possible to "pressure" the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and to "claim special rights on the natural resources of the young liberated states."

The Soviet Union has frequently cautioned against the futility of plans to pressure us. The entire history of international relations following the victory of the Great October Revolution has indicated the total groundlessness of such efforts. "Such attempts are even less promising today," the author notes, "when our forces have grown immeasurably, when the fraternal socialist countries are building a new life, together with the Soviet Union, when the scope of anti-imperialist struggle is broadening in Asia, Africa and Latin America and when the forces of the fighters for democracy and social progress in capitalist countries are growing. Therefore, if anyone is to lose as a result of the hasty actions of Washington's Administration, it would be the American side itself, including American business" (p 284).

The Soviet Union favors the continuation of talks and the reaching of agreements on all key problems of contemporary international relations. However, such talks could be conducted only on the basis of respect for the principle of equality and equal security of the sides. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries wish not only to preserve but to increase the positive accomplishments in the international arena reached in the 1970's. This applies to restraining the arms race and the elimination of conflict situations in various parts of the globe. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has pointed out, "We consider acceptable and desirable any road providing that it leads to a durable peace."

The author extensively covers the activities of the communist party and Soviet state aimed at insuring the state security of our country. Discussing such activities, he points out that the Cheka organs, created by the will of the party in 1917, have kept steady watch over the gains of the Great October Revolution.

Today the state security organs are working under developed socialist conditions. A new historical community--the Soviet people--has developed, welded by single interests and a single Marxist-Leninist ideology. The state of proletarian dictatorship has developed into the socialist state of the whole people.

Historical changes have taken place in the foreign political position of our country as well. Imperialism has been forced to take into consideration the real power of the Soviet Union and of the entire socialist comity. However, this does not mean in the least that it has abandoned its attempts to turn the course of world developments in its favor.

Important conclusions apply to the Cheka organs from such a domestic and international situation. "This includes," Yu. V. Andropov states, "above all the conclusion of the inviolable unity, of the powerful unity of our socialist society. Under developed socialist conditions there are no class foundations within our country to trigger subversive activities aimed against the Soviet social and governmental system. Today the source of threats to the security of the USSR is abroad. Hence it is from abroad that the class enemy is trying to shift on our territory subversive activities and to energize ideological subversion, relying on isolated unstable people" (p 275).

Spies and organizers of ideological subversions and emissaries of various anti-Soviet subversive centers are trying to ferret out our secrets and "indoctrinate" the Soviet people suitably. That is why the high political vigilance of all Soviet citizens remains, to this day, an important topical requirement.

The author emphasizes that the guidance of the communist party is a prerequisite for the strict observance of the political line in the entire work of state security organs and a prerequisite for its success. At the 25th CPSU Congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said that, "The state security organs are doing all their work, under the party's guidance and unabated control, on the basis of the interests of the people and the state, with the support of the broad toiling masses and on the basis of the strict observance of constitutional norms and socialist legality. This, precisely, is the origin of their strength and the main prerequisite for the successful implementation of their functions."

In whatever sector they may be working, whether engaged in the struggle against enemy intelligence or subversive centers, or protecting the state borders of the USSR, the Soviet Chekists are loyally serving our socialist homeland everywhere and always. The Chekist traditions, developed under Lenin, and representing today a reliable weapon in the struggle for insuring the security of our country, are a reliable criterion in assessing the activities of all state security personnel. "Communist convictions and high professionalism, moral purity and loyalty to duty, constant vigilance and responsiveness, sensitiveness, faith in the people, a general culture and a developed feeling of civic responsibility," the author states, "is the nature of the Soviet Chekist as Dzerzhinskiy saw him and as he is seen by the Soviet people today. Such is the way he is raised by the party and the Komsomol and by our entire socialist reality" (p 266).

Unquestionably, Ye. V. Andropov's collection of speeches and articles will attract the attention of the party and soviet aktivs, ideological and scientific workers and a broad circle of readers. The materials in the collection contribute to the ideological upbringing of the Soviet people, describing to them the class, the profoundly humane nature of the domestic and foreign policy of the communist party and Soviet state.

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

5003

CSO: 1802

- END -

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

12 June 1980

J.D.

